

In the Supreme Court

OF THE

United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1963

No. 16, Original

STATE OF ARIZONA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA and CHARLES L.
HARNEY, INC., a California corpora-
tion,

Defendants.

BRIEF OF DEFENDANT

CHARLES L. HARNEY, INC., IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT

GEORGE H. HAUERKEN,

635 Russ Building, 235 Montgomery Street,
San Francisco, California 94104,

Attorney for Charles L. Harney, Inc.

Of Counsel:

JOHN D. ST. CLAIR,

C. DUDLEY ZAPPETTINI,

EDWARD J. MCFETRIDGE,

HAUERKEN, ST. CLAIR, ZAPPETTINI & HINES,

635 Russ Building, 235 Montgomery Street,
San Francisco, California 94104,

Attorneys for Charles L. Harney, Inc.

Subject Index

	Page
Statement of the case	1
Argument	2
I. The complaint fails to state a cause of action	2
II. The complaint does not present a controversy for original jurisdiction	4

Table of Authorities Cited

Cases	Pages
Aetna Casualty and Surety Co. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., et al., 41 Cal. 2d 785, 264 Pac. 2d 5 (1953)	3
Alabama v. Arizona, 291 U.S. 286 (1934)	2, 4
Arizona v. California, 298 U.S. 558 (1935)	2
Commission v. Neville, 58 Ariz. 325, 119 Pac. 2d 934	3
Employers Casualty Co. v. Moore, 60 Ariz. 544, 124 Pac. 2d 414 (1943)	2
Georgia v. Pennsylvania R.R. Co., 324 U.S. 439 (1944)	2
Massachusetts v. Missouri, 308 U.S. 1 (1939)	4
Moseley v. Lily Ice Cream, 38 Ariz. 417, 300 Pac. 958	3
Peller v. Liberty Mutual Fire Ins. Co., 220 A.C.A. 615 (1963)	2
State of Oklahoma ex rel. Johnson v. Cook, 304 U.S. 387 (1937)	4
 Statutes 	
Arizona Revised Statutes:	
Section 12-541	3
Section 23-1023	3
28 United States Code, Section 1251(b)(3)	2

1. Introduction

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records and the role of the committee in overseeing these processes. It highlights the need for transparency and accountability in all financial transactions.

The second part of the document details the specific procedures for recording and reporting financial data. This includes the use of standardized forms and the regular submission of reports to the relevant authorities.

The third part of the document outlines the responsibilities of the committee members and the staff involved in the financial management process. It emphasizes the need for clear communication and collaboration between all parties.

The fourth part of the document discusses the challenges faced in the current financial environment and the strategies being implemented to address these challenges. It includes a detailed analysis of the current market conditions and the impact on the organization's operations.

The fifth part of the document provides a summary of the key findings and recommendations from the committee's report. It includes a list of action items and a timeline for their implementation.

The sixth part of the document contains the committee's final conclusions and a statement of support for the organization's leadership. It expresses confidence in the organization's ability to overcome the current challenges and achieve its long-term goals.

The seventh part of the document includes a list of references and a list of appendices. The references provide additional information on the topics discussed in the report, and the appendices contain supporting data and documents.

The eighth part of the document is a list of the committee members and their contact information. It also includes a list of the staff members who assisted in the preparation of the report.

The ninth part of the document is a list of the organizations and individuals who provided support and assistance during the course of the committee's work. It expresses their appreciation for their contributions.

The tenth part of the document is a list of the organizations and individuals who provided funding for the committee's work. It expresses their appreciation for their financial support.

In the Supreme Court

OF THE

United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1963

No. 16, Original

STATE OF ARIZONA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA and CHARLES L.
HARNEY, INC., a California corpora-
tion,

Defendants.

