S280322

# In the Supreme Court of California

# Jayde Downey,

Plaintiff and Appellant

v.

# City of Riverside, et. al.,

Defendants and Respondents.

After a Decision by the Court of Appeal Fourth Appellate District, Division One, Case No. D080377 Appealing from a Judgment Entered in Favor of Defendants Riverside, Ara Sevacherian and Vahram Sevacherian, County Superior Court Case No. RIC 1905830 Honorable Harold W. Hopp, Judge.

# JAYDE DOWNEY'S ANSWERING BRIEF TO THE AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF THE CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ET AL.

Greg Rizio, Bar No. 157008 Eric Ryanen, Bar No. 146559 **Rizio Lipinsky Law Firm PC** 2677 N. Main Street, #225 Santa Ana, CA 92705

Telephone (714) 547-1234 Facsimile (714) 547-1245

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Appellant

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABL	E OF AUTHORITIES	3
I.	Introduction	4
II. Mainta	Downey did not Define the Injurious Event as the Deficiently ained Public and Private Property	5
CERT	IFICATION OF WORD COUNT	7
PROO	F OF SERVICE	8

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### Cases

<i>Bird v. Saenz</i> (2002) 28 Cal. 4 <sup>th</sup> 910	4
Fortman v. Forvaltnings-bolaget Insualan (2013) 212 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 3d 1415	4
Mobaldi v. Regents of University of California (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 573	4
<i>Thing v. La Chusa</i> (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 644	4

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Amici Curiae (Amici) echo the same positions asserted by And as did Respondents, Amici parse and misquote the respondents. evidence and authorities cited by the parties (including Downey); they rely on principals established in the context of medical malpractice cases (and expanded to include defective product cases in Fortman v. Forvaltnings*bolaget Insualan* (2013) 212 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 3d 1415; they claim that Downey's goal is to overturn (as opposed to return to) Thing v. La Chusa, (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 644 and its progeny (before *Fortman*); they claim, falsely, Downey invites this Court to reverse Bird v. Saenz (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 910, and breathe new life into Mobaldi v. Regents of University of California (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 573; and they conveniently omit the "or" in the *Thing's* statement of elements which justify and simultaneously limit an award of damages for emotional distress caused by awareness of the negligent infliction of injury to a close relative, which are the traumatic emotional effect on the plaintiff who contemporaneously observes both the event or conduct that causes serious injury to a close relative and the injury itself, *Thing*, Id., 48 Cal. 3d at 667.

Downey made her case in her Opening Brief and her Reply Brief. We will address only the fallacy of the premise that underpins Amici's position:

# DOWNEY DID NOT DEFINE THE INJURIOUS EVENT AS THE DEFICIENTLY MAINTAINED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROPERTY

Amici claim at page 9 of their brief (ACB) that Downey defined the injury producing event in terms of the dangerous conditions of the intersection. But that's not how she defined it. At page 3 of her operative (third amended) complaint (CT, Vol. 2 at 296), she pleaded as follows:

"At all relevant times, plaintiff DOWNEY was present, or virtually present, at the scene of the collision, at the time of the collision and, then and there, had *contemporaneous, sensory awareness of the connection between the injury-causing traffic collision and the grievous injury suffered by her daughter as a result of the collision, thereby causing Plaintiff DOWNEY (to suffer) serious emotional injuries and damages as a result of these events and conditions at the scene...*" (Emphasis added).

By itself, the negligent maintenance of Respondents' properties was of no moment without the injurious traffic collision that caused the injuries to Vance that Downey perceived contemporaneously with the collision. That Respondents negligent maintenance and control of their properties were two of the three causes of the collision that caused Vance to suffer emotional distress as she contemporaneously perceived the collision that occurred as a result of the conditions on the property should be recognized as actionable by a bystander NIED claimant. DATED: 2/9/2024

By:\_\_\_\_\_

ERIC RYANEN Attorneys for Appellant

### **CERTIFICATION OF WORD COUNT**

Pursuant to CRC 8.204(c) and 8.486(a)(6), the text of this brief, including footnotes and excluding the cover information, table of contents, table of authorities, signature blocks and this certificate, consists of 456 words in 13-point Times New Roman type as counted by the word processing program used to generate the text.

DATED: 2/9/2024

RIZIO LIPINSKY LAW FIRM PC

. /

By:\_\_\_\_\_

ERIC RYANEN Attorneys for Appellant

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

#### STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 2677 N. Main Street, Suite 225, Santa Ana, California, 92705.

