

Jonah D. Retzinger (SBN 326131)  
jretzinger@nixonpeabody.com  
Christopher D. Grigg (SBN 220243)  
cgrigg@nixonpeabody.com  
Brock J. Seraphin (SBN 307041)  
bseraphin@nixonpeabody.com  
April C. Yang (SBN 330951)  
ayang@nixonpeabody.com  
NIXON PEABODY LLP  
300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 4100  
Los Angeles, California 90071-3151  
Tel: 213-629-6000  
Fax: 213-629-6001

Attorneys for Defendants  
HALOMD, LLC, ALLA LAROQUE  
and SCOTT LAROQUE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND  
HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY, a  
California corporation; BLUE CROSS OF  
CALIFORNIA DBA ANTHEM BLUE  
CROSS, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HALOMD, LLC; ALLA LAROQUE;  
SCOTT LAROQUE; MPOWERHEALTH  
PRACTICE MANAGEMENT, LLC;  
BRUIN NEUROPHYSIOLOGY, P.C.;  
iNEUROLOGY, PC; N EXPRESS, PC;  
NORTH AMERICAN NEUROLOGICAL  
ASSOCIATES, PC; SOUND  
PHYSICIANS EMERGENCY  
MEDICINE OF SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA, P.C.; and SOUND  
PHYSICIANS ANESTHESIOLOGY OF  
CALIFORNIA, P.C.,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-1467-KES

Before the Honorable Karen E. Scott,  
United States Magistrate Judge

**DEFENDANTS ALLA LAROQUE  
AND SCOTT LAROQUE'S  
NOTICE OF MOTION TO  
DISMISS**

Hearing Date: March 10, 2026  
Time: 10:00 A.M.  
Courtroom: 6D

1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT at 10:00 a.m., on March 10, 2026, or as soon  
2 thereafter as the matter may be heard, in Courtroom 6D of the Honorable Karen E.  
3 Scott, located at 411 West 4th Street, Room 1053, Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516,  
4 Defendants Alla LaRoque (“Mrs. LaRoque”) and Scott LaRoque (“Mr. LaRoque”)  
5 (collectively, “the LaRoques”) will and hereby do move this Court to dismiss  
6 Plaintiffs Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company’s and Blue Cross  
7 of California d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross’s (collectively, “Anthem’s”) Amended  
8 Complaint [Dkt. 50] (the “Amended Complaint”) with prejudice pursuant to Fed. R.  
9 Civ. P. 12(b)(1), (2), and (6) because:

- 10 (i) this Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over Anthem’s claims,  
11 which are barred by the No Surprises Act’s judicial review prohibition;  
12 (ii) this Court lacks personal jurisdiction over the LaRoques; and  
13 (iii) Anthem fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

14 This Motion is based upon this Notice of Motion, the accompanying  
15 Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the records in this action, and such further  
16 evidence and argument that may be presented at the hearing of this Motion and that  
17 the Court may consider.

18 Dated: December 12, 2025

NIXON PEABODY LLP

20 By: /s/Jonah D. Retzinger

21 Jonah D. Retzinger  
22 Christopher D. Grigg  
23 Brock J. Seraphin  
24 April C. Yang

25 Attorneys for Defendants  
26 HALOMD, LLC, ALLA  
27 LAROQUE and SCOTT  
28 LAROQUE

Jonah D. Retzinger (SBN 326131)  
jretzinger@nixonpeabody.com  
Christopher D. Grigg (SBN 220243)  
cgrigg@nixonpeabody.com  
Brock J. Seraphin (SBN 307041)  
bseraphin@nixonpeabody.com  
April C. Yang (SBN 330951)  
ayang@nixonpeabody.com  
NIXON PEABODY LLP  
300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 4100  
Los Angeles, California 90071-3151  
Tel: 213-629-6000  
Fax: 213-629-6001

Attorneys for Defendants  
HALOMD, LLC, ALLA LAROQUE  
and SCOTT LAROQUE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND  
HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY, a  
California corporation; BLUE CROSS OF  
CALIFORNIA DBA ANTHEM BLUE  
CROSS, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HALOMD, LLC; ALLA LAROQUE;  
SCOTT LAROQUE; MPOWERHEALTH  
PRACTICE MANAGEMENT, LLC;  
BRUIN NEUROPHYSIOLOGY, P.C.;  
iNEUROLOGY, PC; N EXPRESS, PC;  
NORTH AMERICAN NEUROLOGICAL  
ASSOCIATES, PC; SOUND  
PHYSICIANS EMERGENCY  
MEDICINE OF SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA, P.C.; and SOUND  
PHYSICIANS ANESTHESIOLOGY OF  
CALIFORNIA, P.C.,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-1467-KES

Before the Honorable Karen E. Scott,  
United States Magistrate Judge

**DEFENDANTS ALLA LAROQUE  
AND SCOTT LAROQUE'S  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS  
AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT  
OF MOTION TO DISMISS**

