

1 SHANE G. SMITH (SBN 272630)
2 ssmith@mccormickbarstow.com
3 **MCCORMICK BARSTOW LLP**
4 7647 North Fresno Street
5 Fresno, CA 93729
6 Telephone: (559) 433-1300

ELIZABETH M. TRECKLER (SBN 282432)
etreckler@bakerlaw.com
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
11601 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90025
Telephone (310) 820-8800

5 KYLE G.A. WALLACE (*pro hac vice*)
6 kwallace@shiverhamilton.com
7 **SHIVER HAMILTON LLC**
8 3490 Piedmont Road, Suite 640
Atlanta, GA 30305
Telephone: (404) 593-0020

ROBB C. ADKINS (SBN 194576)
radkins@bakerlaw.com
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3100
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone (415) 659-2600

9 *Attorneys for Defendant*
10 *OneShare Health, LLC*

Attorneys for Defendant
Trinity Healthshare, Inc.

11 ALAN D. LEETH (SBN 199226)
12 aleeth@burr.com
13 **BURR & FORMAN LLP**
14 420 North 20th Street, Suite 3400
15 Birmingham, AL 35203
16 Telephone: (205) 458-5499

Attorneys for Defendant
The Alieria Companies Inc.

17 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
18 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

18 CORLYN DUNCAN and BRUCE DUNCAN,
19 individually and on behalf of all others similarly
20 situated,

Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 THE ALIERA COMPANIES INC., f/k/a Alieria
23 Healthcare, Inc., and TRINITY
24 HEALTHSHARE, INC., ONESHARE
25 HEALTH, LLC, f/k/a UNITY HEALTH
26 SHARE, LLC and as KINGDOM
27 HEALTHSHARE MINISTRIES, LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-867-TLN-KJN

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO FILE RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'
THIRD NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORITY**

HON. TROY L. NUNLEY

Complaint Filed: April 28, 2020
Amended Complaint Filed: June 26, 2020

1 Defendants The Alieria Companies Inc. (“Alieria”), Trinity Healthshare, Inc. (“Trinity”),
2 and OneShare Health, LLC (“OneShare”) jointly move for leave to file this response to Plaintiffs’
3 Third Notice of Supplemental Authority. (Doc. 66). The notice attaches a recent order from a
4 Colorado federal court involving different plaintiffs and the facts surrounding their own separate
5 enrollment in Unity and Trinity plans. (Doc. 66-1).

6 Put simply and respectfully, the Colorado court misapplied the law and facts and reached
7 the wrong conclusion. That court concluded that the arbitration clause in the member guide (which
8 no one disputes exists) was not enforceable against the plaintiffs in that case. The court reached
9 that conclusion despite the plaintiffs having notice of and the opportunity to review the member
10 guide before their plans became effective, and then instead of cancelling and requesting a refund,
11 choosing to participate in the HCSM program for many months thereafter by making monthly
12 contributions, each time reaffirming their implicit acknowledgement and assent to the member
13 guidelines including the arbitration clause. In reaching its conclusion, the Colorado court accepted
14 the plaintiffs’ mischaracterization of the meaning of disclaimer language in the application and
15 member guide intended to make clear to members that they were not entering into an insurance
16 contract, and instead were enrolling in a health care sharing ministry that facilitates medical
17 expense sharing among the members pursuant to the guidelines but takes on no indemnity
18 obligations like an insurance company. The Colorado court erred in concluding that no binding
19 agreement was created under the arbitration clause, but even if the court had believed that there
20 was a fact issue concerning the enforceability of the member guide and its arbitration clause, the
21 court should have conducted an FAA Section 4 trial instead of resolving that issue in favor of the
22 plaintiffs. *See* 9 U.S.C. § 4 (Section 4 of the Federal Arbitration Act) (explaining that the court
23 shall proceed to a summary trial “if the making of the arbitration agreement . . . be in issue”).

24 Defendants’ arguments concerning the Colorado order are further detailed in a Rule 59(e)
25 motion to amend or alter that is pending before that court. A copy is attached as **Exhibit A**.

