

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
NEW YORK

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

WILLIAM P. DONOVAN, JR (SBN 155881)
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
wdonovan@mwe.com
2049 Century Park East, Suite 3200
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206
Telephone: +1 310 277 4110
Facsimile: +1 310 277 4730

JOSHUA B. SIMON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
WARREN HASKEL (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DMITRIY TISHYEVICH (SBN 275766)
CAROLINE INCLEDON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
CHELSEA COSILLOS (admitted *pro hac vice*)
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
jsimon@mwe.com
whaskel@mwe.com
dtishyevich@mwe.com
cincledon@mwe.com
ccosillos@mwe.com
One Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, NY 10017
Telephone: +1 212 547 5400
Facsimile: +1 212 547 5444

Attorneys for Defendant
CIGNA HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RJ, as the representative of her beneficiary son
SJ; LW as the representative of her
beneficiary spouse MW; and, DS, an
individual, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CIGNA HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY, and MULTIPLAN, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:20-cv-02255-EJD

**CIGNA HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
PARTIAL MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED COMPLAINT
UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 12(B)(6)**

Date: August 12, 2021
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 4 – 5th Floor
Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

INTRODUCTION1

ARGUMENT2

I. Plaintiffs’ RICO § 1962(c) Claim Fails (Count I).2

 A. Plaintiffs Have Not Plausibly Alleged Cigna Engaged in RICO
 Predicate Acts.2

 1. Plaintiffs Do Not Adequately Plead Mail or Wire Fraud.2

 a) Plaintiffs Fail to Plead Reliance.....2

 b) Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Cigna Had Specific Intent to
 Defraud.5

 2. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Federal Health Care Offenses or Money
 Laundering as a Predicate Act.5

 B. Plaintiffs Have Not Pled A Rico Enterprise or That Cigna
 Conducted Its Affairs.....8

 C. Plaintiffs LW and DS Have Not Alleged a RICO Injury.....9

II. Plaintiffs’ RICO Conspiracy Claim Fails (Count II)10

III. Plaintiff LW’s Claims Should Be Dismissed Because Her Plan Contains a Binding Forum
 Selection Clause.....11

CONCLUSION.....14

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
NEW YORK

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

ABC Servs. Grp., Inc. v. Health Net of Cal., Inc.,
2020 WL 2121372 (C.D. Cal. May 4, 2020)3

Agric. Water v. Occidental Oil & Gas Corp.,
235 F. Supp. 3d 1132 (E.D. Cal. 2017).....6

*Atlantic Marine Construction Co. v. U.S. District Court for the Western District Of
Texas*,
571 U.S. 49 (2013).....11

In re Becker,
993 F.3d 731 (9th Cir. 2021)12

Brummett v. Cty. of San Diego,
2013 WL 1285144 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2013)9

Cedars Sinai Med. Ctr. v. Mid-W. Nat'l Life Ins. Co.,
118 F. Supp. 2d 1002 (C.D. Cal. 2000)3

CIGNA Corp. v. Amara,
563 U.S. 421 (2011).....12

Coleman v. Supervalu, Inc. Short Term Disability Program,
920 F. Supp. 2d 901 (N.D. Ill. 2013)13

DeSoto v. Condon,
2008 WL 11338151 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2008).....6

Desoto v. Condon,
371 F. App'x 822 (9th Cir. 2010)1, 5, 6

Eclectic Props. E., LLC v. Marcus & Millichap Co.,
751 F.3d 990 (9th Cir. 2014)8

Gomez v. Guthy-Renker, LLC,
2015 WL 4270042 (C.D. Cal. July 13, 2015).....8, 9

Grant v. County of Erie,
542 F. App'x 21 (2d Cir. 2013)10

Holland Am. Line Inc. v. Wartsila N.A., Inc.,
485 F.3d 450 (9th Cir. 2007)14

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
NEW YORK

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
NEW YORK

1 *Howard v. Am. Online Inc.*,
 208 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2000)11

2 *Kyko Global, Inc. v. Prithvi Information Solutions, Ltd.*,
3 2020 WL 3654951 (W.D. Pa. July 6, 2020)6

4 *Laurel Vill. Bakery LLC v. Glob. Payments Direct Inc.*,
5 2006 WL 2792431 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2006)14

6 *LD v. United Behavioral Health, Inc.*,
 508 F. Supp. 3d 583 (N.D. Cal. 2020)1, 4

7 *Manetti-Farrow, Inc. v. Gucci Am., Inc.*,
8 858 F.2d 509 (9th Cir. 1988)14

9 *Marin v. Xerox Corp.*,
 935 F. Supp. 2d 943 (N.D. Cal. 2013)13

10 *Martinez v. Quality Loan Serv. Corp.*,
11 2009 WL 586725 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2009).....10

12 *Metaxas v. Lee*,
13 2020 WL 7025095 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2020)7

14 *Nicolas v. MCI Health & Welfare Plan No. 501*,
 453 F. Supp. 2d 972 (E.D. Tex. 2006).....13

15 *Odom v. Microsoft Corp.*,
16 486 F.3d 541 (9th Cir. 2007)6

17 *Oscar v. Univ. Students Co-operative Ass’n*,
18 965 F.2d 783 (9th Cir. 1992), *abrogated on other grounds by*
 Diaz v. Gates, 420 F.3d 897 (9th Cir. 2005).....10

19 *Pac. Bay Recovery, Inc. v. Cal. Physicians’ Servs., Inc.*,
20 12 Cal. App. 5th 200 (2017)3

21 *Prichard v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*,
22 783 F.3d 1166 (9th Cir. 2015)12

23 *Rapp v. Henkel of Am., Inc.*,
 2018 WL 6307904 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2018).....13

24 *RJ, et al. v. Cigna Behavioral Health, Inc.*,
25 2021 WL 1110261 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2021).....5, 8

26 *Rodriguez v. McKinney*,
27 878 F. Supp. 744 (E.D. Pa. 1995)10

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 NEW YORK

1	<i>Rodriguez v. PepsiCo Long Term Disability Plan</i> , 716 F. Supp. 2d 855 (N.D. Cal. 2010)	13
2		
3	<i>Sarmiento v. BMG Ent.</i> , 326 F. Supp. 2d 1108 (C.D. Cal. 2003)	13
4		
5	<i>Stewart v. Wachowski</i> , 2004 WL 2980783 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 28, 2004)	6
6		
7	<i>Stitt v. Citibank, N.A.</i> , 2015 WL 75237 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2015)	9
8		
9	<i>TML Recovery, LLC v. Humana Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 3208807 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2019)	3
10		
11	<i>U.S. Med. Instruments, Inc. v. CFS N.A., Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 6055387 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2013)	10
12		
13	<i>United States v. Caldwell</i> , 560 F.3d 1214 (10th Cir. 2009)	7
14		
15	<i>United States v. Esterman</i> , 324 F.3d 565 (7th Cir. 2003)	7
16		
17	<i>Verifone, Inc. v. A CAB, LLC</i> , 2016 WL 4480686 (D. Nev. Aug. 24, 2016)	11
18		
19	<i>Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA</i> , 317 F.3d 1097 (9th Cir. 2003)	6
20		
21	<i>Wallace v. Int’l Paper Co.</i> , 2020 WL 4938361 (C.D. Cal. July 2, 2020)	13
22		
23	<i>Yamauchi v. Cotterman</i> , 84 F. Supp. 3d 993 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	7
24		
25	Statutes	
26	18 U.S.C. § 1961(1)	8
27	28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)	11
28		
29	Other Authorities	
30	Rule 9(b)	<i>passim</i>
31	Rule 12(b)(6)	7, 11, 12

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.