Hearing Date: March 10, 2026  
Time: 10:00 A.M.  
Courtroom: 6D

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|    |   | <b>Page</b> |
|----|---|-------------|
| 1  |   |             |
| 2  | I. Anthem Fails to Plead Any Particularized, Relevant Allegations |             |
| 3  | against the LaRoques.....   | 6           |
| 4  | II. The Court Lacks Personal Jurisdiction over the LaRoques. .... | 7           |
| 5  | A. Anthem Cannot Establish General Jurisdiction over              |             |
| 6  | the LaRoques.....   | 7           |
| 7  | B. Anthem Cannot Establish Specific Jurisdiction over             |             |
| 8  | the LaRoques.....   | 8           |
| 9  | C. The Fiduciary Shield Doctrine Protects the LaRoques.....       | 10          |
| 10 | D. RICO and ERISA Do Not Alternatively Establish Personal         |             |
| 11 | Jurisdiction. ....  | 11          |
| 12 | III. Anthem Fails to State a Claim Against the LaRoques.....      | 13          |
| 13 | A. Anthem Does Not Plausibly Allege That the LaRoques             |             |
| 14 | Personally Participated in Any Conduct Supporting a               |             |
| 15 | Claim for Relief. ....  | 13          |
| 16 | B. Anthem Cannot Summarily and Implicitly Allege Corporate        |             |
| 17 | Veil Piercing. ....   | 16          |
| 18 | IV. Conclusion.....   | 18          |
| 19 |   |             |
| 20 |   |             |
| 21 |   |             |
| 22 |   |             |
| 23 |   |             |
| 24 |   |             |
| 25 |   |             |
| 26 |   |             |
| 27 |   |             |
| 28 |   |             |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

|    | <b>Cases</b>  | <b>Page(s)</b> |
|----|---|----------------|
| 1  |   |                |
| 2  |   |                |
| 3  | <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> ,  |                |
| 4  | 556 U.S. 662 (2009) .....   | 13             |
| 5  | <i>Barantsevich v. VTB Bank</i> ,   |                |
| 6  | 954 F. Supp. 2d 972 (C.D. Cal. 2013).....   | 9, 12          |
| 7  | <i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> ,   |                |
| 8  | 550 U.S. 544 (2007) .....   | 13             |
| 9  | <i>Boat People S.O.S., Inc. v. VOICE</i> ,  |                |
| 10 | No. 8:24-CV-00135-DOC-DFMX, 2024 WL 3914508 (C.D. Cal.<br>July 31, 2024) .....              | 15             |
| 11 | <i>Bobulinski v. Dickson</i> ,  |                |
| 12 | No. CV 24-02600-MWF, 2025 WL 863462 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 20,<br>2025).....                       | 11, 12         |
| 13 | <i>Borrego Cmty. Health Found. v. Hebets</i> ,  |                |
| 14 | No. 3:22-CV-01056-RBM-SBC, 2025 WL 934528 (S.D. Cal. Mar.<br>27, 2025).....                 | 15             |
| 15 | <i>Brayton Purcell LLP v. Recordon &amp; Recordon</i> ,                                     |                |
| 16 | 606 F.3d 1124 (9th Cir. 2010).....  | 8, 9           |
| 17 | <i>Butcher’s Union Loc. No. 498, United Food &amp; Com. Workers v. SDC<br/>Inv., Inc.</i> , |                |
| 18 | 788 F.2d 535 (9th Cir. 1986) .....  | 12             |
| 19 | <i>Calder v. Jones</i> ,  |                |
| 20 | 465 U.S. 783 (1984) .....   | 9              |
| 21 | <i>Casablanca Design Ctr, Inc. v. Closets by Design, Inc.</i> ,                             |                |
| 22 | No. 2:23-cv-02155-ODW, 2024 WL 4729461 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 8,<br>2024).....                     | 14             |
| 23 | <i>Colt Studio, Inc. v. Badpuppy Enter.</i> ,   |                |
| 24 | 75 F. Supp. 2d 1104 (C.D. Cal. 1999).....   | 9, 10          |
| 25 | <i>Davis v. Metro Prods., Inc.</i> ,  |                |
| 26 | 885 F.2d 515 (9th Cir. 1989) .....  | 11             |
| 27 |   |                |
| 28 |   |                |

|    |  |            |
|----|--|------------|
| 1  | <i>Fleites v. MindGeek S.A.R.L.</i> ,                      |            |
| 2  | No. 2:21-cv-04920-WLH-ADS, 2025 WL 2902301 (C.D. Cal. Sep. |            |
| 3  | 26, 2025).....   | 10, 16, 17 |
| 4  | <i>Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown</i> ,   |            |
| 5  | 564 U.S. 915 (2011) .....                                  | 7          |
| 6  | <i>Howard v. Am. Online Inc.</i> ,                         |            |
| 7  | 208 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2000).....                          | 15         |
| 8  | <i>Int’l Shoe Co. v. Washington</i> ,                      |            |
| 9  | 326 U.S. 310 (1945) .....                                  | 7          |
| 10 | <i>LeDuc v. Kentucky Cent. Life Ins. Co.</i> ,             |            |
| 11 | 814 F. Supp. 820 (N.D. Cal. 1992).....                     | 10         |
| 12 | <i>Makarem v. Get Buzzed LLC</i> ,                         |            |
| 13 | No. 2:25-cv-02357-MWC-ASx, 2025 WL 3030580 (C.D. Cal. Sep. |            |
| 14 | 23, 2025).....   | 14         |
| 15 | <i>ML Prods. Inc. v. Ninestar Tech. Co.</i> ,              |            |
| 16 | No. 5:21-CV-01930-MEMF-DTB, 2025 WL 2670869 (C.D. Cal.     |            |
| 17 | June 3, 2025).....   | 17         |
| 18 | <i>Neilson v. Union Bank of Cal., N.A.</i> ,               |            |
| 19 | 290 F. Supp. 2d 1101 (C.D. Cal. 2003).....                 | 17         |
| 20 | <i>Pebble Beach Co. v. Caddy</i> ,                         |            |
| 21 | 453 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2006).....                         | 9          |
| 22 | <i>Rano v. Sipa Press, Inc.</i> ,                          |            |
| 23 | 987 F.2d 580 (9th Cir. 1993).....                          | 8          |
| 24 | <i>Rupert v. Bond</i> ,                                    |            |
| 25 | 68 F. Supp. 3d 1142 (N.D. Cal. 2014).....                  | 12         |
| 26 | <i>Sandoval v. Ali</i> ,                                   |            |
| 27 | 34 F. Supp. 3d 1031 (N.D. Cal. 2014).....                  | 17         |
| 28 | <i>Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.</i> ,           |            |
|    | 374 F.3d 797 (9th Cir. 2004).....                          | 8          |