26 Accordingly, Defendants respectfully submit that the District of Colorado order is not
27 relevant to or dispositive of any issues presented in the pending Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss,

1 or alternatively, Compel Arbitration filed in this action, and as such, the Court should not consider
2 the District of Colorado order submitted with Plaintiffs' Third Notice of Supplemental Authority
3 in rendering its decision on Defendants' Motions. As the Court is aware from Defendants'
4 discussion of *Jackson v. Alieria Cos. Inc.*, No. 19-cv-01281-BJR, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149772,
5 at *10 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 18, 2020) (granting motion to compel arbitration in another case within
6 the Ninth Circuit) in their briefing (*see, e.g.*, Doc. Nos. 37 & 49), and the series of supplemental
7 authorities that have been subsequently presented by the parties, that district courts have split in
8 deciding whether to compel arbitration in other cases brought in other states by members. But,
9 ultimately, this Court should decide the motions to compel arbitration in this case based on the law
10 that governs in this case and the facts relating to the Duncans' enrollment and participation in the
11 Unity and Trinity plans. In doing so, Defendants' motions to compel arbitration should be granted.

12 DATED: May 11, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

13 /s/ Shane G. Smith
14 SHANE G. SMITH (SBN 272630)
15 ssmith@mccormickbarstow.com
16 **MCCORMICK BARSTOW LLC**
7637 North Fresno Street
Fresno, CA 93720
Telephone: (559) 433-1300

17 KYLE G.A. WALLACE (*pro hac vice*)
18 kwallace@shiverhamilton.com
19 **SHIVER HAMILTON LLC**
3490 Piedmont Road, Suite 640
Atlanta, GA 30305
20 Telephone: (404) 593-0020
21 Facsimile: (888) 501-9536

22 *Attorneys for Defendant*
OneShare Health, LLC

23 /s/ Alan D. Leeth
24 ALAN D. LEETH (SBN 199226)
25 aleeth@burr.com
26 **BURR & FORMAN LLP**
420 North 20th Street, Suite 3400
Birmingham, AL 35203
27 Telephone: (205) 458-5499

Attorneys for Defendant
The Alera Companies Inc.

DATED: May 11, 2021

/s/ Elizabeth M. Treckler
ELIZABETH M. TRECKLER (SBN 282432)
etreckler@bakerlaw.com
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
11601 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90025
Telephone (310) 820-8800

ROBB C. ADKINS (SBN 194576)
radkins@bakerlaw.com
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3100
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone (415) 659-2600

DATED: May 11, 2021

Attorneys for Defendant
Trinity Healthshare, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of the foregoing **DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' THIRD NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY** has been filed this 11th day of May, 2021 through the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all parties of record. All parties may access the foregoing via the Court's CM/ECF system.

Dated: May 11, 2021

/s/ Shane G. Smith
SHANE G. SMITH (SBN 272630)
ssmith@mccormickbarstow.com
MCCORMICK BARSTOW LLC

Attorney for Defendant
OneShare Health, LLC

ATTESTATION

I hereby attest that I have obtained concurrence of the above noted signatories as indicated by a “conformed” signature (/s/) within this e-filed document.

Dated: May 11, 2021

/s/ Shane G. Smith
SHANE G. SMITH (SBN 272630)
ssmith@mccormickbarstow.com
MCCORMICK BARSTOW LLC

*Attorney for Defendant
OneShare Health, LLC*

Exhibit “A”

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO**

Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-02130-RBJ

REBECCA SMITH;
ELLEN LARSON;
JUSTINE LUND; and
JAIME and JARED BEARD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE ALIERA COMPANIES, INC., formerly known as ALIERA HEALTHCARE, INC., a Delaware corporation;
TRINITY HEALTHSHARE, INC., a Delaware corporation; and
ONESHARE HEALTH, LLC, formerly known as UNITY HEALTHSHARE, LLC and as KINGDOM HEALTHSHARE MINISTRIES, LLC, a Virginia limited liability corporation,

Defendants.

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION**

Defendants The Alieria Companies Inc. (“Alieria”), Trinity Healthshare, Inc. (“Trinity”), and OneShare Health, LLC (f/k/a Unity HealthShare, LLC and referred to herein as “Unity”) respectfully move pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) to alter or amend the Court’s April 16, 2021 Order (“Order,” ECF No. 67), which denied Defendants’ Combined Motion to Compel Arbitration (“Arbitration Motion”) (ECF No. 50). Pursuant to D.C.COLO.LCivR 7.1(a), the parties have conferred regarding this Motion, which Plaintiffs oppose.

