

No. 21-16162

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

---

CARL WASHINGTON, et al.,  
*Plaintiffs/Appellants,*

v.

CVS PHARMACY, INC.,  
*Defendant/Appellee.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
No. 15-cv-03504-YGR-JSC (Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers)

---

**OPENING BRIEF**

---

Robert B. Gilmore  
Jeffrey S. Beelaert  
Susie Kim  
STEIN MITCHELL BEATO &  
MISSNER LLP 901 15th Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-737-7777

Bonny E. Sweeney  
Samantha Stein  
HAUSFELD LLP  
600 Montgomery Street  
Suite 3200  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
415-633-1908

Elizabeth C. Pritzker  
Jonathan K. Levine  
Caroline Corbitt  
PRITZKER LEVINE LLP  
1900 Powell Street, Suite 450  
Emeryville, CA 94608  
415-692-0772

Richard S. Lewis  
Sathya S. Gosselin  
Theodore F. DiSalvo  
HAUSFELD LLP  
888 16th Street NW, Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
202-540-7200

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
INTRODUCTION .....	1
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT .....	4
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	5
PERTINENT STATUTES .....	6
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	7
A.    Factual and legal background .....	7
1.    Usual and customary pricing .....	8
2.    CVS’s Health Savings Pass program .....	10
a.    Concern as to usual and customary prices .....	10
b.    Intentional concealment and damages .....	14
3.    Courts have held that similar pharmacy discount program prices should have been reported as usual and customary prices. ....	15
4.    State consumer protection statutes .....	16
B.    Procedural background .....	17
1.    Insured customers sued CVS. ....	17
a.    CVS’s motions in limine .....	18
b.    Jury instructions .....	20
i.    No duty to disclose.....	20

ii. Third-party beneficiary status.....	21
2. Jury verdict .....	22
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	23
STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	25
ARGUMENT.....	26
I. The district court’s “no affirmative duty to disclose” jury instruction and related motion in limine ruling misstated the law, confused the jury, and caused prejudicial error.....	26
A. The district court improperly limited plaintiffs’ presentation of their case to the jury based on a misunderstanding of its earlier ruling.....	28
B. The jury instruction and related motion in limine ruling conflict with relevant provisions of the state consumer protection statutes. ....	31
C. The district court misapplied the law of the case doctrine. ....	35
D. The legal errors prejudiced plaintiffs.....	38
II. The district court erred in instructing the jury that plaintiffs’ statutory consumer protection claims turned on their status as third-party beneficiaries. ....	40
III. The district court abused its discretion in excluding evidence of other litigation against CVS.....	46
A. The district court abused its discretion when it prevented plaintiffs from asking witnesses about other lawsuits after CVS opened the door to such questioning. ....	47

B. Other lawsuits demonstrate that CVS knew of disagreement within the industry.....	49
CONCLUSION .....	52
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES	
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	
ADDENDUM	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Actuate Corp. v. Aon Corp.</i> , No. C 10-05750 WHA, 2012 WL 2285187 (N.D. Cal. June 18, 2012) .....	47
<i>Arizona v. California</i> , 460 U.S. 605 (1983) .....	35
<i>BladeRoom Grp. v. Emerson Elec. Co.</i> , 20 F.4th at 1231 (9th Cir. 2021) .....	25, 28, 31, 38, 39, 40
<i>Caballero v. City of Concord</i> , 956 F.2d 204 (9th Cir. 1992) .....	39
<i>Cheatham v. ADT Corp.</i> , 161 F. Supp. 3d 815 (D. Ariz. 2016) .....	32
<i>Chess v. Dovey</i> , 790 F.3d 961 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	25
<i>Clem v. Lomeli</i> , 566 F.3d 1177 (9th Cir. 2009) .....	25, 28, 38, 40
<i>Collins v. eMachines, Inc.</i> , 202 Cal. App. 4th 249 (2011) .....	33
<i>Compton v. Countrywide Fin. Corp.</i> , 761 F.3d 1046 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	17, 37
<i>Connick v. Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd.</i> , 675 N.E.2d 584 (Ill. 1996) .....	34
<i>Corcoran v. CVS Health Corp.</i> , 779 Fed. App'x 431 (9th Cir. 2019) .....	7, 18
<i>Dang v. Cross</i> , 422 F.3d 800 (9th Cir. 2005) .....	25
<i>Entek GRB, LLC v. Stull Ranches, LLC</i> , 840 F.3d 1239 (10th Cir. 2016) .....	36

# 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.