|    |   |               |
|----|---|---------------|
| 1  | <i>Sollberger v. Wachovia Sec., LLC,</i>                                    |               |
| 2  | No. SACV 09-0766AGANX, 2010 WL 2674456 (C.D. Cal. June                      |               |
| 3  | 30, 2010).....  | 13            |
| 4  | <i>Theodorakis v. DFINITY Stiftung,</i>                                     |               |
| 5  | No. 23-CV-02280-AMO, 2025 WL 822978 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 14,                     |               |
| 6  | 2025).....  | 8             |
| 7  | <i>Walden v. Fiore,</i>   |               |
| 8  | 571 U.S. 277 (2014) .....   | 7             |
| 9  | <i>Weberman v. Noble Collection, Inc.,</i>                                  |               |
| 10 | No. 2:24-CV-05230 AB, 2024 WL 4800875 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 19,                  |               |
| 11 | 2024).....  | 11            |
| 12 | <i>White v. Seabrooks,</i>  |               |
| 13 | 2022 WL 17224493 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2022).....                             | 14            |
| 14 | <b>Federal Statutes</b>   |               |
| 15 | Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 29 U.S.C. §§               |               |
| 16 | 1001 <i>et seq.</i> .....   | <i>passim</i> |
| 17 | No Surprises Act.....   | <i>passim</i> |
| 18 | Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. §§            |               |
| 19 | 1961 <i>et seq.</i> .....   | <i>passim</i> |
| 20 | 18 U.S.C. § 1961 .....  | 14            |
| 21 | 18 U.S.C. § 1965 .....  | 12            |
| 22 | <b>State Statutes</b>   |               |
| 23 | California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 <i>et</i> |               |
| 24 | <i>seq.</i> .....   | 16            |
| 25 | <b>Federal Rules</b>  |               |
| 26 | Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.....  | 13, 15, 16    |
| 27 | Fed. R. Civ. P. 9.....  | 13            |
| 28 | Fed. R. Civ. P. 12.....   | 6             |

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1), (2) and (6), Defendants Alla LaRoque (“Mrs. LaRoque”) and Scott LaRoque (“Mr. LaRoque”) (collectively, “the LaRoques”) independently move to dismiss the claims asserted by Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company and Blue Cross of California d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross (collectively, “Anthem”) in Anthem’s Amended Complaint.<sup>1</sup>

### **I. Anthem Fails to Plead Any Particularized, Relevant Allegations against the LaRoques.**

Anthem’s Amended Complaint contains 371 numbered paragraphs. Every count Anthem asserts sounds in fraud, but Anthem does not offer a single, specific, substantive allegation—*not one*—that either of the LaRoques took any fraudulent action or even knew about any fraudulent conduct. Instead, Anthem alleges only that:

- Mrs. LaRoque is the founder and President of HaloMD and was MPOWERHealth Practice Management, LLC’s (“MPOWERHealth’s”) “COO from January 2014 to at least January 2024” (Anthem’s Amended Complaint, Dkt. 50 (“AC”), ¶¶ 6, 16, 148, 150, 159);
- Mr. LaRoque is the founder and CEO of MPOWERHealth and HaloMD once referred to Mr. LaRoque as its CEO (*id.*, ¶¶ 7, 18, 135, 142, 162);
- the LaRoques are members of non-party entities that are members of HaloMD and MPOWERHealth (*id.*, ¶¶ 15, 17);
- the LaRoques are married and residents of Texas (*id.*, ¶¶ 7, 16, 18, 134, 148, 164);
- “Upon information and belief” Mr. LaRoque “exercises both managerial and operational control” over MPOWERHealth, its alleged subsidiaries and affiliates (“including, but not limited to [Bruin Neurophysiology, P.C.;

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the arguments set forth in this memorandum, the LaRoques join in the arguments asserted by HaloMD in its Motion to Dismiss Anthem’s Amended Complaint and all other arguments, as applicable to the LaRoques, asserted by co-Defendants in their respective motions to dismiss.



iNeurology, PC; N Express, PC; and North American Neurological Associates, PC]”) (*id.*, ¶¶ 135, 142);

- Mrs. LaRoque is a self-described No Surprises Act (“NSA”) expert and HaloMD’s “public face” who “directs HaloMD’s operations,” “on information and belief . . . had personal knowledge about the core aspects of HaloMD’s business operations,” and “runs HaloMD as a hands-on manager, overseeing the company’s operations, business practices, and finances” (*id.*, ¶¶ 149-150);
- the LaRoques are a “magnificent couple,” according to a social media post, and appear in public together on behalf of their companies (*id.*, ¶ 158); and,
- “[t]hrough the coordination of” the LaRoques, HaloMD, MPOWERHealth, and other defendants “acted with the common purpose of exploiting the IDR process to fraudulently obtain reimbursements from Anthem by maximizing the number of disputes submitted and inflating payment demands well beyond their billed charges or market rates” (*id.*, ¶ 164).

Independent of Anthem’s failure to plead plausible claims generally, these threadbare and irrelevant allegations against the LaRoques are insufficient to establish: (i) this Court’s personal jurisdiction over the LaRoques; or (ii) any cause of action against the LaRoques.