Defendants respectfully submit that the Court misapprehended controlling facts and law, which resulted in manifest errors of fact and law. *See Fisher v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co.*, No. 17-cv-01949-MEH, 2018 WL 4491423, at *1 (D. Colo. Sept. 19, 2018) (stating that granting a

Rule 59(e) motion is appropriate “where the court has misapprehended the facts, a party’s position, or the controlling law”) (citing *Servants of Paraclete v. Does*, 204 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10th Cir. 2000)); *see generally Kirzhner v. Silverstein*, No. 09-cv-2858-RBJ, 2012 WL 1222368, at *2 (D. Colo. Apr. 10, 2012) (granting motion for partial reconsideration of order, citing Rule 59(e)). Accordingly, Defendants request that the Court alter or amend the Order by granting the Arbitration Motion. Defendants further state as follows in support of this Motion.

I. THE ORDER ERRED ON THE FACTS

With regard to errors of fact, respectfully, the Court erred in several respects. First, the Court misinterpreted ECF No. 50-3, a Unity Member Guide discussed in the Court’s Order. (Order at 18.) The quoted language from the Unity Member Guide recited in the Court’s Order (and similar language in the Trinity Member Guide) does not mean that the member guides are not enforceable contracts. Instead, it means that the member guides contain “an outline for eligible needs,” and these outlined needs do not create a legal obligation in favor of a contributor – members, such as Plaintiffs – to enforce the outlined eligible needs as a binding contract. Fairly construed in context of the Member Guide and HCSM membership, the language relied upon by the Court does not negate the existence of any enforceable rights created by the membership, but rather recognizes that because Unity is a health care sharing ministry and not an insurance company, the guidelines do not constitute an insurance contract and thus do not give the member a right of indemnity. Even though members such as Plaintiffs do not have a contractual right to payment or indemnification of medical expenses as they would under an insurance contract, there are numerous binding aspects of the member guides. For example, ECF No. 50-3 binds Unity to (i) consider members’ submitted share requests for consideration pursuant to the outline

of eligible needs, (ii) act as a clearing house that administers sharing of outlined eligible needs in accordance with the HCSM membership's established sharing guidelines; and (iii) participate in the appeals process, including arbitration. (ECF No. 50-3, at ECF 4, 12, 18.)

While the member guides are enforceable agreements, the agreement is for the HCSM to act as a facilitator of medical expense sharing among its members pursuant to member guidelines. In doing so, no indemnity obligation is assumed by the HCSM and thus there is no contractual right for members to have their medical expenses paid or indemnified that exists under an insurance contract.

If, however, the Court is not convinced of the above interpretation, then it should order a trial on the issue of what is the parties' contract and whether it contains an arbitration provision to resolve what the Court views as a dispute of fact. *See* 9 U.S.C. § 4 (Section 4 of the Federal Arbitration Act) (explaining that the court shall proceed to a summary trial "if the making of the arbitration agreement . . . be in issue"). *See also, e.g., Howard v. Ferrellgas Partners, L.P.*, 748 F.3d 975, 977-78 (10th Cir. 2014) (Gorsuch, J.) (reversing denial of motion to compel arbitration for failure to conduct trial under FAA Section 4 where there was a disputed fact issue on contract formation).

The Court also erred when it found as a matter of law that the parties' contract consists only of the application emails signed by each Plaintiff, and unidentified conversations with various Alera representatives about the sharing programs prior to signing the application emails. (*See, e.g.,* Order at 15, 17, 18.) Respectfully, the finding does not accord with the record.

The application emails clearly contemplate the member guides as controlling the parties' agreement and do not evidence that the application emails are the only applicable documents

governing the parties' relationship. For example, Plaintiff Larson's Unity application email refers to the document as an "application [f]or membership." (ECF No. 50-5, at ECF 4.) Further, the application email does not contain an outline of medical needs that are eligible for sharing – instead, those are found in Larson's Unity Member Guide (and the other Plaintiffs' applicable member guides).