BRIEF OF DEFENDANT

CHARLES L. HARNEY, INC., IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Plaintiff seeks to invoke the original jurisdiction of this court in order to prosecute an assigned claim for personal injuries. The Complaint alleges that the accident upon which the action is based occurred on March 4, 1962. It is alleged that plaintiff's assignor was injured while a passenger in an automobile on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, that these injuries were the result of a dangerous and defective condition existing on the bridge, and that the accident and injuries were proximately caused by the carelessness and negligence of the defendants.

The Complaint further alleges that plaintiff's assignor claimed compensation under its workmen's compensation laws, and pursuant thereto, plaintiff made payments for temporary disability, compensation, and medical care to or on behalf of its assignor. Pursuant to the laws of plaintiff State, by operation of law, the claim for damages was assigned to plaintiff and plaintiff became the sole owner thereof.

Jurisdiction of defendant, Charles L. Harney, Inc., is sought under 28 U.S.C. Section 1251(b)(3).

ARGUMENT

I. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION.

The Motion should be denied if no cause of action is stated on the face of the Complaint or it is plain that no relief may be granted.

Georgia v. Pennsylvania R.R. Co., 324 U.S. 439 (1944);

Alabama v. Arizona, 291 U.S. 286 (1934);

Arizona v. California, 298 U.S. 558 (1935).

The accident occurred on March 4, 1962. This Motion was filed two years later, on or about March 4, 1964.

Both under Arizona and California law, an action to recover for personal injuries cannot be assigned.

Employers Casualty Co. v. Moore, 60 Ariz. 544, 124 Pac. 2d 414 (1943);

Peller v. Liberty Mutual Fire Ins. Co., 220 A.C.A. 615 (1963).

In Arizona, however, a statutory exception is made where an injured employee elects to receive compensation. His claim is automatically assigned to the State and thereafter the employee has no interest in any amount recovered by the State.

Ariz. Rev. Stat., Sec. 23-1023;

Moseley v. Lily Ice Cream, 38 Ariz. 417, 300 Pac. 958;

Commission v. Neville, 58 Ariz. 325, 119 Pac. 2d 934.

Since Arizona does not recognize such assignment in absence of statute, the liability sought to be imposed by this Complaint under Arizona law is one created by statute and is barred by the one year Statute of Limitations in Arizona.

Ariz. Rev. Stat., Sec. 12-541.

As indicated, California prohibits an assignment of an action for personal injuries, and the Complaint is accordingly barred in that State. There is no statutory provision for such an assignment to the employer or compensation insurance carrier. The employer can institute an action on behalf of and for the employee, but this is subject to a one year Statute of Limitations.

Aetna Casualty and Surety Co. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., et al., 41 Cal. 2d 785, 264 Pac. 2d 5 (1953).

Thus, whether Arizona or California Law is considered, the Complaint, on its face, fails to state a cause of action and is barred.

II. THE COMPLAINT DOES NOT PRESENT A CONTROVERSY
FOR ORIGINAL JURISDICTION.

This court has not and should not entertain original jurisdiction merely because one State is suing another State or its citizens. To do so would impose an enormous and insurmountable burden upon the court which would effectively paralyze its judicial function.

Massachusetts v. Missouri, 308 U.S. 1 (1939);
Alabama v. Arizona, 291 U.S. 286 (1934);
State of Oklahoma ex rel. Johnson v. Cook,
304 U.S. 387 (1937).

This in effect is an action by an insurance carrier who has received by assignment the cause of action of its insured. The alleged controversy does not involve the sovereign or "quasi-sovereign" interests of the State of Arizona, and the fact that this insurance carrier happens to be a State does not warrant this court's acceptance of jurisdiction.

The Motion should be denied.

Dated, San Francisco, California,
April 30, 1964.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE H. HAUERKEN,

Attorney for Charles L. Harney, Inc.

Of Counsel:

JOHN D. ST. CLAIR,

C. DUDLEY ZAPPETTINI,

EDWARD J. MCFETRIDGE,

HAUERKEN, ST. CLAIR, ZAPPETTINI & HINES,

Attorneys for Charles L. Harney, Inc.

