August, Cantonna 20075

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Attorneys for

CITY OF VERNON

1	Steve M. Berliner, Bar No. 142835
- 1	sberliner@lcwlegal.com
2	Joung H. Yim, Bar No. 216136
ا ۽	jyim@lcwlegal.com
3	Alex Polishuk, Bar No. 265349
4	apolishuk@lcwlegal.com LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE
	A Professional Law Corporation
5	6033 West Century Boulevard, 5th Floor
- 1	Los Angeles, California 90045
6	Telephone: 310.981.2000
_ [	Facsimile: 310.337.0837
7	Zaynah N. Moussa, Bar No. 265343
8	Deputy City Attorney
١	zmoussa@ci.vernon.ca.us
9	City of Vernon
10	4305 Santa Fe Avenue Vernon, CA 90058
	Telephone: 323.583.8811
	Facsimile: 323.826.1438
11	1 400111110, 323,020,1430

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

In re the retirement benefits of
BRUCE V. MALKENHORST, SR. and
CITY OF VERNON,
Respondents.

CALPERS CASE NO.: 2012-0671 OAH CASE NO.: 2013080917

CITY OF VERNON'S OPPOSITION TO BRUCE MALKENHORST'S MOTION TO "AMEND NOTICE OF DEFENSE"

### I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Bruce Malkenhorst Sr.'s administrative appeal concerns the final determination of his retirement allowance – under the Public Employees' Retirement Law (the "PERL") Government Code §§ 2000 et seq. – from the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS). With his Motion to Amend Notice of Defense ("Motion"), Malkenhorst attempts to obfuscate the sole issue before this tribunal by requesting that it exceed its jurisdiction and adjudicate his private breach of contract claims against the City of Vernon. These claims have nothing to do 846795.1 VE060-025

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

with CalPERS' final determination or application of the PERL. Because it is not supported by law or equity and would only confuse the pertinent issue of this proceeding, the Motion should be denied.

#### II. MALKENHORST HAS NO STATUTORY BASIS FOR AMENDING HIS NOTICE OF DEFENSE.

Government Code section 11506, subdivision (a) states, in pertinent part, "[w]ithin 15 days after service of the accusation...the respondent may file with the agency a notice of defense." Subdivision (b) of section 11506 allows a respondent to file one or more notices of defense, "within the time specified." (Emphasis added.) Further, while Government Code section 11507 permits an agency to amend or supplement its accusations, it does not allow a respondent to file an amended notice of defense.

In his Motion, Malkenhorst cites to sections 11506 and 11507 for authority to file his amended notice. Neither of these statutes permits him to file an amended notice of defense more than fifteen days after any filed accusation. Moreover, CalPERS never filed an "accusation" in this matter; it only filed a Statement of Issues. Accordingly, Plaintiff lacked statutory authority to file a notice of defense in the first place, let alone an amendment.

#### PLAINTIFF MISTATES THE SUPERIOR COURT'S RULING. III.

Malkenhorst misinterprets the ruling of the California Superior Court in his civil lawsuit against the City of Vernon. The Superior Court sustained the City's demurrer to Malkenhorst's complaint because he had "failed to exhaust his available administrative remedy for challenging CalPERS adverse pension determination." The Court did not (and could not) order the OAH to expand its jurisdiction and rule on Mr. Malkenhorst's breach of contract claim against the City. Rather, the Court unambiguously ruled that Plaintiff had to effectuate his available administrative appeal regarding CalPERS determination of his final retirement compensation amount before he can bring a lawsuit against the City of Vernon for breach of contract:

As noted, the administrative process has not concluded. Whether plaintiff [Malkenhorst] has a 'contract right or other common law, constitutional, or statutory claim' against the City must await the conclusion of the administrative process.

