

# THEUPDATE

SPRING 2020 | ISSUE 1



SAN DIEGO  
DEFENSE LAWYERS



# IN THIS ISSUE

4. **Covid-19**  
What California Employers Ought to Know
6. **Spread of Novel Coronavirus**  
Risks Potential Future Claims for  
Negligent Exposure
8. **Plaintiff Dies After Accepting  
Defendants Settlement Offer:**  
A Synopsis of California's Survival Statutes
9. **Meet the new Board Members**
10. **Installation Dinner Photos**
12. **Defending Sexual Assault and  
Molestation Claims**
13. **MCLE Lunch-and-Learn Recaps**
14. **How to Avoid Plaintiff's Attempt  
of a Second Bite at the Apple**

---

## MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION

Membership is open to any attorney or paralegal who is primarily engaged in the defense of civil litigants, as well as retired defense attorneys. Dues are \$125.00 for new members for the first year and \$160.00 per year for renewing members. The dues year runs from January 1 to December 31. Applications can be downloaded at: [sddl.org](http://sddl.org).

The Update is published for the mutual benefit of the SDDL membership, a non-profit association composed of defense lawyers in the San Diego metropolitan area. All views, opinions, statements and conclusions expressed in this magazine are those of the authors, and they do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the SDDL or its leadership. The SDDL welcomes the submission of articles by our members on topics of general interest to its membership.



**SAN DIEGO  
DEFENSE LAWYERS**

## 2020 SDDL UPDATE

Editors-in-Chief | David Hoynacki, Rachel Fisher, Codie Dukes

Design | April Woodard Design  
[www.aprilwdesign.com](http://www.aprilwdesign.com)

## 2020 SDDL OFFICERS

President | N. Ben Cramer  
Carroll, Kelly, Trotter & Franzen

Vice-President | Vanessa C. Whirl-Grabau,  
Thomas Lucas

Treasurer | Lawrence Zucker, Haight Brown  
and Bonesteel

Secretary | Christine Y. Dixon, Dunn DeSantis  
Walt & Kendrick

## 2020 SDDL DIRECTORS

Rachel A. Fisher  
Neil Dymott Frank McCabe & Hudson

Nicole Melvani  
Neil Dymott Frank McCabe & Hudson

David Hoynacki  
Wilson Elser Moskowitz Edelman & Dicker

Codie Dukes  
Tyson Mendes

Ian Friedman  
Wingert Grebing Brubaker & Juskie

Danielle C. Hicks  
Dummit Buchholz & Trapp

Nicholas Schechter  
Tyson Mendes

**SDDL UPDATE** c/o David Hoynacki  
Wilson Elser, 401 West A Street, Suite 1900,  
San Diego, CA 92101  
P: 619.321.6208  
[david.hoynacki@wilsonelser.com](mailto:david.hoynacki@wilsonelser.com)

# Spread of Novel Coronavirus Risks Potential Future Claims for Negligent Exposure

By Ian R. Friedman, Esq.

Although the health and economic effects of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) are still not fully understood, one certainty is that once Court's re-open and life gets back to normal, a barrage of legal claims will follow. One subset of claims will likely seek to impose liability on individuals and businesses for exposing others to the harmful effects of this deadly disease.

As businesses and individuals seek to mitigate future exposure it is important to know there is legal authority potentially supporting these types of claims in California. (See e.g., *John B. v. Superior Court* (2006) 38 Cal.4th 1177.) Much of the authority governing liability flowing from the transmission of infectious diseases arises in the context of the sexually transmitted diseases.

In *John B*, the California Supreme Court analyzed the issue of whether an ex-wife could sue her ex-husband for bringing HIV into the marriage. The ex-husband argued he should only be liable for disease transmission if his ex-wife could prove he actual knew he was infected contending this had to be "established only by a positive HIV test from an accredited laboratory or a medical diagnosis of HIV or AIDS." (*Id.* at p. 1188.) The Supreme Court disregarded this argument and held *actual knowledge of infection is not required.*

The Court reasoned "limiting tort defendants to those who have actual knowledge they are infected with HIV would have perverse effects on the spread of the virus. If only those who have been tested are subject to suit, there may be 'an incentive for some persons to avoid



diagnosis and treatment in order to avoid knowledge of their own infection.' (Gostin & Hodge, *Piercing the Veil of Secrecy in HIV/AIDS and Other Sexually Transmitted Diseases: Theories of Privacy and Disclosure in Partner Notification* (1998) Duke J. Gender L. & Poly. 9, 40.) Extending liability to those

with constructive knowledge of the disease, on the other hand, 'will provide at least a small incentive to others to use proper diagnostic techniques and to alter behavior and procedures so as to limit the likelihood of HIV transmission.' (Hermann, Torts: *Private Lawsuits about AIDS in AIDS and the Law: A Guide for the Public* (Dalton & Yale AIDS Law Project edits., 1987) p. 172 (Hermann).)" (*Id.* at p. 1190.)

