2:23-cv-06195-MRA (Ex)

Joint Case Management Statement

Case 2:23-cv-06195-MRA-E $\,$ Document 34 $\,$ Filed 03/13/24 $\,$ Page 1 of 6 $\,$ Page ID #:266

Counsel for Plaintiffs Azadeh Khatibi, M.D., Marilyn M. Singleton, M.D., and Do No Harm and counsel for Defendants Randy W. Hawkins, in his official capacity as President of the Medical Board of California, Laurie Rose Lubiano, in her official capacity as Vice President of the Medical Board of California, Ryan Brooks, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Medical Board of California, Reji Varghese, in his official capacity as Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, and Marina O'Connor, in her official capacity as Chief of Licensing of the Medical Board of California jointly present the Court with the following statement:

A. Date of filing

The original complaint was filed on August 1, 2023. The operative First Amended Complaint was filed on December 22, 2023. (ECF No. 26).

B. Parties

Plaintiffs: Azadeh Khatibi, M.D.; Marilyn M. Singleton, M.D.; and Do No Harm, a Virginia nonprofit corporation with no subsidiaries, parents, or affiliates.

Defendants: Randy W. Hawkins, in his official capacity as President of the Medical Board of California; Laurie Rose Lubiano, in her official capacity as Vice President of the Medical Board of California; Ryan Brooks, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Medical Board of California; Reji Varghese, in his official capacity as Executive Director of the Medical Board of California; and Marina O'Connor, in her official capacity as Chief of Licensing for the Medical Board of California.

C. Summary of claims

Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint raises two claims challenging the constitutionality of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 2190.1(d)(1): the requirement that continuing medical education courses include discussion of implicit bias compels their speech in violation of the First Amendment and serves to unconstitutionally condition the conferral of credit for continuing medical education courses taught by them on foregoing their First Amendment right to not include discussion of implicit bias as required by section 2190.1(d)(1).

It is Defendants' position that the implicit bias training requirement under section 2190.1(d)(1) constitutes government speech not subject to First Amendment protection. And even if the implicit bias training requirement under section 2190.1(d)(1) were protected speech under the First Amendment, the law would survive constitutional scrutiny. As for Plaintiffs' First Amendment claim under the unconstitutional conditions doctrine, it is Defendants' position that Plaintiffs do not have a constitutional right to teach continuing medical education courses for credit, and Plaintiffs fail to identify any other right or benefit of which they are deprived because of any unconstitutional condition.

D. Events underlying the action

In 2019, the California Legislature enacted Assembly Bill 241 to amend Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 2190.1. As of January 1, 2022, certain continuing medical education courses in California "shall contain curriculum that includes the understanding of implicit bias." § 2190.1(d)(1). Plaintiffs Dr. Azadeh Khatibi and Dr. Marilyn M. Singleton, as well as at least one member of Plaintiff Do No Harm, allege that they are California-licensed physicians who teach and organize continuing medical education courses in California. Plaintiffs allege that, as a result of section 2190.1(d), they are now required to include discussion of implicit bias in the courses they teach. Plaintiffs further allege that implicit bias trainings are controversial, that the very concept of implicit bias is controversial, that the efficacy of implicit bias trainings is unproven, and that the training requirement diverts time and attention away from more valuable topics.

It is Defendants' position that speech that the State Legislature requires to be included in continuing medical education courses necessary for state licensure constitutes government speech not subject to First Amendment protection. Thus, the State's requirement that continuing medical education courses include discussion of implicit bias as part of their curriculum does not implicate Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights. And even if the implicit bias training requirement under section

2190.1(d)(1) were protected speech under the First Amendment, the law would survive constitutional scrutiny. As for Plaintiffs' First Amendment claim under the unconstitutional conditions doctrine, it is Defendants' position that Plaintiffs do not have a constitutional right to teach continuing medical education courses for credit, and that the Medical Board of California has ultimate discretion over the standards for the continuing education of licensed physicians and surgeons.

E. Relief sought

Both of Plaintiffs' legal claims arise under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiffs seek an injunction prohibiting Defendants from enforcing Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 2190.1(d)(1) and declaratory relief pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202. Plaintiffs do not seek damages.