## **II. The Court Lacks Personal Jurisdiction over the LaRoques.**

Anthem offers no basis for this Court to exercise personal jurisdiction over the LaRoques. To establish personal jurisdiction, Anthem must show that the exercise of jurisdiction would be consistent with federal due process requirements. Personal jurisdiction may be general or specific and exists over a nonresident party if it has minimum contacts with the forum state, such that the exercise of jurisdiction does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. *Walden v. Fiore*, 571 U.S. 277, 283-90 (2014); *Int’l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945).

The primary focus in the analysis, and Anthem’s fundamental failure here, is the LaRoques lack of a relevant relationship with California.

### **A. Anthem Cannot Establish General Jurisdiction over the LaRoques.**

“For an individual, the paradigm forum for the exercise of general jurisdiction is the individual’s domicile.” *Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown*, 564

1 U.S. 915, 924 (2011). An individual is domiciled in her permanent home, where she  
2 resides with the intention to remain. *Theodorakis v. DFINITY Stiftung*, No. 23-CV-  
3 02280-AMO, 2025 WL 822978, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2025).

4 Here, Anthem identifies the LaRoques as Texas residents and identifies their  
5 roles with HaloMD and MPOWERHealth, both of which are Texas-based  
6 companies. AC, ¶¶ 16, 18. Anthem does not allege that either of the LaRoques resides  
7 or is domiciled in California. Nor does Anthem allege either of the LaRoques has any  
8 continuous and systematic contacts with California.

9 Accordingly, this Court lacks general jurisdiction over the LaRoques as neither  
10 of the LaRoques is domiciled in California. *Theodorakis*, 2025 WL 822978, at \*2  
11 (allegations did not support exercise of general jurisdiction over individual  
12 defendant).

13 **B. Anthem Cannot Establish Specific Jurisdiction over the LaRoques.**

14 Separate and apart from general jurisdiction, a person may be subject to  
15 specific jurisdiction in actions arising from the specific, forum-related activities of  
16 that person. The Ninth Circuit has established a three-part test for determining  
17 specific jurisdiction: (1) the defendant must purposefully avail itself of the privilege  
18 of conducting activities in the forum and invoking the benefits and protections of its  
19 laws; (2) the plaintiff's claim must arise out of or result from the defendant's forum-  
20 related activities; and (3) the exercise of jurisdiction must be reasonable. *Rano v. Sipa*  
21 *Press, Inc.*, 987 F.2d 580, 588 (9th Cir. 1993).

22 The first part of the specific jurisdiction test may be satisfied by either  
23 purposeful availment or purposeful direction. *Brayton Purcell LLP v. Recordon &*  
24 *Recordon*, 606 F.3d 1124, 1128 (9th Cir. 2010). Courts generally apply the  
25 purposeful availment analysis in connection with contract claims and the purposeful  
26 direction analysis in tort actions. *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374  
27 F.3d 797, 802 (9th Cir. 2004). "Evidence of availment is typically action taking place  
28 in the forum that invokes the benefits and protections of the laws in the forum.

1 Evidence of direction generally consists of action taking place outside the forum that  
2 is directed at the forum.” *Pebble Beach Co. v. Caddy*, 453 F.3d 1151, 1155 (9th Cir.  
3 2006) (citation omitted). Purposeful direction is evaluated under the three-part  
4 “effects” test: a defendant allegedly must have (1) committed an intentional act, (2)  
5 expressly aimed at the forum state, (3) causing harm that the defendant knows is  
6 likely to be suffered in the forum state. *Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S. 783 (1984); *Brayton*  
7 *Purcell LLP*, 606 F.3d at 1128.

8 Here, Anthem fails to establish specific jurisdiction over the LaRoques in any  
9 respect. Anthem’s RICO-based theory of liability sounds in tort. *Barantsevich v. VTB*  
10 *Bank*, 954 F. Supp. 2d 972, 991 (C.D. Cal. 2013) (finding that, for claims sounding  
11 in tort, including fraud and RICO violations, courts apply a “purposeful direction”  
12 “effects test” and may exercise specific jurisdiction over defendants who have  
13 committed an intentional act aimed at the forum state and caused harm). The  
14 Amended Complaint attributes alleged false attestations of belief of IDR process  
15 eligibility to HaloMD, not to either of the LaRoques personally. AC, ¶¶ 91-93, 96-  
16 104. The Amended Complaint utterly fails to identify even a single intentional act by  
17 the LaRoques in their personal capacities, let alone one that was expressly directed  
18 at California. Mere allegations that the LaRoques hold corporate titles and are  
19 founders and officers of HaloMD and MPOWERHealth do not come close to  
20 satisfying the purposeful direction “effects test.” *Colt Studio, Inc. v. Badpuppy*  
21 *Enter.*, 75 F. Supp. 2d 1104, 1111 (C.D. Cal. 1999) (“The mere fact that a corporation  
22 is subject to local jurisdiction does not necessarily mean its nonresident officers,  
23 directors, agents, and employees are suable locally as well.”).

