Case 5:17-cv-00965-GW-DTB Document 56 Filed 09/27/17 Page 1 of 6 Page ID #:1862

1 Defendants make this submission to inform the Court of new legislation 2 signed by Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. on September 26, 2017. Defendants 3 request that this Court take judicial notice of the new legislation, pursuant to 4 Federal Rule of Evidence 201, because it amends Labor Code section 4615, which 5 is the statute challenged by Plaintiffs in this action. 6 On September 26, 2017, Governor Brown signed Assembly Bill No. 1422 7 ("AB 1422"), enacting that statute into law, effective January 1, 2018. AB 1422 is 8 a cleanup bill that amends Labor Code sections 139.21 and 4615, the two workers' 9 compensation anti-fraud statutes that were adopted in 2016 as part of Assembly Bill 10 No. 1244 and Senate Bill No. 1160. A true and correct copy of the full text of AB 11 1422 is attached hereto as Exhibit A and is posted on the official California 12 Legislative Information website and available here: 13 http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\_id=201720180 14 AB1422. The legislative committee reports for this bill, which summarize the 15 cleanup nature of the legislation, are available on the California Legislative 16 Information website here: 17 http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill\_id=201720180 18 AB1422. 19 Among other provisions, AB 1422 amends Labor Code section 4615, the 20 constitutionality of which has been challenged by the Plaintiffs in this case. As 21 amended, effective January 1, 2018, the new text of Labor Code section 4615 will 22 read in full as follows: 23 4615. (a) Upon the filing of criminal charges against a physician, practitioner, or provider for any crime described in subparagraph (A) 24 of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 139.21, the following 25 shall occur: 26

27

28

(1) Any lien filed by, or on behalf of, the physician, practitioner, or

provider or any entity controlled, as defined in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 139.21, by the physician, practitioner, or

1 provider for medical treatment services under Section 4600 or medical-legal services under Section 4621, and any accrual of interest 2 related to the lien, shall be automatically stayed. 3 (2) Except as provided in subdivisions (b) and (c), the stay shall be in 4 effect from the time of the filing of the charges until the disposition of 5 the criminal proceedings. 6 (b) Upon conviction, as defined in paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) of 7 Section 139.21, of the physician, practitioner, or provider for any crime described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision 8 (a) of Section 139.21, the automatic stay shall remain in effect for any 9 liens not dismissed pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (e) of Section 139.21 until the commencement of lien consolidation 10 procedures under paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of Section 139.21. 11 (c) The automatic stay required by this section shall not preclude a 12 physician, practitioner, or provider from requesting the dismissal with 13 prejudice and forfeiture of sums claimed therein of any liens subject to the stay. Upon the receipt of that request and for good cause shown, 14 the chief judge of the Division of Workers Compensation or his or her 15 designee may lift the stay as to one or more of those liens and order that they be dismissed with prejudice. 16 17 (d) The administrative director shall promptly post on the division's Internet Web site the names of any physician, practitioner, or provider 18 of medical treatment services whose liens are stayed pursuant to this 19 section. 20 (e) The automatic stay required by this section shall not preclude the 21 appeals board from inquiring into and determining within a workers' compensation proceeding whether a lien is stayed pursuant to 22 subdivision (a) or whether a lien claimant is controlled by a physician, 23 practitioner, or provider. 24 (f) The administrative director may adopt rules for the implementation 25 of this section. 26 (g) Notwithstanding this section, the filing of new or additional 27 criminal charges against a physician, practitioner, or provider who has been suspended pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of 28

1 subdivision (a) of Section 139.21 shall not stay liens that are subject to consolidation and adjudication pursuant to subdivisions (e) to (i), 2 inclusive, of Section 139.21, unless a determination has been made 3 pursuant to subdivision (i) of Section 139.21 that a lien did not arise from the conduct that subjected the physician, practitioner, or provider 4 to suspension. 5 Defendants bring the Court's attention, in particular, to new subdivision (e) 6 in the text above. 7 The Governor included a Signing Message with his signing of the bill. The 8 signing message is attached hereto as Exhibit B and is posted on the Governor's 9 webpage here: 10 https://www.gov.ca.gov/docs/AB\_1422\_Signing\_Message\_2017.pdf. 11 The Signing Message states in full: 12 To the Members of the California State Assembly: 13 14 I am signing AB 1422 which is clean-up legislation to last year's workers' compensation anti-fraud bills, AB 1244 and SB 1160. Those measures 15 established new requirements and authority to help prevent and reduce fraud 16 in the workers' compensation system. Specifically, they require the suspension of medical providers who have been convicted of crimes 17 involving fraud or abuse. They also require placing a stay on any liens filed 18 by providers charged with such crimes (pending disposition of the charges). 19 AB 1422 confirms that the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board retains 20 jurisdiction to resolve disputes about the applicability of the automatic stay provision to specific liens. This bill is declaratory of existing law which 21 provides for the resolution of these disputes through the Board's current 22 practices and procedures. Nothing in last year's legislation creating the stay was intended, or operated, to divest the Board from jurisdiction over these 23 issues. 24 Sincerely, 25 26 Edmund G. Brown Jr. 27 28

1	Legislative history is an appropriate subject of judicial notice. See <i>Arce v</i> .				
2	Douglas, 793 F.3d 968, 979, n. 4 (9th Cir. 2015) ("We take judicial notice of				
3	legislative history materials pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 201(b)."),				
4	citing Aramark Facility Servs. v. SEIU, Local 1877, 530 F.3d 817, 826 n. 4 (9th				
5	Cir. 2008); see also Ass'n des Eleveurs de Canards et d'Oies du Quebec v. Harris,				
6	729 F.3d 937, 945 (9th Cir. 2013); Chaker v. Crogan, 428 F.3d 1215, 1223 (9th				
7	Cir. 2005).				
8	Dated: September 27, 2017 Respectfully submitted,				
9	XAVIER BECERRA				
10	Attorney General of California MARK R. BECKINGTON Supervising Density Attorney Canada				
11	Supervising Deputy Attorney General				
12	/a/ Amia I Madlay				
13	/s/ Amie L. Medley AMIE L. MEDLEY Denuty Attorney General				
14	Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants Christine Baker and George Parisotto, in their				
15	Official Capacities				
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Case Name:	Vanguard Medical	No.	5:17-cv-00965	
	Management, et al. v. Christine			
	Baker, et al.			

I hereby certify that on <u>September 27, 2017</u>, I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system:

## NOTICE OF NEW LEGISLATION AND REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

I certify that **all** participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on <u>September 27, 2017</u>, at Los Angeles, California.

Amie L. Medley	/s/ Amie L. Medley
Declarant	Signature