

**BRODSKY & SMITH**  
Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352)  
esmith@brodskysmith.com  
Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113)  
rcardona@brodskysmith.com  
9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Phone: (877) 534-2590  
Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GABRIEL ESPINOZA,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

VOCERA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,  
JOHN N. MCMULLEN, SHARON L.  
O'KEEFE, MIKE BURKLAND,  
RONALD A. PAULUS, BHARAT  
SUNDARAM, JULIE ISKOW, BRENT D.  
LANG, ALEXA KING, and HOWARD E.  
JANZEN,

Defendants.

Case No.:

**Complaint For:**

- (1) Breach of Fiduciary Duties
- (2) Aiding and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duties
- (3) Violation of § 14 (e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934
- (4) Violation of § 14 (d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934
- (5) Violation of § 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Plaintiff, Gabriel Espinoza (“Plaintiff”), by and through his attorneys, alleges upon information and belief, except for those allegations that pertain to him, which are alleged upon personal knowledge, as follows:

**SUMMARY OF THE ACTION**

1. Plaintiff brings this stockholder action against Vocera Communications, Inc. (“Vocera” or the “Company”) and the Company’s Board of Directors (the “Board” or the “Individual Defendants,” collectively with the Company, the “Defendants”), for breaches of fiduciary duty and for violations of Sections 14(e), 14(d) and 20(a) of the Securities and Exchange

1 Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) as a result of Defendants’ efforts to sell the Company to Stryker  
2 Corporation, Inc. (“Parent”) through merger vehicle Voice Merger Sub Corp. (“Merger Sub”)  
3 (collectively with “Parent,” “Stryker”) as a result of an unfair process, and to enjoin an upcoming  
4 tender off on a proposed all cash transaction (the “Proposed Transaction”).

5 2. The terms of the Proposed Transaction were memorialized in a January 6, 2022,  
6 filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) on Form 8-K attaching the definitive  
7 Agreement and Plan of Merger (the “Merger Agreement”). Under the terms of the Merger  
8 Agreement, Stryker will acquire all of the remaining outstanding shares of Vocera’ common stock  
9 at a price of \$79.25 per share in cash. As a result, Vocera will become an indirect wholly-owned  
10 subsidiary of Stryker.

11 3. Thereafter, on January 25, 2022, Vocera filed a Solicitation/Recommendation  
12 Statement on Schedule 14D-9 (the “Recommendation Statement”) with the SEC in support of the  
13 Proposed Transaction.

14 4. In approving the Proposed Transaction, the Individual Defendants have breached  
15 their fiduciary duties of loyalty, good faith, due care and disclosure by, *inter alia*, (i) agreeing to  
16 sell Vocera without first taking steps to ensure that Plaintiff in his capacity as a public Company  
17 stockholder would obtain adequate, fair and maximum consideration under the circumstances; and  
18 (ii) engineering the Proposed Transaction to benefit themselves and/or Vocera without regard for  
19 Plaintiff in his capacity as a public Company stockholder. Accordingly, this action seeks to enjoin  
20 the Proposed Transaction and compel the Individual Defendants to properly exercise their  
21 fiduciary duties to Plaintiff in his capacity as a public Company stockholder.

22 5. Next, it appears as though the Board has entered into the Proposed Transaction to  
23 procure for itself and senior management of the Company significant and immediate benefits with  
24 no thought to Plaintiff as a public stockholder. For instance, pursuant to the terms of the Merger  
25 Agreement, upon the consummation of the Proposed Transaction, Company Board Members and  
26 executive officers will be able to exchange all Company equity awards for the merger  
27 consideration.

28



1 at all relevant times.

2 13. Defendant Mike Burkland (“Burkland”) has been a director of the Company at  
3 all relevant times.

4 14. Defendant Ronald A. Paulus (“Paulus”) has been a director of the Company at  
5 all relevant times.

6 15. Defendant Bharat Sundaram (“Sundaram”) has been a director of the Company at  
7 all relevant times.

8 16. Defendant Julie Iskow (“Iskow”) has been a director of the Company at all relevant  
9 times.

10 17. Defendant Brent D. Lang (“Lang”) has been a director of the Company at all  
11 relevant times. In addition, Lang serves as the Company’s Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”).

12 18. Defendant Alexa King (“King”) has been a director of the Company at all relevant  
13 times.

14 19. Defendant Howard E. Janzen (“Janzen”) has been a director of the Company at all  
15 relevant times.

16 20. Defendants identified in ¶¶ 10 - 19 are collectively referred to as the “Individual  
17 Defendants.”

18 21. Non-Party Parent is a Stryker Corporation operates as a medical technology  
19 company. Parent was founded in 1941 and is headquartered in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Shares of  
20 Parent common stock are traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol “SYK”.

21 22. Non-Party Merger Sub is a wholly owned subsidiary of Parent created to effectuate  
22 the Proposed Transaction.

23 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

24 23. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange  
25 Act (15 U.S.C. § 78aa) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) as Plaintiff alleges  
26 violations of Sections 14(a) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act. This action is not a collusive one to  
27 confer jurisdiction on a court of the United States, which it would not otherwise have. The Court  
28

1 has supplemental jurisdiction over any claims arising under state law pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

2 24. Personal jurisdiction exists over each defendant either because the defendant  
3 conducts business in or maintains operations in this District or is an individual who is either present  
4 in this District for jurisdictional purposes or has sufficient minimum contacts with this District as  
5 to render the exercise of jurisdiction over defendant by this Court permissible under traditional  
6 notions of fair play and substantial justice.

7 25. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, because Vocera  
8 maintains its principal offices in this district, and each of the Individual Defendants, as Company  
9 officers or directors, has extensive contacts within this District.

10 **THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS' FIDUCIARY DUTIES**

11 26. By reason of the Individual Defendants' positions with the Company as officers  
12 and/or directors, said individuals are in a fiduciary relationship with Vocera and owe the public  
13 stockholders of the Company, including Plaintiff, the duties of due care, loyalty, and good faith.

14 27. By virtue of their positions as directors and/or officers of Vocera, the Individual  
15 Defendants, at all relevant times, had the power to control and influence, and did control and  
16 influence and cause Vocera to engage in the practices complained of herein.

17 28. Each of the Individual Defendants are required to act with due care, loyalty, good  
18 faith and in the best interests of the Company public stockholders including Plaintiff. To diligently  
19 comply with these duties, directors of a corporation must:

- 20 a. act with the requisite diligence and due care that is reasonable under the  
21 circumstances;
- 22 b. act in the best interest of the Company and its public stockholders,  
23 including Plaintiff;
- 24 c. use reasonable means to obtain material information relating to a given  
25 action or decision;
- 26 d. refrain from acts involving conflicts of interest between the fulfillment  
27 of their roles in the Company and the fulfillment of any other roles or  
28

# 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.