On February 9, 2024, I served the foregoing document described as: on the parties in this action by serving: JAYDE DOWNEY'S ANSWERING BRIEF TO THE AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF THE CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ET AL.

#### SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

(X) By Mail: I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with United States Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Santa Ana, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

(X) I electronically filed the document(s) with the Clerk of the Court by using the TrueFiling system. Participants in the case who are registered TrueFiling users will be served by the TrueFiling system. Participants in the case who are not registered TrueFiling users will be served by mail or by other means permitted by the court rules.

Executed on February 9, 2024, at Santa Ana, California.

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

/s/ Michele A. Markus Michele A. Markus

#### SERVICE LIST

Counsel for California Med Assoc at al. Curtis A. Cole, Esq. Cassidy Davenport, Esq. Cole Pedroza LLP 2295 Huntington Drive San Marino, CA 91108 <u>curtiscole@colepedroza.com</u> <u>cassidydavaenport@colepedroza.com</u> Service via First Class Mail

Service via First Class

Mail

#### **Counsel for City of Riverside**

Michael A. Verska, Deputy City Attorney Rebecca McKee, Assistant City Attorney City of Riverside, Office of the City Attorney 3750 University Avenue, Suite 350 Riverside, CA 92501 mverska@riversideca.gov ereid@riversideca.gov smurphy@riversideca.gov esummers@riversideca.gov cperez-cota@riversideca.gov koehlert@riversideca.gov rmckee-reimbold@riversideca.gov

#### **Counsel for Severacherian Respondents**

Shelby Kennick, Esq. CP Law Group 655 North Central Avenue, Suite 1125 Glendale, CA 91203 p: 818-853-5131 f: 818-638-8549 skennick@cplawgrp.com achikuami@cplawgrp.com

Christian E. Foy Nagy, Esq. Freeman Mathis & Gary LLP 550 South Hope Street, Suite 2200 Los Angeles, CA 90071 (213) 615-7000 (833) 264-2083 fax Christian.Nagy@fmglaw.com

Evan Theodore Martin 1009 NE Elm Street Grants Pass, Oregon 97526 Service Via First Class Mail

Service Via First Class Mail California Court of Appeals 4th Appellate District Division One 750 B Street, Suite 300 San Diego, California 92101 Service Via First Class Mail

Superior Court of the County of Riverside Honorable Harold W. Hopp, Judge Department 10 4050 Main Street Riverside, CA 92501 Service Via First Class Mail

#### STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Supreme Court of California

# **PROOF OF SERVICE**

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Supreme Court of California

### Case Name: **DOWNEY v. CITY OF RIVERSIDE** Case Number: **S280322** Lower Court Case Number: **D080377**

- 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: eryanen@riziolawfirm.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
BRIEF	Downey Answer to Amicus Brief
Service Recipients:	

Person Served	Email Address	Туре	Date / Time
Shelby Kennick	skennick@cplawgrp.com	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Cp Law Group		Serve	AM
Vee Beauregard	vbeauregard@riversideca.gov	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
City Attorney's Office		Serve	AM
Karen Moore	kmoore@riversideca.gov	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Riverside City Attorney's Office		Serve	AM
Eric Ryanen	eryanen@riziolawfirm.com	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Rizio Law Firm		Serve	AM
146559			
Dorothy Zolman	dzolman@riversideca.gov	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Office of the City Attorney - City of Riverside		Serve	AM
Curtis Cole	curtiscole@colepedroza.com	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Cole Pedroza LLP		Serve	AM
52288			
Cassidy Davenport	cassidydavenport@colepedroza.com		2/9/2024 10:32:25
Cole Pedroza LLP		Serve	AM
259340			
Pro Per Attorney	sfcourt@nationwideasap.com		2/9/2024 10:32:25
Nationwide Legal, LLC		Serve	AM
148947			
Cristina Flores	Cristina.Flores@fmglaw.com		2/9/2024 10:32:25
Freeman Mathis & Gary LLP		Serve	
Christian Nagy	Christian.Nagy@fmglaw.com	1	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Freeman Mathis & Gary LLP		Serve	AM
231536			
Freddi Lindsey	flindsey@colepedroza.com	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Cole Pedroza LLP		Serve	
Erin Summers	esummers@riversideca.gov	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Riverside City Attorney		Serve	AM

Michael Verska	mverska@riversideca.gov	e-	2/9/2024 10:32:25
Riverside City Attorney		Serve	AM
207213			

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.

2/9/2024

Date

/s/Michele Markus

Signature

Ryanen, Eric (146559)

Last Name, First Name (PNum)

Rizio Law Firm

Law Firm