846795.1 VE060-025

(See Exhibit "A," p. 3, Ruling on Demurrer, Malkenhorst's Motion to Amend Notice of Defense.) Indeed, there is no order that would preclude Malkenhorst from re-filing his breach of contract claim against the City after the administrative process has been fully exhausted.  IV. CONCLUSION  For the reasons stated herein the OAH should deny Plaintiff's motion to amend his notice of defense.  Dated: August 18, 2014  LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE  By:  August 18, 2014  LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE  By:  August 18, 2014  LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE  By:  August 18, 2014  Altoneys for CITY OF VERNON  CITY OF VERNON  20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 846795.1 VERSO-925  3		City of Vernon's Opposition to Bruce Malkenhorst's Motion to "Amend Notice of Defense" Page 3 of 6
Indeed, there is no order that would preclude Malkenhorst from re-filing his breach of contract claim against the City after the administrative process has been fully exhausted  IV. CONCLUSION  For the reasons stated herein the OAH should deny Plaintiff's motion to amend his notice of defense.  Dated: August 18, 2014  By: Steven M. Berliner Goung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	,	(Can Falailia MA 2 and 2 Parliam and Parlia
claim against the City after the administrative process has been fully exhausted  IV. CONCLUSION  For the reasons stated herein the OAH should deny Plaintiff's motion to amend his notice of defense.  Dated: August 18, 2014  LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE  By: Steven M. Berliner foung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  CITY OF VERNON  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		
For the reasons stated herein the OAH should deny Plaintiff's motion to amend his notice of defense.  Dated: August 18, 2014  By: Steven M. Berliner doung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  CITY OF VERNON  LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE  By: Steven M. Berliner doung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON		
For the reasons stated herein the OAH should deny Plaintiff's motion to amend his notice of defense.  Dated: August 18, 2014  By:  Steven M. Berliner  Foung H. Yim  Alex Polishuk  Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  CITY OF VERNON  13  14  15  16  17  18  19  20  21  22  23  24  25  26  27  28		
of defense.  Dated: August 18, 2014  By:  Steven M. Berliner  Foung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  CITY OF VERNON  LIBBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE  By:  Steven M. Berliner Foung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	ļ	
Dated: August 18, 2014  By: Steven M. Berliner Foung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		
By: Steven M. Berliney   Found H. Yim	- 1	
By: Steven M. Berliner foung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	1	Dated: August 18, 2014 LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE
By: Styren M. Berliner Goung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		
Steven M. Berliner Joung H. Yim Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		By: Christyn
Alex Polishuk Attorneys for CITY OF VERNON  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	l	Steven M. Berliney
12   CITY OF VERNON   13   14   15   16   17   18   19   20   21   22   23   24   25   26   27   28	İ	Alex Polishuk
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		CITY OF VERNON
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	ı	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	ì	
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	ľ	
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	i	
23 24 25 26 27 28	1	
24 25 26 27 28		
25 26 27 28	i	
26 27 28		
27   28	ĺ	
28		
11	1	
* *	28	846795.1 VE060-025 3

Liebert Cassidy Whitmore A Professional Law Corporation 6033 West Century Boulevard, 5th Floor Los Angeles, California 90045

# 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

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

#### STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 6033 West Century Boulevard, 5th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90045.

On August 18, 2014, I served the foregoing document(s) described as CITY OF

### VERNON'S OPPOSITION TO BRUCE MALKENHORST'S MOTION TO "AMEND

NOTICE OF DEFENSE" in the manner checked below on all interested parties in this action

### addressed as follows:

John Michael Jensen
Law Offices of John Michael Jensen
11500 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 550
Los Angeles, California 90064
Telephone: (310) 312-1100
Facsimile: (310) 312-1109
Turnile in business (Din bussianons nom

Email: <u>johnjensen(a)johnmjensen.com</u>

### **Edward Gregory** Jason Levin Lisa Petrovsky STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 633 West Fifth Street, Suite 700 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 439-9400

Facsimile: (213) 439-9599 Email: egregory@steptoe.com Email *ilevin@steptoe.com* Email: lpetrovsky@steptoe.com

Renee Salazar **CalPERS** P.O. Box 942707 Sacramento, CA 94229-2707

Telephone: (916) 795-0725 Facsimile: (916) 795-3659

Attorneys for Respondent Bruce Malkenhorst, Sr.

Attorneys for California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS)

Attorneys for Defendants/Respondents CalPERS

(BY U.S. MAIL) I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and  $\square$ processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

846795.1 VE060-025

Attachment H (GG)

Liebert Cassidy Whitmore
A Professional Law Corporation
6033 West Century Boulevard, 5th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90045

Attachment H (GG)
City of Vernon's Opposition to Bruce Malkenhorst's Motion to "Amend Notice of Defense"
Page 6 of 6

