- 1			
1	WAYNE R. GROSS, State Bar No. 138828		
2	AGreenberg@GGTrialLaw.com JESSICA B. HARDY, State Bar No. 246377	ELECTRONICALLY FILED	
3	JHardy@GGTrialLaw.com FRANK J. MICKADEIT, State Bar No. 293520	Superior Court of California, County of Orange	
4	FMickadeit@GGTrialLaw.com GREENBERG GROSS LLP	05/22/2014 at 01:40:00 PM Clerk of the Superior Court	
5	650 Town Center Drive, Suite 1750 Costa Mesa, California 92626	By e Clerk, Deputy Clerk	
6	Telephone: (949) 383-2800 Facsimile: (949) 383-2801		
7	JOHN K. BECKLEY, State Bar No. 140440		
8	Beckley.John@aaa-calif.com AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALI	FORNIA	
9	3333 Fairview Road A451 Costa Mesa, CA 92626		
10	Telephone: (714) 885-1319 Facsimile: (714) 885-1307		
11	Attorneys for Thomas V. McKernan		
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
13	COUNTY OF ORANGE, CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER		
14			
15	JANET BECKFORD,	Case No. 30-2012-00556081-CU-IC-CJC	
16	Plaintiff,	HONORABLE MARY FINGAL SCHULTE	
17	v.	DEPT. C06	
18	INTERINSURANCE EXCHANGE OF THE AUTOMOBILE CLUB; AUTOMOBILE	NOTICE OF RULING ON THOMAS V. McKERNAN'S MOTION TO DISMISS	
19	CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA; and DOES 1 to 10,	(BARROWS MOTION) AND DEMURRER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT	
20	Defendants.	Action Filed: March 21, 2012	
21		Trial Date: July 21, 2014	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on May 22, 2014, at 10:00 a.m. in Department C06 of the above-captioned Court, the motion of Thomas V. McKernan to dismiss with prejudice all causes of action alleged against him in the Second Amended Complaint and demurrer to the Second Amended Complaint came on regularly for hearing. The Court issued a tentative ruling, attached hereto as Exhibit A. The tentative ruling became the order of the Court. The motion to dismiss was granted. All causes of action against Thomas McKernan are dismissed with prejudice. The demurrer to the Second Amended Complaint was denied as moot.

DATED: May 22, 2014

GREENBERG GROSS LLP

By:

Wayne R. Gross (
Jessica B. Hardy

Frank J. Mickadeit

Attorneys for Thomas V. McKernan

EXHIBIT A

12-0556081	BECKFORD V AUTO	DEMURRER Moot, given ruling on motion to dismiss.
		MOTION TO DISMISS
		Defendant Thomas V. McKernan's Motion to Dismiss is granted and the action is dismissed as to him. Defendant's demurrer is moot.
		A Barrows motion is an evidence-based motion that may be used by a defendant named in an action by a Doe amendment under Code of Civil Procedure section 474 to challenge the amendment on the ground plaintiff "unreasonably delayed" in filing it. The defendant bears the burden of establishing plaintiff knew of its identity and the facts suggesting its liability earlier than claimed by plaintiff. Moreover, the defendant "must show not only that the plaintiff was dilatory but also 'that defendant suffered prejudice from any such delay.'" (Barrows, supra, 144 Cal.App.3d at p. 9; A.N., supra, at p. 1067.)
		Defendant has sustained his burden. It is clear from the original complaint alone, filed 3-21-2012,and Ex. A attached thereto, that Plaintiff knew of the identify of facts suggesting liability against Defendant's CEO, Thomas V. McKernan since 2012.
		Furthermore, the homeowners insurance renewal offer letter of 7-28-2009 was signed by Mr. McKernan and attached as Ex.A to the original Complaint.
		Defendant was not served with this lawsuit until March 2014, and he is prejudiced in that trial is now less than 2 months away, he has not been able to obtain evidence or prepare his defense, unlike Plaintiff who has had 4 years to prepare for the case.
		Plaintiff's opposition was read, but not given much weight by the Court. First of all, it is untimely, having been filed on 5/14 for a 5/22 hearing. CCP§1005 required it be filed and served quickest method within 9 Court days of the hearing. 5/14 was just 6 court days before the hearing. Furthermore, there is no POS attached to the Opposition, so it is unclear if Plaintiff's counsel even served it on Defendant. Also, the opposition violates CRC, Rule 3.1113(d)

	in that it is 21 pages long and should have been only 15 pages. Finally, it violates CRC, Rule 3.1113(a) & (b) in that there are no points and authorites. It is just a 20 page rambling declaration. Since the Reply addressed the opposition on the merits (and addressed the many procedural defects that the Court had already noticed), the Court does not strike the opposition.
--	--

1	PROOF OF SERVICE			
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE			
3 4	At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. My business address is 650 Town Center Drive, Suite 1750, Costa Mesa, CA 92626.			
5	On May 22, 2014, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as NOTICE OF RULING ON THOMAS V. McKERNAN'S MOTION TO DISMISS (BARROWS MOTION) AND DEMURRER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT on the interested parties in this action as follows: SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST			
6 7				
8				
9	BY MAIL: I enclosed the document(s) in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in the Service List and placed the envelope for collection and			
mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with the practice Greenberg Gross llp for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the	Greenberg Gross llp for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of			
11	business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope was placed			
12	the mail at Costa Mesa, California.			
13	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.			
14	Executed on May 22, 2014, at Costa Mesa, California. Gina Muscari			
15 16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

NOTICE OF RULING ON THOMAS V. McKERNAN'S MOTION TO DISMISS

NOTICE OF RULING ON THOMAS V. McKERNAN'S MOTION TO DISMISS