FERRIS & BRITTON A Professional Corporation

Michael R. Weinstein (SBN 106464) Scott H. Toothacre (SBN 146530) 501 West Broadway, Suite 1450 San Diego, California 92101

Telephone: (619) 233-3131 Fax: (619) 232-9316

mweinstein@ferrisbritton.com stoothacre@ferrisbritton.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Cross-Defendant LARRY GERACI and Cross-Defendant REBECCA BERRY

ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California,

County of San Diego

05/21/2019 at 02:55:00 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court By E- Filing Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CENTRAL DIVISION

LARRY GERACI, an individual,

Plaintiff,

٧.

DARRYL COTTON, an individual; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

DARRYL COTTON, an individual,

Cross-Complainant,

v.

LARRY GERACI, an individual, REBECCA BERRY, an individual, and DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE,

Cross-Defendants.

Case No. 37-2017-00010073-CU-BC-CTL

Judge:

Hon. Joel R. Wohlfeil

PLAINTIFF/CROSS-DEFENDANTS' **OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT CROSS-**COMPLAINANT DARRYL COTTON'S DECLARATION AND REPLY SEPARATE STATEMENT FILED CONCURRENTLY WITH HIS REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR ALTERNATIVELY, SUMMARY ADJUDICATION; AND DECLARATION OF SCOTT H. TOOTHACRE

[IMAGED FILE]

DATE:

May 23, 2019

TIME:

9:00 a.m.

DEPT:

C-73

Filed:

March 21, 2017

Trial Date:

June 28, 2019

Plaintiff and Cross-Defendant Larry Geraci, by and through counsel, hereby files this objection to the Declaration of Darryl Cotton and the Reply Separate Statement filed concurrently with his Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, or, Alternatively, Summary

PLAINTIFF/CROSS-DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT CROSS-COMPLAINANT DARRYL COTTON'S DECLARATION AND REPLY SEPARATE STATEMENT FILED WITH HIS REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR ALTERANTIVELY, SUMMARY ADJUDICATION; DECLARATION OF SCOTT H. TOOTHACRE

2 3

1

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

GROUNDS FOR OBJECTIONS

1. Mr. Cotton's Opposition Papers Were Not Served on Plaintiff's Counsel in Violation of CCP § 437c(b)(4)

In replying to an opposition to a motion for summary judgment the moving party's declarations or points and authorities in reply to the opposition must be served and filed at least five days before the date set for the hearing (unless the court shortens the period for good cause shown). [CCP § 437c(b)(4).] Plaintiff's counsel were never served with Defendant Cotton's Reply papers. Instead, they were downloaded from the Register of Actions on May 21, 2019.

2. No Summary Judgment Reply Separate Statement is Allowed

The summary judgment statute does not provide for a "Reply Separate Statement." Nor are "Exhibits and Evidence in Support of Reply" generally allowed. [Nazir v. United Airlines, Inc. (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 243, 249]

3. New Evidence in Reply Papers is Generally Not Allowed

The moving party generally may not rely on additional evidence filed with it reply papers. [San Diego Watercrafts, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A. (2002) 1092 CalApp.4th 308, 316.] The opposing party must object to avoid a waiver. [Gafcon, Inc. v. Ponsor & Assocs. (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 1388, 1426.] The court's consideration of the late-filed evidence over objection may violate the opposing party's due process rights to be fully informed as to the issues it must meet to defeat the motion. [San Diego Watercrafts, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., supra, 102 Cal.App.4th at 316]

The court has discretion to consider new evidence in reply papers in ruling on a summary judgment motion, provided the other party had notice and an opportunity to respond. [Plenger v. Alza Corp. (1992) 11 Cal.App.4th 349, 362; Jacobs v. Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage Co. (2017) 14 Cal.App.5th 438, 449-450.] Here, plaintiff was not provided an opportunity to respond to the new evidence contained within Mr. Cotton's Declaration as the reply papers were never served on plaintiff's counsel.

DECLARATION OF SCOTT H. TOOTHACRE

- 1. I, Scott H. Toothacre, am an attorney in good standing and authorized to practice law before all Court's in the State of California. I am employed by the Law Firm of Ferris & Britton, APC and am one of the attorneys representing Mr. Geraci and Ms. Berry in this case.
- 2. I make this Declaration on personal knowledge and if asked to testify to the matters contained herein, I could and would do so competently.
- 3. I am aware that Mr. Cotton's Reply papers on his Motion for Summary Judgment, or Alternatively, Summary Adjudication of Issues, were not served on any Attorney, employee or staff of Ferris & Britton, APC, and were not received by email or in the mail in the normal course of business.
- 4. On May 21, 2019, by looking on the Register of Actions, our office discovered that Reply papers had been filed by Mr. Cotton. Thereafter, one of our paralegals purchase and download the Reply papers.
- 5. The Reply papers downloaded from the Register of Actions do not contain any Proof of Service indicating that service has been accomplished.

I swear under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this May 21, 2019 in San Diego, California.

Scott H. Toothacre