2:23-cv-06195-DSF-E

Joint Rule 26(f) Report

Case 2:23-cv-06195-DSF-E Document 21 Filed 11/20/23 Page 1 of 9 Page ID #:121

On November 6, 2023, 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 held a conference in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) and now jointly present the Court with the following:

A. Statement of the Case

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.

Plaintiffs' Complaint raises two claims challenging the constitutionality of section 2190.1(d)(1): the requirement that continuing medical education courses include discussion of implicit bias compels speech in violation of the First Amendment, and serves as an unconstitutional condition on the conferral of continuing education credit.

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.

B. Subject Matter Jurisdiction

Both of Plaintiffs' legal claims arise under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983. As a result, this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims in this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 (federal question) and 1343(a) (redress for deprivation of civil rights). Plaintiffs seek declaratory relief pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202.

C. Legal Issues

Plaintiffs claim that Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 2190.1(d)(1) 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 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.

D. Parties, Evidence, etc.

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.

E. Damages

Plaintiffs do not seek damages.

F. Insurance

None.

G. Motions

Currently pending before the Court is Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 16). Depending on the outcome of the Motion to Dismiss, and the development of discovery, the Parties may seek to file motions for summary judgment. The Parties do not anticipate filing other motions.

H. Status of Discovery

Other than the Rule 26(a) initial disclosures noted below, no other discovery has been conducted.

26 ||

///

I. Discovery Plan

///

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.

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 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' 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.

J. Discovery Cut-off

The Parties propose July 31, 2024, as the final day for completion of non-expert discovery.

K. Expert Discovery

Initial expert disclosures, if any, will be served by June 1, 2024. Rebuttal expert disclosures, if any, will be served by July 15, 2024, and sur-rebuttal expert disclosures will be served by August 15, 2024. The expert discovery cut-off date will be September 15, 2024.

L. Dispositive Motions

Defendants believe the claims in this action should be dismissed. If the Court denies their pending motion to dismiss, the Parties agree that the claims in this action can be resolved by cross-motions for summary judgment.

M. Settlement/ADR

Because Plaintiffs challenge the constitutionality of a state law and are seeking solely declaratory and injunctive relief, the Parties agree that there is no possibility of settlement in this case. Should the Court deem it appropriate, the Parties select ADR Procedure No. 1 under Local Rule 16-15.4.

N. Trial Estimate

The Parties do not anticipate trial being necessary, but should trial become necessary, the Parties anticipate two to three days being sufficient for a trial by the Court. Each party anticipates calling three to five witnesses, if necessary.

O. Lead Trial Counsel

Plaintiffs: Caleb R. Trotter

Defendants: Stephanie Albrecht

P. Independent Expert or Master

Not applicable.

Q. Timetable

///

SCHEDULE OF PRETRIAL AND TRIAL DATES

CASE NAME: Khatibi v. Hawkins

CASE NO: 2:23-cv-06195-DSF-E

Matter	Time	Weeks	Plaintiff(s)	Defendant(s)	Court
		before trial	Request	Request	Order
Trial (jury)(court) (length 2-3	8:30		1/28/2025	2/25/2025	
days) (Tuesday)	am				
Pretrial Conference, LR 16;	3:00	4	12/30/2024	1/27/2025	
Hearing on Motions in	pm				
Limine (Monday)					
Trial Documents (Set Two)		6	12/16/2024	1/13/2025	
All Trials: Lodge Pretrial					
Conference Order, LR 16-7;					
File Oppositions to Motions					
in Limine					
Jury Trial Only: File Agreed					
Set of Jury Instructions and					
Verdict Forms; Statement					
Regarding Disputed					
Instructions and Verdict					
forms					
Trial Documents (Set One)		7	12/9/2024	1/6/2025	
All Trials: File Memo of					
Contentions of Fact and Law,					
LR 16-4; Exhibit & Witness					
Lists, LR 16-5, 6; Status					
Report Regarding Settlement;					
Motions in Limine (no more					
than five motions per side					
may be filed without Court					
permission)					
Court Trial Only: Lodge					
Findings of Fact and					
Conclusions of Law; LR 52;					
File Summaries of Direct					
Testimony (optional)				12/2/2021	
Last day to conduct ADR		12	11/4/2024	12/2/2024	
Proceeding, LR 16-15	1.00		10/01/005	11/10/202	
Last day to hear motions	1:30	14	10/21/2024	11/18/2024	
(except motion to amend	pm				
pleadings or add parties and motions in limine), LR 7					
(Monday)					
	l	<u> </u>			<u> </u>

Plaintiff(s)

Request

7/31/2024

3/1/2024

4/12/2024

5/13/2024

6/14/2024

5/6/2024

Defendant(s)

Request

7/31/2024

6/1/2024

7/15/2024

8/15/2024

9/15/2024

5/6/2024

Court

Order

1	Matter	Time	Weeks before		
2			trial		
2	Nonexpert Discovery Cutoff		21+		
3	Expert Disclosure (initial)				
4	Expert Disclosure (rebuttal)				
_	Expert Disclosure (sur-				
5	rebuttal)				
6	Expert Discovery Cutoff		21+		
	Last day to hear motion to	1:30	32+		
7	amend pleadings or add	pm			
8	parties (Monday)				
8					
9	R. Magistrate Judge				
10	The Parties do not agree to try this case be				
11	S. Class Action				
12	Not applicable.				

efore a magistrate judge.

T. Other Issues

None known or anticipated.

DATED: November 20, 2023.

16 ///

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Joint Rule 26(f) Report

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