Further, Plaintiffs could not claim here that the application emails are the entirety of the parties' agreement because Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint is based significantly on the member guides. For example, Plaintiffs' Claim for Illegal Contract is based on the member guides as allegedly illegal because the member guides supposedly contain inconsistent and contradictory coverage terms. This claim alleges that the member guide constitutes an insurance plan that is illegal under the Colorado insurance code, and Plaintiffs use these allegations to invoke C.R.S. § 10-3-1116 to argue that the arbitration provision is invalid. (*See* Am. Compl., ECF No. 38-1, ¶¶ 125-128.) Plaintiffs quote the member guides in their Amended Complaint as support for their allegation that the "products" are "insurance," "equivalent to insurance" and "look, feel, and convey the impression that they are equivalent to insurance." (*Id.* ¶¶ 126, 63-64, including all subparagraphs thereto.) Plaintiffs' breach of fiduciary duty counts also quote the member guides and claim that they imposed fiduciary duties on Defendants that were breached. (*Id.* ¶¶ 129-150.) Plaintiffs' Appendix 28 is an EOB for Plaintiff Larson, evidencing that she made requests for sharing in certain medical expenses. As noted earlier, the application emails do not include an outline of eligible medical expenses – but the member guides do. Plaintiffs' claimed relief includes a request that the Court find that "Defendants' unauthorized health insurance plans were and are illegal contracts" and should be either rescinded or reformed to comply with

applicable insurance codes. (*Id.* at Prayer for Relief, pp. 34-35.) Yet, Plaintiffs attacked the enforceability of the arbitration clause by relying in part on (and misapplying) language in the member guide that disclaims any insurance contract and is directly at odds with their substantive claim that this was an illegal insurance contract subject to Colorado insurance law. (*Id.* ¶ 126). The Court should have rejected, not accepted, Plaintiffs’ arbitration arguments that contradict their substantive claims.

Moreover, should Plaintiffs’ Prayer for Relief be construed as applying to the various application emails, no reasonable person could believe that the six-page application emails were what they purchased as insurance plans. Indeed, the application emails consist mostly of general health questions, an affirmation of statement of beliefs, and disclaimers of what is not included in the program. They do not include an outline of medical expenses that are eligible for sharing. They do not include language that Plaintiffs contend has the “look and feel like health insurance.” (Am. Compl. ¶ 13; *see also, e.g.*, Larson’s Unity application email, ECF No. 50-5.)

Again, however, if the Court is not persuaded that the applicable member guides are the parties’ contract, it should order a trial on the issue of what is the parties’ contract and whether it contains an arbitration provision to resolve what the Court views as a dispute of fact. *See* 9 U.S.C. § 4.

II. THE ORDER ERRED ON THE LAW

With regard to errors of law, respectfully, the Court misapplied Colorado law that provides acceptance may be created by performance of terms. *See Terlizzi v. Altitude Mktg., Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1712-WJM-STV, 2018 WL 2196090, at *7 (D. Colo. May 14, 2018) (“Acceptance may be shown ‘by act or conduct.’” (quoting *Linder v. Midland Oil Ref. Co.*, 40 P.2d 253, 254

(Colo. 1935)). Plaintiffs signed the application emails, which indicated their agreement to join the sharing ministry and recognized that the member guides outline the types of medical expenses eligible for sharing (as well as otherwise detailing the parties' rights and obligations). Each Plaintiff received the applicable Unity and/or Trinity Member Guides prior to the effective date of their membership. Plaintiffs could have stopped making voluntary monthly contributions at any time. By choosing to continue to submit monthly sharing contributions many times over after receiving their member guides, Plaintiffs accepted the terms of the member guides as governing the parties' relationship. *Id.*

Additionally, respectfully, the Court did not properly apply Colorado law regarding incorporation of documents by reference. There is no requirement that Plaintiffs had to sign a specific document reciting the appeals language and including arbitration provisions. *See E-21 Eng'g, Inc. v. Steve Stock & Assocs., Inc.*, 252 P.3d 36, 39 (Colo. App. 2010). Instead, pursuant to the FAA, the parties' agreement has to be in writing. The member guides are in writing. They are part of the parties' agreements, and they were effectively incorporated by reference. *See Liquid Magnetix Corp. v. Therma-Stor, LLC*, No. 13-cv-3151-WJM-KMT, 2014 WL 1389984, at *2 (D. Colo. Apr. 9, 2014).

Not only were the applicable member guides incorporated by reference, but also the application emails put Plaintiffs on inquiry notice as to the guidelines – the member guides. The application emails are replete with references to the guidelines, and it is inconsistent with Colorado law to find that these numerous references were for naught and did not put Plaintiffs on inquiry notice of the terms and conditions contained in the applicable member guides. *See Terlizzi*, 2018 WL 2196090, at *8 (citing *Schnabel v. Trilegiant Corp.*, 697 F.3d 110, 120 (2d

Cir. 2012) (an offeree is bound by a contractual term, even absent actual notice, “if he or she is on *inquiry* notice of the term and assents to it through conduct that a reasonable person would understand to constitute assent” (emphasis in original).¹

III. CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court alter or amend its Order on the Defendants’ Combined Motion to Compel Arbitration, and grant that Motion.

