

**CASE No. S272113**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

---

MICHAEL R. RATTAGAN,

PLAINTIFF AND APPELLANT,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

DEFENDANT AND RESPONDENT.

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT  
CASE No. 20-16796  
APPEAL FROM U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR NORTHERN CALIFORNIA  
CASE No. 3:19-cv-01988-EMC  
HONORABLE EDWARD M. CHEN

---

**APPLICATION OF LESLIE SPELLMAN FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
*AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER;  
PROPOSED *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF**

---

STRATEGIC LEGAL PRACTICES, APC  
PAYAM SHAHIAN (SBN 228406)  
1888 CENTURY PARK EAST, 19TH  
FL.  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067  
TELEPHONE: (310) 929-4900  
FACSIMILE: (310) 943-3838

---

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae*  
LESLIE SPELLMAN

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

APPLICATION OF STRATEGIC LEGAL PRACTICES TO FILE  
    *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER..... 2  
AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF ..... 3  
CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT ..... 7

**APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

Leslie E. Spellman respectfully requests leave to file the accompanying brief as *amicus curiae* in this proceeding in support of petitioner Michael R. Rattagan under California Rule of Court 8.520(f)(2).

On February 9, 2023, this Court extended Leslie Spellman's deadline to file the *amicus curiae* brief to March 1, 2023.

This brief has been drafted entirely by Spellman's counsel, Strategic Legal Practices, APC ("SLP"), without compensation or monetary contribution from any party or counsel for a party, and has been served on all parties (proof of service attached).

***Interest of the Amicus Curiae.*** Leslie Spellman is the plaintiff and real party in interest in *Kia America, Inc. v. Superior Court (Spellman)* (Case No. D079858), a case that presents issues as to whether the economic loss rule bars a claim for fraudulent inducement of contract that is committed via fraudulent concealment. This Court issued a grant-and-hold order in *Spellman* on April 20, 2022 (Supreme Court Case No. S273170), pending a decision in *Rattagan v. Uber Technologies* (Supreme Court Case No. S272113). In light of her personal interest in how *Rattagan* is decided and because she brings a valuable perspective to the issues before this Court, Ms. Spellman wishes to aid the court as *amicus curiae*.

In addition, Ms. Spellman's counsel, SLP, is a plaintiff's-side law firm consisting of over 20 attorneys practicing in California. The firm, which was established in 2010, regularly litigates fraudulent concealment/inducement claims against automobile manufacturers, in

which manufacturers fail to disclose automobile defects to consumers. Indeed, SLP has litigated thousands of such cases in the State of California and has taken a leading role in advancing and protecting the rights of injured consumers, including through individual and class actions. SLP thus can provide perspective on the issues before this Court, including whether the Court should reach the fraudulent inducement issue encompassed by the Ninth Circuit's certified question.

### **AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF**

Ms. Spellman adopts the positions in Knight Law Group LLP's amicus curiae brief—specifically, that (1) the Ninth Circuit's certified question encompasses both types of fraudulent concealment claims, namely, fraud during the performance of a contract and fraud in the inducement to enter into a contract; (2) courts in California have long held that claims for fraudulent inducement are not barred by the economic loss doctrine; (3) the fraud-in-the-performance analysis in *Robinson Helicopter Co., Inc. v. Dana Corp.* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 979 (*Robinson*) does not bar claims for fraud in the inducement; (4) even more broadly, *Robinson* does not bar claims for fraudulent concealment; and (5) *Robinson*'s exception to the economic loss doctrine is not limited to fraudulent affirmative misrepresentations.

Further, by virtue of having litigated thousands of fraudulent concealment claims against car manufacturers, Ms. Spellman's counsel, SLP, has extensive experience with respect to car manufacturers' attempts to exploit the economic loss doctrine. In the past few years, SLP has observed a flood of cases in which manufacturers assert that the economic loss doctrine bars all fraudulent concealment claims.