Accordingly, the Supreme Court in *John B* concluded "the tort of negligent transmission of HIV does not depend solely on actual knowledge of HIV infection and would extend at least to those situations where the actor, under the totality of the circumstances, has reason to know of the infection. Under the reason-to-know standard, 'the actor has information from which a person of reasonable intelligence or of the superior intelligence of the actor would infer that the fact in question exists, or that such person would govern his conduct upon the assumption that such fact exists.' (Rest.2d Torts, § 12, subd. (1).) In other words, 'the actor has knowledge of facts from which a reasonable man of ordinary intelligence or one of the superior intelligence of the actor would either infer the existence of the fact in question or would regard its existence as so highly probable that his conduct would be predicated upon the assumption that the fact did exist.' (*Id.*, § 12, com. a. p. 20)."



*John B* makes clear the “constructive knowledge” standard adopted “means knowledge ‘that one using reasonable care or diligence should have, and therefore is attributed by law to a given person’ (Black’s Law Dict. (7th ed.1999) p. 876), encompasses a variety of mental states, ranging from one who is deliberately indifferent in the face of an unjustifiably high risk of harm (see *Farmer v. Brennan* (1994) 511 U.S. 825, 836–840) to one who merely should know of a dangerous condition (see [*Ortega v. Kmart Corp.* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1200, 1208–1209]).” (*Id.* at pp. 1190-1191.)

While the Court in *John B* somewhat attempted to limit its analysis to the facts of that case, its holding should cause real caution during the current global pandemic as there is arguably no requirement that someone be diagnosed with COVID-19 in order for liability to flow from its transmission.

The CDC says the disease spreads through close contact with persons or surfaces and that it first manifests

itself as fever, cough and shortness of breath appearing within 2-14 days of exposure (See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html>). Plaintiff lawyers will argue persons and businesses were on constructive notice of potential infection once the first symptoms appear in an

procedures so as to limit the likelihood of [] transmission.”To the extent businesses or individuals do not take immediate action to limit spread upon constructive notice of contact with or contraction of this disease, there is real danger of future claims for negligently exposing others to this deadly disease.

**Like the virus itself, we are just learning about the worldwide economic damages that will follow this outbreak. Do what you can now to protect yourself and your business in the future.**

employee or even once the employee learns they encountered someone exposed to the disease. Likewise, businesses could be on constructive notice once they knew or should have known someone exposed to the disease visited their establishment.

There is no question the clear current public policy supporting potential liability mirrors the policy relating to the spread of HIV such that it is designed to “incentive to others to use proper diagnostic techniques and to alter behavior and

Like the virus itself, we are just learning about the worldwide economic damages that will follow this outbreak. Do what you can now to protect yourself and your business in the future.

*Wingert Grebing Brubaker & Juskie, LLP wants to be your partner in understanding and defending these challenges together. Learn more about our firm at [www.WingertLaw.com](http://www.WingertLaw.com). Contact Ian Friedman at [ifriedman@wingertlaw.com](mailto:ifriedman@wingertlaw.com).* 



**Your Employment Neutral.**  
*Your solution.*



**MEDIATION**

With years of experience representing employees and companies in a wide range of employment law matters, Kristin’s unique background informs a deep understanding of both parties’ perspectives. Kristin is available to mediate all employment matters.

**To schedule a mediation, please contact Kathy Purcell at 619.238.7282, or [KPurcell@westcoastresolution.com](mailto:KPurcell@westcoastresolution.com)**



**WORKPLACE INVESTIGATION**

As a neutral with a background in employment litigation and advisory work, Kristin brings demonstrated commitment, detail, and sensitivity to every workplace investigation. Kristin is available to conduct prompt, thorough, and impartial investigations.

**To schedule a workplace investigation, please contact Kristin Rizzo at 619.333.0949, or [Rizzo@RizzoResolution.com](mailto:Rizzo@RizzoResolution.com)**

**RizzoResolution.com**