Respectfully submitted, this 11th day of May, 2021.

s/ Sarah R. Craig
Sarah R. Craig
BURR & FORMAN, LLP
One Tampa City Center
201 North Franklin Street, Suite 3200
Tampa, FL 33602
Telephone: (813) 367-5766
scraig@burr.com

Robert H. Rutherford
Elizabeth B. Shirley
BURR & FORMAN, LLP
420 North 20th Street, Suite 3400
Birmingham, AL 35203
Telephone: (205) 251-3000
rrutherford@burr.com

¹ The Order (pp. 20-22) distinguishes *Vernon v. Qwest Communications International, Inc.*, 857 F. Supp. 2d 1135 (D. Colo. 2012), *aff’d*, 925 F. Supp. 2d 1185 (D. Colo. 2013); *Wagner v. Discover Bank*, No. 12-cv-2786-MSK-BNB, 2014 WL 128372 (D. Colo. Jan. 13, 2014); and *Martinez v. TCF National Bank*, No. 13-cv-3504-PAB-MJW, 2015 WL 854442 (D. Colo. Feb. 25, 2012). While *Wagner* and *Martinez* are distinguished by reference to the Court’s conclusion about the disavowal of the member guide being part of the agreement, if the Court were to reconsider that finding for the reasons discussed in Section I above, then Defendants respectfully contend that the Court’s analysis in *Wagner* and *Martinez* should control. As for *Vernon*, Defendants respectfully submit that the references to the guidelines in the application in this case, the ability of the Plaintiffs to review the member guide before the effective dates (and cancel and request refunds), and Plaintiffs’ decision to continue participation for many months thereafter, aligns this case with *Vernon*, as well as with *Wagner* and *Martinez*. Accordingly, as in those cases, the arbitration agreements here should be enforced.

bshirley@burr.com

Attorneys for Defendant The Alier Companies, Inc.

s/ Laurin D. Quiat

Laurin D. Quiat
Matthew C. Baisley
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
1801 California Street, Suite 4400
Denver, CO 80202-2662
Telephone: (303) 861-0600
Fax: (303) 861-7805
lquiat@bakerlaw.com
mbaisley@bakerlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Trinity Healthshare, Inc.

s/ Jon F. Sands

Jon F. Sands
Marilyn S. Chappell
Sweetbaum Sands Ramming PC
1125 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2100
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (303) 296-3377
jsands@sweetbaumsands.com
mchappell@sweetbaumsands.com

Kyle G.A. Wallace
SHIVER HAMILTON LLC
3490 Piedmont Road, Suite 640
Atlanta, Georgia 30305
Telephone: (404) 593-0020
Fax: (888) 501-9536
kwallace@shiverhamilton.com

*Attorneys for Defendant OneShare Health,
LLC (f/k/a Kingdom and Unity)*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 11, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing **DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION** with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will email the foregoing to the following:

Laurin D. Quiat
Matthew C. Baisley
Baker & Hostetler LLP
1801 California Street, Suite 4400
Denver, CO 80202
lquiat@bakerlaw.com
mbaisley@bakerlaw.com

Sarah R. Craig
Burr & Forman LLP
One Tampa City Center
201 North Franklin Street, Suite 3200
Tampa, FL 33602
scraig@burr.com

Robert H. Rutherford
Elizabeth B. Shirley
BURR & FORMAN, LLP
420 North 20th Street, Suite 3400
Birmingham, AL 35203
rrutherford@burr.com
bshirley@burr.com

Victoria E. Lovato, Esq.
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
1776 Lincoln Street, Suite 1100
Denver, CO 80203
velovato@michaelbest.com

Patrick Bernal, Esq.
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
8300 Arista Place, Suite 300
Broomfield, CO 80021
pjbernal@michaelbest.com

Eleanor Hamburger
Richard E. Spoonemore

SIRIANNI YOUTZ SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC

3101 Western Avenue, Suite 350

Seattle, WA 98121

le@sylaw.com

rick@sylaw.com

Michael David Myers

MYERS & COMPANY PLLC

1530 Eastlake Avenue East

Seattle, WA 98102

mmyers@myers-company.com

s/ Megan MacLennan _____