F. Status of discovery

Plaintiffs served Defendants with their Rule 26(a) initial disclosures on November 6, 2023. Defendants served Plaintiffs with their Rule 26(a) initial disclosures on November 20, 2023. No other discovery has been conducted.

Plaintiffs anticipate seeking written discovery, including interrogatories, document requests, and requests for admission as to Defendants' approval, supervision, and auditing of continuing medical education courses and providers. In addition, Plaintiffs anticipate deposing Defendant O'Connor and/or a deponent designated by Defendants pursuant to Rule 30(b)(6).

Defendants currently intend to serve each Plaintiff with written discovery, including interrogatories, requests for production of documents, and requests for admission, relevant to the factual basis, if any, for the allegations and legal theories in the First Amended Complaint. Defendants also intend to notice the depositions of some or all of the Plaintiffs, including a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of Plaintiff Do No Harm, and any expert witness(es) that Plaintiffs may designate, in order (1) to test the factual allegations in Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, and (2) to discover

evidence relevant to the claims and defenses asserted in this action. Defendants anticipate that the need for further discovery and additional topics may be identified during the course of discovery.

The Court previously issued a Scheduling Order on November 22, 2023 (ECF No. 23), in which the following discovery deadlines were set:

Discovery cut-off: July 31, 2024.

Expert witness exchange deadline: June 1, 2024, for initial experts; July 15, 2024, for rebuttal experts; August 15, 2024, expert cut-off date.

G. Procedural history

The Court previously dismissed Plaintiffs' original Complaint on December 11, 2023, with leave to amend. (ECF No. 25). After Plaintiffs filed their First Amended Complaint, Defendants filed a second Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 29), which is fully briefed and currently pending before the Court.

In the Court's Scheduling Order (ECF No. 23), the ADR cut-off date is set as December 2, 2024.

H. Other deadlines

Pursuant to the Court's Scheduling Order (ECF No. 23), additional deadlines are:

Motion to amend pleadings or add parties: May 6, 2024.

Motion hearing cut-off: November 18, 2024.

Trial documents (set one): January 6, 2025.

Trial documents (set two): January 13, 2025.

Final pre-trial conference: January 27, 2025.

Trial date: February 25, 2025.

I. Consent to a magistrate judge

The parties do not consent to a magistrate judge for trial.

27 | | ///

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

28 | | ///

1 J. Counsel statement on magistrate judge consent program 2 Counsel for Plaintiffs have discussed the Court's magistrate judge consent program with Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs do not consent to participate in the program. 3 4 Counsel for Defendants have discussed the Court's magistrate judge consent 5 program with Defendants, and Defendants do not consent to participate in the 6 program. 7 K. Need for case management conference 8 There is no need for an immediate case management conference. 9 DATED: March 14, 2024. Respectfully submitted, 10 11 JOSHUA P. THOMPSON, SBN 250955 ROB BONTA CALEB R. TROTTER, SBN 305195 Attorney General of California 12 DONNA G. MATIAS, SBN 154268 LARA HADDAD 13 CAMERON T. NORRIS, Supervising Deputy Attorney General Va. Bar No. 91624* 14 /s/ Stephanie Albrecht † 15 STEPHANIE ALBRECHT By /s/ Caleb R. Trotter Deputy Attorney General CALEB R. TROTTER 16 Attorneys for Defendants Randy W. 17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Hawkins, President of the Medical Azadeh Khatibi, M.D., 18 Board of California, Laurie Rose Marilyn M. Singleton, M.D., and Lubiano, Vice President of the Medical Do No Harm 19 Board of California, Ryan Brooks, 20 Secretary of the Medical Board of *Pro hac vice California, Reji Varghese, Executive 21 Director of the Medical Board of 22 California, and Marina O'Connor, Chief of Licensing of the Medical 23 Board of California, in their official capacities 24 25 † The filer attests that all signatories concur with this filing's content and 26 have authorized the filing. L.R. 27 5-4.3.4(a)(2)(i). 28