Case No. 2:18-bk-20172-ER;

Case No. 2:18-bk-20173-ER;

27

28

Affects O'Connor Hospital

Affects Saint Louise Regional

Foundation

1 2 3 4	Hospital Foundation Affects St. Francis Medical Center of Lynwood Foundation Affects St. Vincent Foundation Affects St. Vincent Dialysis Center, Inc. Affects Seton Medical Center Foundation	Case No. 2:18-bk-20175-ER; Case No. 2:18-bk-20176-ER; Case No. 2:18-bk-20178-ER; Case No. 2:18-bk-20179-ER; Case No. 2:18-bk-20180-ER; Case No. 2:18-bk-20181-ER;
5	☐ Affects Verity Business Services ☐ Affects Verity Medical	Adv. Case No. 2:20-ap-0100-ER
6	Foundation Affects Verity Holdings, LLC	STRATEGIC GLOBAL MANAGEMENT, INC.'S
7	☐ Affects De Paul Ventures, LLC ☐ Affects De Paul Ventures - San	OPPOSITION TO DEBTORS' CORRECTED REQUEST FOR
8	Jose Dialysis, LLC,	JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS SGM'S
9	Debtors and Debtors-in- Possession.	AMENDED COUNTERCLAIMS
10	1 0550551011.	Judge: Hon. Dale S. Fischer
11		
12	VERITY HEALTH SYSTEM OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a California	
13	nonprofit public benefit corporation, ST. VINCENT MEDICAL	
14	CENTER, a California nonprofit	
15	public benefit corporation, ST. VINCENT DIALYSIS CENTER,	
16	INC., a California nonprofit public benefit corporation, and ST.	
17	FRANCIS MEDICAL CENTER, a California nonprofit public benefit	
18	corporation, SETON MEDICAL CENTER, a California nonprofit	
19	public benefit corporation, and VERITY HOLDINGS, LLC, a	
20	California limited liability company; and	
21	Plaintiffs,	
22	V.	
23	KALI P. CHAUDHURI, M.D., an	
24	individual, STRATEGIĆ GLOBAL MANAGEMENT, INC a California	
25	KALI P. CHAUDHURI, M.D., an individual, STRATEGIC GLOBAL MANAGEMENT, INC., a California corporation, KPC HEALTHCARE HOLDINGS, INC., a California corporation, KPC HEALTH PLAN HOLDINGS, INC., a California	
26	corporation, KPC HEALTH PLAN HOLDINGS, INC. a California	
27	corporation, KPC HEALTHCARE, INC., a Nevada corporation, KPC	
28	GLOBAL MANAGEMENT, LLC, a California Limited Liability	
0	Camonia Emilion Liability	

1	Company, and DOES 1 through 500,	
2	Defendants.	
3	STRATEGIC GLOBAL MANAGEMENT, INC., a California	
4	corporation,	
5	Counter-Plaintiff,	
6	V.	
7	VERITY HEALTH SYSTEM OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a California	
8	nonprofit public benefit corporation, ST. VINCENT MEDICAL	
9	CENTER, a California nonprofit	
10	public benefit corporation, ST. VINCENT DIALYSIS CENTER, INC., a California nonprofit public	
11	benefit corporation, and ST. FRANCIS MEDICAL CENTER, a	
12	California nonprofit public benefit	
13	corporation, SETON MEDICAL CENTER, a California nonprofit	
14	public benefit corporation, and VERITY HOLDINGS, LLC, a	
15	California limited liability company,	
16	Counter-Defendants.	
17	Counter-Defendants.	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Defendant Strategic Global Management, Inc. ("SGM") hereby objects to
Plaintiffs and Counter-Defendants Verity Health System of California, Inc., St.
Vincent Medical Center, St. Vincent Dialysis Center, Inc., St. Francis Medical
Center, Seton Medical Center, and Verity Holdings, LLC's ("Debtors") Corrected
Request for Judicial Notice in support of their Motion to Dismiss SGM's Amended
Counter-claims.

As a general rule, "Iblecause factual challenges have no bearing under Rule

As a general rule, "[b]ecause factual challenges have no bearing under Rule 12(b)(6)," courts in this Circuit do not consider material beyond the pleadings in ruling on a motion to dismiss. *Kamali v. Berman*, 2020 WL 2220201, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2020) (citations omitted). And while "the Court may take judicial notice of matters of public record, [...] it 'cannot take judicial notice of disputed facts contained in such public records." *Id.* (quoting Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc., 899 F.3d 988, 999 (9th Cir. 2018)).

Ignoring this well-established law, Debtors ask the Court to take judicial notice of a host of disputed facts in their Motion to Dismiss – including facts included in (and the disputed interpretation of) the bankruptcy court's orders. *See*, *e.g.*, Motion at 1:18-21 (bankruptcy court orders); *id.* at 5:22-11 (same); *id.* at 6:12-7:13 (same); *id.* at 8:10-9:3 (same); *id.* at 10:3-11 (same); *id.* at 10:17-19 (disputed facts in the parties' correspondence); *id.* at 16:11-19 (bankruptcy court orders); *id.* at 16:20-25; *id.* ¶ 6:-12 (facts at issue in bankruptcy court submissions). It is established that a court may take judicial notice of the *existence* of another court's opinion, but not of the facts or findings contained in them. *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 690 (9th Cir. 2001); *see also Peel v. BrooksAmerica Mortg. Corp.*, 788 F.Supp.2d 1149, 1158 (C.D. Cal. 2011) ("a court may take judicial notice of the existence of another court's opinion or of the filing of pleadings in related proceedings; the Court may not, however, accept as true the facts found or alleged in such documents.")

The Court should deny Debtors' Request for Judicial Notice.

Case 2:20-cv-00613-DSF Document 66 Filed 09/14/20 Page 5 of 5 Page ID #:5264