24 Further, Anthem’s claims do not “arise out of or result from” forum-related  
25 activities to establish specific jurisdiction over the LaRoques. The pleaded conduct  
26 giving rise to Anthem’s claims is the initiation of IDR proceedings via a web portal  
27 administered by federal agencies. AC, ¶¶ 54-59, 90-91, 96-104. Anthem does not  
28 tether any California-directed, personal conduct by the LaRoques to any of the claims

1 that it asserts. Instead, Anthem’s claims allegedly arise and result from acts by  
2 HaloMD and the other Defendant entities. But ““a parent-subsidary relationship is  
3 insufficient, on its own, to justify imputing one entity’s contacts with a forum state  
4 to another for the purpose of establishing personal jurisdiction.”” *Fleites v. MindGeek*  
5 *S.A.R.L.*, No. 2:21-cv-04920-WLH-ADS, 2025 WL 2902301, at \*25 (C.D. Cal. Sep.  
6 26, 2025) (quoting *Ranza v. Nike, Inc.*, 793 F.3d 1059, 1070 (9th Cir. 2015)). This is  
7 especially so for suits against individual owners or members of such entities. *Colt*  
8 *Studio, Inc.*, 75 F. Supp. 2d at 1111 (“For jurisdictional purposes, the acts of corporate  
9 officers and directors in their official capacities are the acts of the corporation  
10 exclusively and are thus not material for purposes of establishing minimum contacts  
11 as to the individuals.”); see *LeDuc v. Kentucky Cent. Life Ins. Co.*, 814 F. Supp. 820,  
12 824 (N.D. Cal. 1992) (“Each defendant’s contacts with the forum state must be  
13 examined individually....”). Anthem’s claims are thus woefully insufficient to  
14 establish specific jurisdiction over the LaRoques.

15 Finally, exercising jurisdiction would be unreasonable. The LaRoques are  
16 Texas residents with no alleged personal presence or property in, and no personal  
17 conduct directed at, California. Anthem’s attempt to burden them personally with  
18 costly and onerous discovery and litigation in California is grossly misaligned with  
19 the Amended Complaint’s total lack of substantive allegations against them.  
20 Anthem’s claims independently fail for the many reasons set forth in HaloMD’s  
21 motion to dismiss,<sup>2</sup> but Anthem’s attempt to assert jurisdiction over the LaRoques  
22 here is entirely unreasonable.

23 **C. The Fiduciary Shield Doctrine Protects the LaRoques.**

24 Anthem’s attempt to premise personal jurisdiction on the LaRoques’ executive  
25 positions further fails as a matter of law. The Ninth Circuit recognizes that a corporate  
26 officer’s forum contacts, if any, must be assessed individually and cannot be  
27 bootstrapped from alleged company activities. The fiduciary shield doctrine bars

28 <sup>2</sup> See HaloMD’s Motion to Dismiss Anthem’s Amended Complaint.

1 jurisdiction over an officer based solely on corporate acts, absent allegations that the  
2 officers themselves have sufficient minimum contacts with the forum state. *See Davis*  
3 *v. Metro Prods., Inc.*, 885 F.2d 515, 520 (9th Cir. 1989) (“Under the fiduciary shield  
4 doctrine, a person’s mere association with a corporation that causes injury in the  
5 forum state is not sufficient in itself to permit that forum to assert jurisdiction over  
6 the person.”); *Weberman v. Noble Collection, Inc.*, No. 2:24-CV-05230 AB (AJRX),  
7 2024 WL 4800875, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 19, 2024) (“The fiduciary shield doctrine  
8 protects individuals from being subject to jurisdiction solely on the basis of their  
9 employers’ minimum contacts within a given jurisdiction.”).

10 Here, while this Court also lacks personal jurisdiction over the companies led  
11 by the LaRoques (*i.e.*, HaloMD and MPOWERHealth), Anthem does not allege that  
12 either of the LaRoques personally communicated into California, personally  
13 executed the allegedly false IDR attestations, or otherwise engaged in conduct  
14 expressly directed at California that would establish minimum contacts in California.  
15 Without such concrete factual allegations, the law shields the LaRoques from  
16 personal jurisdiction here.

17 **D. RICO and ERISA Do Not Alternatively Establish Personal**  
18 **Jurisdiction.**

19 Anthem also cannot salvage personal jurisdiction through the Racketeer  
20 Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (“RICO”) or the Employee Retirement  
21 Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”).

22 Principally, the Amended Complaint’s failure to plausibly plead either a viable  
23 RICO or ERISA claim (as against the LaRoques or otherwise) moots any personal  
24 jurisdictional analysis under either statute.<sup>3</sup> *See Bobulinski v. Dickson*, No. CV 24-  
25 02600-MWF (JPRX), 2025 WL 863462, at \*10 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2025) (“There  
26 can be no jurisdiction over defendants otherwise not subject to jurisdiction pursuant

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>3</sup> *See* HaloMD’s Motion to Dismiss Anthem’s Amended Complaint, pp. 21-26, 28-  
29.

1 to § 1965(b) if there is not a plausible underlying RICO claim.”). But even if Anthem  
2 had plausibly pleaded a RICO claim, it may not rely on 18 U.S.C. § 1965(b) to assert  
3 personal jurisdiction over the LaRoques because Anthem cannot show the “ends of  
4 justice” require bringing the LaRoques individually before this Court. 18 U.S.C. §  
5 1965(b) (court may authorize service of process in a RICO action “in which it is  
6 shown that the ends of justice require that other parties residing in any other district  
7 be brought before the court”); *see also Rupert v. Bond*, 68 F. Supp. 3d 1142, 1161-  
8 62 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (“A plaintiff seeking to exercise jurisdiction pursuant to RICO’s  
9 ‘ends of justice’ provision faces a high hurdle” to “affirmatively show that no other  
10 district could exercise jurisdiction over all the alleged co-conspirators”); *Butcher’s*  
11 *Union Loc. No. 498, United Food & Com. Workers v. SDC Inv., Inc.*, 788 F.2d 535,  
12 539 (9th Cir. 1986) (“merely naming persons in a RICO complaint does not, in itself,  
13 make them subject to section 1965(b)’s nationwide service provisions.”).

