BARBARA J. PARKER, City Attorney, SBN 069722 MARIA BEE, Chief Assistant City Attorney, SBN 167716 KEVIN P. MCLAUGHLIN, Supervising Deputy City Attorney, SBN 2514 One Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor Oakland, California 94612 Telephone: (510) 238-2961; Fax: (510) 238-6500 Email: kmclaughlin@oaklandcityattorney.org Attorneys for Plaintiff CITY OF OAKLAND 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIC TO 9 **COUNTY OF SOLANO** JUDGE _______CHRISTINE CARRINGER FOR ALL PURPOSES 10 FCS057752 11 CITY OF OAKLAND. Case No. 12 COMPLAINT OF PLAINTIFF CITY OF Plaintiff. **OAKLAND** 13 14 MARCELL PATTERSON and DOES 1-10, 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 COMPLAINT OF PLAINTIFF CITY OF OAKLAND

21.

Plaintiff City of Oakland ("Plaintiff" or "City") complains as follows:

THE PARTIES

- The City is a charter city existing under the laws of the State of California, in the
 County of Alameda.
- 2. Defendant Marcell Patterson is an individual. The City is informed and believes that Defendant lives in the City of Vallejo, County of Solano.
- 3. The names and capacities of the defendants named as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to the City. The City is informed and believed, and thereon alleges, that Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are the affiliates, employees, agents, partners, co-venturers, control persons, or aiders and abettors of the other defendants, and each other, and that Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are legally responsible in some manner for the events herein alleged. The City alleges that each Doe is a natural person or entity, whether public or private, whether natural persons or corporations, partnerships associations, or sole proprietorships, duly organized and existing and authorized to do business in the State of California. When the City learns the identities and capacities of Does 1 through 10, the City will amend the Complaint accordingly.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 4. Defendant is a police officer employed with the City of Oakland. On June 5, 2019, Defendant drove a motor vehicle in Vallejo, California, and negligently collided with a motor vehicle driven by Terry Baker. The accident caused injury to Ms. Baker.
- 5. Ms. Baker filed a lawsuit in the County of Alameda against the City and Defendant, styled *Terry Baker v. City of Oakland, Marcell Patterson, and Does 1 to 10*, Case No. RG20054133. In the lawsuit, Ms. Baker sought to recover damages against the City and Defendant for her injuries incurred in the accident. During the lawsuit, the City contended that Defendant was not within the scope of employment with the City when the accident occurred.
- 6. The City provided Defendant with a legal defense in the *Baker* lawsuit pursuant to Government Code sections 825 and 995.2. The legal defense was provided pursuant to an agreement with Defendant reserving the rights of the City not to pay any judgment, compromise, or settlement in the *Baker* case until it is established that the injury arose out of an act or omission

occurring within the scope of Defendant's employment with the City. In that circumstance, the City is required to pay the judgment, compromise, or settlement only if it is established that the injury arose out of an act or omission occurring in the scope of Defendant's employment as an employee of the City. See Gov. Code § 825(a).

- 7. In fact, Defendant was not in the scope of employment at the time of the June 5, 2019 accident. Among other things, Defendant was off the clock and uncompensated for his driving, was driving his ordinary commute home, was not in uniform and had no job duties while driving, was not required to drive home from work, and his driving provided no benefit to the City on the date of the accident.
- 8. The *Baker* lawsuit settled, with the City paying in excess of \$4 million to Ms. Baker to resolve her claims against the City and Defendant. The parties agreed that the settlement would not alter or affect any obligation of Defendant to indemnify the City.
- 9. In this action, the City seeks to have it established that the June 5, 2019 accident and Ms. Baker's resulting injuries arose out of an act or omission of Defendant not within the scope of Defendant's employment with the City, and to hold Defendant liable to indemnify the City, and/or pay in contribution in proportion to fault, for the claims, losses, damages, and settlement expenses incurred in mitigation and defense of the claims asserted against the City in the *Baker* case.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. This Court has jurisdiction to address the issues raised in this Complaint because, among other things, Defendant resides in this state and is employed in this state, and because the amount in controversy is within the amount for unlimited jurisdiction.
- 11. Venue is proper in this Court because Defendant is believed to reside within Solano County.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION - EQUITABLE INDEMNITY

Against All Defendants

- 12. The City re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs, as if fully set forth herein.
 - 13. The City is without fault, culpability, negligence, or other liability in the Baker

case, but was required to defend itself and settle that case as a result of Defendants' acts or omissions. Defendants therefore have an equitable obligation to indemnify and hold harmless the City against the claims, losses, damages, and settlement expenses incurred in mitigation and defense of the claims asserted against the City in the *Baker* case.

Wherefore, the City prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as hereinafter set forth.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – EQUITABLE CONTRIBUTION Against All Defendants

- 14. The City re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs, as if fully set forth herein.
- 15. The City is without fault, culpability, negligence, or other liability in the *Baker* case, but was required to defend itself and settle that case as a result of Defendants' acts or omissions. Defendants therefore have an equitable obligation of contribution in the payment of the claims, losses, damages, and settlement expenses incurred in mitigation and defense of the claims asserted against the City in the *Baker* case in proportion to the actual culpability, fault, responsibility, and negligence caused and created by Defendants.

Wherefore, the City prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as hereinafter set forth.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the City respectfully requests judgment as follows:

- 1. For judgment against Defendants requiring that Defendants indemnify the City for all claims, losses, damages, and settlement expenses incurred by the City in mitigation and defense of the claims asserted against the City in the *Baker* case;
- 2. For judgment against Defendants requiring that Defendants contribute in payment of the claims, losses, damages, and settlement expenses incurred in mitigation and defense of the claims asserted against the City in the *Baker* case in proportion to the actual culpability, fault, responsibility, and negligence caused and created by Defendants;