*Spellman* is typical. *Spellman* involves an engine defect that can cause certain Kia vehicles to spontaneously burst into flames. Kia sold millions of these vehicles to consumers, but never disclosed the defect to consumers or the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration ("NHTSA").<sup>1</sup> This defect has resulted in, among other things, a United States Congressional hearing into Kia and Hyundai's conduct (at which their officials refused to appear)<sup>2</sup>, criminal indictments brought by the Seoul Central District Prosecutors' Office against former Kia and Hyundai executives on charges of delaying recall processes even though the executives were aware of defects<sup>3</sup>, \$210 million in civil penalties assessed by NHTSA against Kia and Hyundai for their delayed and untimely recall of affected vehicles<sup>4</sup>, a whistleblower award in excess of \$24 million (the maximum amount allowed by law) to the former Hyundai employee who revealed Hyundai's safety violations<sup>5</sup>, and an ever-expanding NHTSA investigation into Kia and Hyundai's conduct<sup>6</sup>.

These events tell the story of Kia's large-scale fraud against

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.consumerreports.org/car-recalls-defects/park-recalled-hyundai-kia-vehicles-outside-due-to-fire-risk-a1002120529/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.nbcdfw.com/news/local/ceos-of-hyundai-kia-decide-not-to-attend-hearing-on-burning-cars/78652/>;  
<https://www.abcactionnews.com/news/local-news/i-team-investigates/kia-hyundai-ceos-refuse-to-attend-senate-hearing-to-explain-cause-of-car-fires>

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20190724000850](http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20190724000850;);  
<http://www.koreaaitimes.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=92104>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.reuters.com/business/autos-transportation/us-regulators-step-up-probe-into-hyundai-kia-engine-fires-2021-12-27/>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.npr.org/2021/11/09/1053985268/whistleblower-gets-more-than-24m-for-reporting-hyundai-and-kia-over-engine-fires>;  
<https://www.newsweek.com/whistleblower-who-reported-that-hyundai-kia-moved-too-slowly-major-recall-awarded-24m-1647630>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.reuters.com/business/autos-transportation/us-regulators-step-up-probe-into-hyundai-kia-engine-fires-2021-12-27/>

consumers. Yet rather than acknowledge and come to terms with its wrongdoing, as Volkswagen did in connection with its diesel emissions scandal, Kia has sought to evade the consequences of its fraud by trying to exploit the economic loss doctrine.

This is precisely what happened in *Spellman*. Despite the absence of any legal support in the case law for its position, Kia invoked the economic loss doctrine as its basis to demur to Ms. Spellman's fraudulent inducement / fraudulent concealment claim—a claim which alleges that Kia knew about a dangerous engine defect in 2018 Kia Sportage vehicles prior to the sale of the plaintiff's vehicle, but failed to disclose the defect to her at the time of sale or thereafter.

The manufacturers' position on the economic loss rule is untenable. No case law supports it. That's why in *Spellman*, the trial court easily ruled that the economic loss doctrine does **not** bar claims for fraudulent inducement / fraudulent concealment. As the Knight Law Group amicus brief makes clear, this is the obvious and only conclusion, since there is no published California case that has applied the economic loss rule to bar a claim for fraudulent inducement.

Kia's strategy in *Spellman* is part of a comprehensive, systematic effort to avoid fraud liability and has been used, in almost identical form, by numerous other car manufacturers in California—indeed, SLP sees these arguments regularly. Because there is no actual split in authority on whether the economic loss rule bars claims for fraudulent inducement, there is no need for further briefing on the issue.

Rather, the Court should simply address the issue in its decision in *Rattagan*. Indeed, the Ninth Circuit's certified question on its face *includes* both fraud in the inducement and fraud in the performance.

The Court should therefore answer the question as broadly as the Ninth Circuit asked it and should hold that the economic loss doctrine does not apply to claims for fraudulent concealment / inducement.

