	Attachment H (X) CalPERS Opposition to Malkenhorst's Motion in Limine No. 11 Page 1 of 3		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Edward Gregory (State Bar No. 128375) Jason Levin (State Bar No. 161807) Lisa Petrovsky (State Bar No. 239539) STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 633 West Fifth Street, Suite 700 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 439-9400 Facsimile: (213) 439-9599 egregory@steptoe.com jlevin@steptoe.com lpetrovsky@steptoe.com  Attorneys for California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS)	Filed OAH  By: elruiz Date:06/09/14 11:36	
11 12 13 14	BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
15   16   17   18   19   20   21   22   23   24   25   26   27   28	In the Matter of the Calculation of Final Compensation of:  BRUCE MALKENHORST, SR.,  Respondent,  and.  CITY OF VERNON,  Respondent.	CASE NO. 2012-0671  OAH NO. 2013080917  CALPERS OPPOSITION TO MALKENHORST'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 11  Hearing: June 13, 2014, 9:00 a.m.	

## MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 11 SHOULD BE DENIED

This administrative proceeding concerns the determination of Malkenhorst's retirement allowance under the Public Employees' Retirement Law ("the PERL," Government Code section 20000, et seq.). CalPERS initially determined Malkenhorst's retirement allowance in 2006, but subsequently discovered in 2012 that its initial determination failed to meet statutory requirements. CalPERS then corrected its mistake as required by the PERL. (Govt. Code § 20160(b) ["[T]he board shall correct all actions taken as a result of errors or omissions of ... this system."]; see also, *Welch v. California State Teachers' Retirement Bd.* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 1, 27 [statutory history of Section 20160 indicates that "shall" means that CalPERS has a mandatory duty to act.])

In his Motion in Limine No. 11, Malkenhorst argues that CalPERS should be judicially estopped from introducing evidence "inconsistent" with its initial determination in 2006. Judicial estoppel is a discretionary, equitable doctrine that "prohibits a party from asserting a position in a legal proceeding that is contrary to a position he or she successfully asserted in the same or some earlier proceeding." (*Owens v. County of Los Angeles* (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 107, 121.) Judicial estoppel cannot apply unless there was an earlier legal proceeding in which the party to be estopped "was successful in asserting the first position (i.e., the tribunal adopted the position or accepted it as true)." (*Id.*) Judicial estoppel also does not apply when the first position was asserted by mistake. (*Id.*)

There are several reasons that judicial estoppel does not apply to CalPERS' recalculation of Malkenhorst's retirement allowance. Many of those reasons are described in CalPERS' "OPPOSITION TO MALKENHORST'S MOTION REGARDING COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, RES JUDICATA, ISSUE PRECLUSION, AND CLAIM PRECLUSION," (filed May 16, 2014), and CalPERS adopts here its prior Opposition. In summary, judicial estoppel cannot apply here because there has never been a legal proceeding where Malkenhorst's retirement allowance has been litigated. In 2005 and 2006, CalPERS decided not to litigate the issue and refrained from filing a Statement of Issues. (Tit. 2, Cal. Code Regs. §§ 555.2, 555.4.)

	Attachment H (X) CalPERS Opposition to Malkenhorst's Motion in Limine No. 11 Page 3 of 3			
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And because there was no Statement of Issues, the argument, no hearing, and no judicial adoption of Judicial estoppel does not apply for a state was the result of a mistake that, by law, must be an equitable doctrine to prevent a public entity from For the reasons set forth above, the Motion DATED: June	IPERS Opposition to Malkenhorst's Motion in Limine No. 11 ge 3 of 3  and because there was no Statement of Issues, there was no judge, no evidence, no motions, no gument, no hearing, and no judicial adoption of CalPERS' initial determination.  Judicial estoppel does not apply for a second reason: CalPERS' initial determination as the result of a mistake that, by law, must be corrected. There is no authority for applying a equitable doctrine to prevent a public entity from carrying out its legal, statutory obligations.  For the reasons set forth above, the Motion should be denied.		
10	10			
11	By:	forefr		
12		Jason Levin		
14	Atte	orneys for Complainant CalPERS		
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20	20			
21	21			
22	22			
23	23			
24	24			
25	25			
26	26			
27	27			
28	28			
		2		