14 To demonstrate this Court has jurisdiction over defendants under § 18 U.S.C.  
15 § 1965(b), Anthem’s burden is to allege there is no other district in which a court will  
16 have personal jurisdiction over all of the alleged defendants. *See Butcher’s Union*  
17 *Loc. No. 498*, 788 F.2d at 539 (“For nationwide service to be imposed under [18  
18 U.S.C. § 1965(b)] . . . the plaintiff must show that there is no other district in which  
19 a court will have personal jurisdiction over all of the alleged co-conspirators.”).

20 Here, Anthem has not even attempted to meet that burden. Accordingly, the  
21 “ends of justice” do not require haling the LaRoques before this Court. *See*  
22 *Bobulinski*, 2025 WL 863462, at \*10 (granting dismissal on personal jurisdictional  
23 grounds because the plaintiff did not attempt to show no other federal district court  
24 that could exercise jurisdiction over all defendants); *Barantsevich*, 954 F. Supp. 2d  
25 at 989-90 (“While it is not clear that there is another district that could exercise  
26 jurisdiction over all defendants, plaintiff has the burden of showing affirmatively that  
27 this is the case.”).



1 **III. Anthem Fails to State a Claim Against the LaRoques.**

2 Issues of personal jurisdiction aside, Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 requires a short, plain  
3 statement of allegations showing Anthem is entitled to recover against the LaRoques.  
4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b) requires Anthem to plead its fraud allegations against the  
5 LaRoques with particularity. Anthem does neither.

6 **A. Anthem Does Not Plausibly Allege That the LaRoques Personally**  
7 **Participated in Any Conduct Supporting a Claim for Relief.**

8 To survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain enough  
9 facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face. *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*,  
10 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). A claim is facially plausible when the plaintiff pleads facts  
11 that allow the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for  
12 the misconduct alleged. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citation and  
13 quotation omitted). A claim must be supported by facts sufficient to “raise a right to  
14 relief above the speculative level.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555, 570.

15 Rather than offering any facts showing the LaRoques personally participated  
16 in any conduct that could support a plausible claim against either of them, Anthem  
17 has adopted an impermissible group or shotgun pleading strategy. *See Sollberger v.*  
18 *Wachovia Sec., LLC*, No. SACV 09-0766AGANX, 2010 WL 2674456, at \*4 (C.D.  
19 Cal. June 30, 2010) (noting shotgun pleadings are unacceptable and recognizing their  
20 “many negative consequences”). While group pleading of defendants is permissible  
21 in certain cases, a complaint violates pleading rules when it “deprives [d]efendants  
22 of knowing exactly what they are accused of doing wrong.” *Id.* at \*5. That is  
23 especially true for claims sounding in fraud because Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b) requires a  
24 plaintiff to plead such claims with particularity as to each defendant.

25 Here, the Amended Complaint merely offers allegations about the LaRoques’  
26 marriage, along with vague and conclusory allegations about their roles in their  
27 companies. Anthem does not allege that either Mrs. LaRoque or Mr. LaRoque was  
28 even aware of, let alone participated in, a single IDR proceeding, including in any of

1 the representative IDR proceedings identified by Anthem. *See* AC, ¶¶168-205; 224-  
2 48 (listing the representative IDR proceedings cited by Anthem in support of its  
3 factual allegations). Nor does Anthem allege that either of the LaRoques specifically  
4 knew or intended that any IDR proceeding was initiated with a false attestation of a  
5 belief of IDR process eligibility.

6 Whatever Anthem may allege against the other Defendants, the Amended  
7 Complaint's silence regarding the LaRoques' individual actions is fatal for all claims  
8 against them. Otherwise, a plaintiff could proceed with claims against any individual  
9 employed by a corporate defendant simply due to the nature of their employment  
10 based on a vague information-and-belief allegation of operational control. Permitting  
11 such claims is inconsistent with bedrock pleading requirements under federal rules  
12 and long-established *Iqbal/Twombly* standards.

13 Anthem's RICO allegations demonstrate how glaring these pleading  
14 deficiencies are for the LaRoques. To state a civil RICO claim, Anthem must allege  
15 conduct of a pattern of racketeering consisting of two acts of racketeering activity  
16 enumerated in 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1). Specifically, Anthem must plausibly plead, with  
17 particularity, "at least two predicate acts *by each defendant*." *See Makarem v. Get*  
18 *Buzzed LLC*, No. 2:25-cv-02357-MWC-ASx, 2025 WL 3030580, at \*4 (C.D. Cal.  
19 Sep. 23, 2025) (quoting *In re WellPoint, Inc. Out-of-Network UCR Rates Litig.*, 903  
20 F. Supp. 2d 880, 914 (C.D. Cal. 2012)); *White v. Seabrooks*, 2022 WL 17224493, at  
21 \*6-7 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2022) (dismissing conclusory RICO claim that set "forth no  
22 factual allegations detailing the occasions, the relationship between the activity, and  
23 the continuing threat"). Moreover, to state a substantive RICO claim against the  
24 LaRoques, Anthem must plausibly plead that their conduct was a but-for and  
25 proximate cause of injury to Anthem. *Casablanca Design Ctr, Inc. v. Closets by*  
26 *Design, Inc.*, No. 2:23-cv-02155-ODW, 2024 WL 4729461, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 8,  
27 2024) (proximate cause requires "some direct relation between the injury asserted  
28 and the injurious conduct alleged").



1 The Amended Complaint, however, fails to allege that either Mrs. LaRoque or  
2 Mr. LaRoque committed even a single predicate act—or any act at all. Anthem’s  
3 omission is fatal. *See, e.g., Boat People S.O.S., Inc. v. VOICE*, No. 8:24-CV-00135-  
4 DOC-DFMX, 2024 WL 3914508, at \*8 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2024) (dismissing as  
5 insufficient RICO claims that lumped defendants together and failed to state their  
6 role in alleged predicate acts); *Borrego Cmty. Health Found. v. Hebets*, No. 3:22-  
7 CV-01056-RBM-SBC, 2025 WL 934528, at \*16 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2025) (finding  
8 shotgun RICO pleading “woefully non-complaint” with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 and 9 and  
9 noting that “unless cases are pled clearly and precisely, issues are not joined,  
10 discovery is not controlled, the trial court’s docket becomes unmanageable, the  
11 litigants suffer, and society loses confidence in the court’s ability to administer  
12 justice.”) (internal quotation and citation omitted)).