Dated: March 1, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/Caitlin J. Scott*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Payam Shahian  
Tionna Dolin  
Caitlin J. Scott  
attorney for Leslie Spellman





STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Supreme Court of California

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Supreme Court of California

Case Name: **RATTAGAN v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES**

Case Number: **S272113**

Lower Court Case Number:

1. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age and not a party to this legal action.
2. My email address used to e-serve: **cscott@slpattorney.com**
3. I served by email a copy of the following document(s) indicated below:

Title(s) of papers e-served:

Filing Type	Document Title
APPLICATION	Rattagan - SLP Amicus Brief (Spellman)-

Service Recipients:

Person Served	Email Address	Type	Date / Time
Christopher Swanson Knight Law Group LLP	chriss@knightlaw.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Millie Cowley Horvitz & Levy LLP	mcowley@horvitzlevy.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Mike Terry STEYER LOWENTHAL BOODROOKAS ALVARES & SMITH LLP	mterry@steyerlaw.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Laura Lim Greines, Martin, Stein & Richland LLP 319125	llim@gmsr.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Records Unit United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit	CA09_Records@ca9.uscourts.gov	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Connie Christopher Horvitz & Levy LLP	cchristopher@horvitzlevy.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Jeffrey Davidson Covington & Burling LLP 248620	j davidson@cov.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Cynthia Tobisman Greines Martin Stein & Richland LLP 197983	ctobisman@gmsr.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Allan Steyer Steyer, Lowenthal, Boodrookas, Alvarez, & Smith LLP 100318	asteyer@steyerlaw.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Beth Brinkmann	bbrinkmann@cov.com	e-	3/1/2023

Covington & Burling 129937		Serve	6:43:04 PM
Lindsey Barnhart Covington & Burling, LLP 294995	LBarnhart@cov.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Cassandra Johnson Horvitz & Levy LLP	cstgeorge@horvitzlevy.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Alana Rotter Greines, Martin, Stein & Richland LLP 236666	arotter@gmsr.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Caitlin Scott Law Offices of Loyst P. Fletcher 310619	cscott@slpattorney.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Roger Kirnos Knight Law Group 283163	rogerk@knightlaw.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Richard Lee Covington & Burling LLP 338126	rlee@cov.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Rebecca Powell Horvitz & Levy LLP 310909	rpowell@horvitzlevy.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Martin Anderson Anderson Law Firm 178422	firm@andersonlaw.net	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Andrew August Steyer Lowenthal Boodrookas Alvarez & Smith LLP 112783	aaugust@steyerlaw.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Cameron Fraser Horvitz & Levy LLP 326692	cfraser@horvitzlevy.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Tionna Dolin Strategic Legal Practices, APC 299010	tdolin@slpattorney.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Lisa Perrochet Horvitz & Levy, LLP 132858	lperrochet@horvitzlevy.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Rebecca Nieto Greines Martin Stein & Richland LLP	rnieto@gmsr.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Chris Hsu Greines Martin Stein & Richland LLP	chsu@gmsr.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Amy Heath Covington & Burling LLP 312516	aheath@cov.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Denis Listengourt Covington & Burling LLP	dlistengourt@cov.com	e-Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Payam Shahian	pshahian@slpattorney.com	e-	3/1/2023

Strategic Legal Practices, APC 228406		Serve	6:43:04 PM
Jeremy Rosen Horvitz & Levy LLP 192473	jrosen@horvitzlevy.com	e- Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM
Clara Shin Covington & Burling LLP 214809	cshin@cov.com	e- Serve	3/1/2023 6:43:04 PM

This proof of service was automatically created, submitted and signed on my behalf through my agreements with TrueFiling and its contents are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

3/1/2023

Date

/s/Caitlin Scott

Signature

Scott, Caitlin (310619)

Last Name, First Name (PNum)

Strategic Legal Practices, APC

Law Firm