

1 MICHAEL A. KAHN #057432
mkahn@crowell.com
2 J. DANIEL SHARP #131042
dsharp@crowell.com
3 CHRISTOPHER A. CADENA #284834
ccadena@crowell.com
4 Crowell & Moring LLP
275 Battery Street, 23rd Floor
5 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415.986.2800
6 Facsimile: 415.986.2827

7 Attorneys for Respondent

8 ANDREW THOMAS SINCLAIR
ats@sinclairlawoffice.com
9 Sinclair Law Office
300 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza
10 Rotunda Building, Suite 160
Oakland, CA 94612
11 Telephone: (510) 465-5300
12 Facsimile: (510) 465-5356

13 Attorneys for Petitioners

14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
15 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

17 JOHN REQUA, WENDELL G. MOEN,
JAY DAVIS, DONNA VENTURA,
18 ROBERT BECKER, GREGORY A.
BIANCHINI, GEORES BUTTNER,
19 ALAN HINDMARSH, STEVE
HORNSTEIN, CAL WOOD AND
20 SHARON WOOD, on behalf of
Themselves and Others Similarly Situated,

21 Petitioners,

22 v.

23 REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
24 CALIFORNIA, and DOES 1-99, inclusive,

25 Respondents.

Case No. RG 10530492

**STIPULATION RE "MAXIMUM HEALTH
PLAN CONTRIBUTION HISTORY – UC
AND PERS"**

Complaint Filed: August 11, 2010

1 This stipulation is entered with reference to the following facts:

2 A. Petitioners have made a discovery request relating to a document entitled
3 “Maximum Health Plan Contribution History – UC and PERS,” produced by Regents and Bates-
4 stamped as UC006125 - UC006177 (the “Maximum Contribution History” document).

5 B. The document is published on the University of California website and can be found
6 at: [http://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/tools-and-services/administrators/docs/girs-](http://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/tools-and-services/administrators/docs/girs-chronology.pdf)
7 [chronology.pdf](http://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/tools-and-services/administrators/docs/girs-chronology.pdf).

8 C. The parties have met and conferred regarding Petitioners’ taking the deposition of the
9 “person most knowledgeable” about the Maximum Contribution History document with counsel
10 for the Regents. The Regents represent that the employee(s) who prepared the document is/are no
11 longer employed but may be available by subpoena.

12 In order to avoid the time and expense of one or more PMK depositions, the parties
13 stipulate as follows:

- 14 1. The Maximum Contribution History document is authentic and shall not be excluded
15 from evidence for lack of authenticity.
- 16 2. The Maximum Contribution History document was prepared by one or more
17 employees of the University based on records of the University. For purposes of this
18 litigation only, the Maximum Contribution History document shall be deemed an
19 accurate summary of the information that it purports to convey and shall be treated as
20 a business record of a public employee under California Evidence Code section 1280.
- 21 3. The first two pages of the Maximum Contribution History document describe the
22 Regents’ maximum contribution toward the premiums charged by various insurers
23 that provided health care benefits to University employees and annuitants (retirees)
24 pursuant to group insurance contracts (“plans”) negotiated or arranged by
25 representatives of the Regents from 1961 to 2006. See UC006125 - UC006126. The
26 “maximum contribution” is the maximum amount that the Regents contributed for
27 premiums at particular times. This “maximum contribution” amount may have
28 included the entire premium or may not have included the entire premium. If the

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


“maximum contribution” did not cover the entire premium, the employee or retiree paid the difference.

4. The remainder of the Maximum Contribution History document summarizes some of the terms of various health care insurance plans available to University employees or annuitants from 1961 to 2011 under the column entitled “Medical.” See UC006127 - UC006177.

5. The admissibility of the Maximum Contribution History document shall be determined by the Court in accordance with the California Rules of Evidence at the time, and for the purpose, for which the proponent of the document seeks to have it admitted into evidence.


IT IS SO STIPULATED, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD.

DATED: 6.10.2015



J. Daniel Sharp
Crowell & Moring LLP
Attorneys for Respondent

DATED: 6/10/15



Andrew Thomas Sinclair
Sinclair Law Office
Attorneys for Petitioners