13 Anthem’s RICO conspiracy count fares no better. To state a RICO conspiracy  
14 claim, Anthem must establish all of the elements of a substantive RICO violation and  
15 the existence of an illicit agreement to violate the substantive RICO provision. *See*  
16 *Howard v. Am. Online Inc.*, 208 F.3d 741, 751 (9th Cir. 2000) (determining that the  
17 “failure to adequately plead a substantive violation of RICO precludes a claim for  
18 conspiracy”). Of course, it is insufficient if someone else formed such an agreement  
19 to commit a crime: to hold the LaRoques liable, Anthem must allege that each of  
20 them individually agreed to commit an offense or knowingly joined such an  
21 agreement intending to further its criminal goal. *Id.* The Amended Complaint offers  
22 no facts showing either of the LaRoques were aware of any alleged fraud, intended  
23 to take part in it, or joined any agreement to perpetrate it.

24 The fundamental absence of non-conclusory allegations that the LaRoques  
25 engaged in any specific act is also fatal to Anthem’s state law claims. The Amended  
26 Complaint is devoid of any facts showing the LaRoques ever made a false  
27 representation (either knowing of its falsity or lacking any reasonable ground for  
28 believing the statement to be true) intending to defraud another into justifiable

1 reliance resulting in damage, as required to support Anthem’s fraudulent and  
2 negligent misrepresentations claims. Nor does Anthem plausibly allege that the  
3 LaRoques ever engaged in an unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent act to support a claim  
4 under the California Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§  
5 17200, *et seq.*

6 By offering no facts showing entitlement to relief from the LaRoques on any  
7 count, Anthem falls far short of its pleading obligations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 and  
8 9(b).<sup>4</sup> Anthem’s naming of the LaRoques anyway thus plainly violates federal  
9 pleading rules. The Court should not condone such tactics.

10 **B. Anthem Cannot Summarily and Implicitly Allege Corporate Veil**  
11 **Piercing.**

12 By stringing together allegations regarding the LaRoques’ marriage, public  
13 appearances, and positions at HaloMD and MPOWERHealth, Anthem seemingly  
14 wishes to ignore corporate forms altogether. But Anthem cannot sufficiently state a  
15 claim against the LaRoques through vague and unsupported assertions of operational  
16 control, regardless of the insufficiency of the allegations asserted against the other  
17 named corporate defendants.

18 Piercing the corporate veil is the rare exception and recognized as an “extreme  
19 remedy” reserved for cases where a plaintiff alleges that a defendant shareholder  
20 exercised control over the corporation in such a manner as to commit fraud, an illegal  
21 act, or a similarly unlawful act. *See Fleites*, 2025 WL 2902301, at \*25. The Amended  
22 Complaint does not come close to meeting this standard.

23 Anthem does not allege—through concrete facts or otherwise—that HaloMD  
24 and MPOWERHealth are alter-egos of Mrs. and Mr. LaRoque, or that Mrs. LaRoque  
25 and Mr. LaRoque personally used HaloMD or MPOWERHealth to commit fraud. To

---

26 <sup>4</sup> Anthem also purports to assert its vacatur, ERISA, and declaratory and injunctive  
27 relief claims (Counts XI-XIII) against all Defendants, including the LaRoques, but  
28 plausibly pleads no allegations supporting such claims against the LaRoques  
individually.

1 the contrary, to the extent the Amended Complaint alleges anything at all, it asserts  
2 implausible allegations against corporate entities. To make a prima facie showing of  
3 an alter ego, Anthem must plausibly allege *both* “(1) that there is such unity of interest  
4 and ownership that the separate personalities of [the entities] no longer exist and (2)  
5 that failure to disregard [their separate identities] would result in fraud or injustice.”  
6 *ML Prods. Inc. v. Ninestar Tech. Co.*, No. 5:21-CV-01930-MEMF-DTB, 2025 WL  
7 2670869, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. June 3, 2025) (quoting *Ranza*, 793 F.3d at 1073).

8 Anthem’s burden is steep. First, unity of interest requires such pervasive  
9 control over a subsidiary that a parent dictates daily operations: “Total ownership and  
10 shared management personnel are alone insufficient.” *Fleites*, 2025 WL 2902301, at  
11 \*26. Second, “[t]he underlying cause of action cannot supply the necessary fraud or  
12 injustice prong. To hold otherwise would render the fraud or injustice element  
13 meaningless[.]” *Id.* at \*27 (citations and quotations omitted).

14 The Amended Complaint fails on both counts. The only pseudo-substantive  
15 allegations Anthem makes about the LaRoques’ operational control over business  
16 entities are entirely speculative, resting “on information and belief,” and fall far short  
17 of the pervasiveness required to nullify corporate forms. *Sandoval v. Ali*, 34 F. Supp.  
18 3d 1031, 1040 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (finding plaintiffs’ conclusory allegations “on  
19 information and belief” of defendants’ alter ego status were insufficient to state a  
20 claim) (relying on *Neilson v. Union Bank of Cal., N.A.*, 290 F. Supp. 2d 1101, 1116  
21 (C.D. Cal. 2003) (“[a] plaintiff must allege specifically both of the elements of alter  
22 ego liability, as well as facts supporting each.”)). Moreover, while information-and-  
23 belief pleading may be permissible when supported by corroborating factual  
24 allegations, the mere fact that someone believes something to be true does not create  
25 a plausible inference that it is. Anthem’s allegations against the LaRoques are simply  
26 not corroborated by concrete pleaded facts, and the Court cannot plausibly infer that  
27 the LaRoques are personally liable for any of the acts alleged in Anthem’s Amended  
28 Complaint, regardless of the implausibility of Anthem’s claims.

**IV. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, Anthem’s Amended Complaint: (i) fails to establish that this Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over Anthem’s claims and personal jurisdiction over the LaRoques; and (ii) fails to state a claim against the LaRoques. Accordingly, this Court should dismiss all claims against the LaRoques with prejudice. Further, for those reasons argued in HaloMD and the LaRoques’ anti-SLAPP motion—and especially because Anthem baselessly elected to name the LaRoques individually—this Court should award attorneys’ fees and costs to the LaRoques pursuant to California’s anti-SLAPP law.

Dated: December 12, 2025

NIXON PEABODY LLP

By: /s/Jonah D. Retzinger

Jonah D. Retzinger  
Christopher D. Grigg  
Brock J. Seraphin  
April C. Yang

Attorneys for Defendants  
HALOMD, LLC, ALLA  
LAROQUE, AND SCOTT  
LAROQUE

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

Pursuant to Section 28 of the Procedures of the Honorable Karen E. Scott, the undersigned, counsel of record for Defendants HALOMD, LLC, ALLA LAROQUE and SCOTT LAROQUE, certifies that, excluding the caption, the table of contents, the table of authorities, the signature block, and any indices and exhibits, this brief contains 4,013 words, which:

[X] complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.1.

\_\_\_ complies with the word limit set by court order dated [date].

Dated: December 12, 2025

NIXON PEABODY LLP

By: /s/Jonah D. Retzinger  
Jonah D. Retzinger

Attorneys for Defendants  
HALOMD, LLC, ALLA  
LAROQUE, AND SCOTT  
LAROQUE

**L.R. 7-3 MEET AND CONFER DECLARATION**

I, Jonah D. Retzinger, counsel of record for Defendants HaloMD, LLC, Alla LaRoque, and Scott LaRoque, declare that on December 3, 2025, I participated in a meet-and-confer videoconference with Anthem's counsel of record (as well as counsel of record for all other Defendants) regarding HaloMD and the LaRoques' intent to file motions to dismiss Anthem's Amended Complaint and a request for judicial notice, along with a special motion to strike Anthem's Amended Complaint pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.

During this videoconference, I referenced the arguments in the motions to dismiss filed by HaloMD and the LaRoques in the other actions brought by Anthem's affiliates pending in Ohio and Georgia against HaloMD and the LaRoques based on similar allegations (in which Anthem's counsel of record also represents Anthem's affiliates). During our conference, Anthem's counsel did not agree that Anthem's claims should be dismissed against HaloMD or the LaRoques in this action for any reason. Accordingly, the parties were unable to reach a resolution that eliminates the necessity of this motion.

I, Jonah D. Retzinger, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

Executed on December 12, 2025.

/s/Jonah D. Retzinger  
Jonah D. Retzinger

Jonah D. Retzinger (SBN 326131)  
jretzinger@nixonpeabody.com  
Christopher D. Grigg (SBN 220243)  
cgrigg@nixonpeabody.com  
Brock J. Seraphin (SBN 307041)  
bseraphin@nixonpeabody.com  
April C. Yang (SBN 330951)  
ayang@nixonpeabody.com  
NIXON PEABODY LLP  
300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 4100  
Los Angeles, California 90071-3151  
Tel: 213-629-6000  
Fax: 213-629-6001

Attorneys for Defendants  
HALOMD, LLC, ALLA LAROQUE,  
and SCOTT LAROQUE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND  
HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY, a  
California corporation; BLUE CROSS  
OF CALIFORNIA DBA ANTHEM  
BLUE CROSS, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HALOMD, LLC; ALLA LAROQUE;  
SCOTT LAROQUE;  
MPOWERHEALTH PRACTICE  
MANAGEMENT, LLC; BRUIN  
NEUROPHYSIOLOGY, P.C.;  
iNEUROLOGY, PC; N EXPRESS, PC;  
NORTH AMERICAN  
NEUROLOGICAL ASSOCIATES, PC;  
SOUND PHYSICIANS EMERGENCY  
MEDICINE OF SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA, P.C.; and SOUND  
PHYSICIANS ANESTHESIOLOGY  
OF CALIFORNIA, P.C.,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-1467-KES

Before the Honorable Karen E. Scott,  
United States Magistrate Judge

**[PROPOSED] ORDER RE  
DEFENDANTS ALLA LAROQUE  
AND SCOTT LAROQUE'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

Hearing Date: March 10, 2026  
Time: 10:00 A.M.  
Courtroom: 6D

1 This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Alla LaRoque and Scott  
2 LaRoque's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health  
3 Insurance Company and Blue Cross of California d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross's  
4 (collectively, "Anthem") Amended Complaint [Dkt. 50] (the "Amended  
5 Complaint"). Having considered the Motion, the records in this action, and good  
6 cause appearing therefore:

7 The Court GRANTS Defendants Alla LaRoque and Scott LaRoque's Motion  
8 to Dismiss Plaintiffs Anthem's Amended Complaint and ORDERS all claims against  
9 Alla LaRoque and Scott LaRoque dismissed with prejudice.

10  
11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12  
13 Dated:

14  
15 U.S. Magistrate Judge Karen E. Scott  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28