

United States Courts
Southern District of Texas
FILED

FEB 28 2002

Michael N. Milby, Clerk

BC

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

MARK NEWBY, ET AL.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ENRON CORPORATION, ET AL.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. H-01-3624
AND CONSOLIDATED CASES

2002 FEB 28 PM 4:35
U.S. COURT'S
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS

FILED

**RESPONSE OF DEFENDANT MICHAEL J. KOPPER TO
MOTION TO REMAND BY AHLICH PLAINTIFFS**

THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THIS COURT:

NOW COMES Defendant Michael J. Kopper ("Kopper") and files this response in opposition to the motion to remand filed by the plaintiffs in *Ahlich, et al. v. Arthur Andersen, L.L.P., et al.*, Civil Action No. H-02-0347.¹ *Ahlich* is consolidated into the above-captioned case number, after having been originally filed under Cause No. 02-000073-CV-272 in Brazos County District Court and removed to this Court on January 30, 2002. In support of his opposition to the motion to remand, Kopper would respectfully show the Court as follows:

¹As part of the consolidated *Newby* proceedings, *Ahlich* is subject to the Court's previous orders applicable to the *Newby* cases, including but not limited to the Court's placement of a hold on the filing of responsive pleadings pending the Court's entry of a scheduling order for the consolidated cases. Accordingly, Kopper's response to this motion to remand is filed without prejudice to his ability to file any necessary responsive pleadings, including but not limited to a motion to dismiss under FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b) at the appropriate time.

I. Lawsuits Filed by Fleming & Associates Seek to Circumvent Federal Securities Laws

1. The *Ahlich* Plaintiffs are represented by Fleming & Associates, L.L.P. (“Fleming”). Fleming has filed at least six additional Enron-related lawsuits² (“the Fleming lawsuits”) in five different forums. The factual allegations in each Fleming lawsuit are virtually identical. All of these cases have been removed to federal court. Kopper is named as a defendant in the majority of the Fleming lawsuits, including *Ahlich*.

2. Despite having filed their lawsuit in the District Court of Brazos County, Texas, according to their petition twenty-six of the *Ahlich* plaintiffs are not residents of Texas. None of the *Ahlich* plaintiffs have alleged that they reside in Brazos County.

3. Sean Jez, a partner at Fleming, has represented to this Court that Fleming represents over 750 individuals. Transcript of January 30, 2002 hearing at 17-18. During a January 30 hearing before this Court, Mr. Jez acknowledged that Fleming might well continue to file additional Enron-related lawsuits. *Id.* at 50-51. Approximately one week later, Fleming filed the *Jose* lawsuit in Bexar County and successfully sought an *ex parte* temporary restraining order against selected defendants. It appears that approximately 80 of Fleming’s claimed 750 clients have had a suit filed under their name to date.

²*Odam v. Enron Corporation*, Civil Action No. H-01-3914, filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division; *Rosen v. Arthur Andersen, L.L.P.*, originally filed under Cause No. 2001-57517 in the 333rd Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas; *Bullock v. Arthur Anderson, L.L.P.*, Cause No. 32716, originally filed in the 21st Judicial District Court of Washington County, Texas; *Jose v. Arthur Andersen, L.L.P.*; originally filed under Cause No. 2002-CI-01906 in the 57th Judicial District Court of Bexar County, Texas; *Pearson v. Fastow*, originally filed under Cause No. 2002-00609, in the 164th Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas; and *Delgado v. Fastow*, originally filed under Cause No. 2002-00569 in the 55th Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas.

4. On January 30, 2002, Arthur Anderson removed the *Ahlich* case to this Court pursuant to the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act (“SLUSA”). Pub. L. 105-353, 112 STAT. 3227 (1998).

II. Relevant Statutory Provisions

5. SLUSA was passed in 1998 in an attempt to strengthen the reforms begun by Congress in 1995 with the passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (“PSLRA”). Pub. L. 104-67, 109 STAT. 737 (1995). PLSRA attempted to reduce the number and expense of frivolous security fraud class action lawsuits by establishing heightened pleading requirements, imposing an automatic stay on discovery until the pleadings comport to the pleading requirements, and, *inter alia*, providing a safe harbor for certain forward-looking statements. SLUSA was passed in 1998 “to prevent certain State private securities class action lawsuits alleging fraud . . . from being used to frustrate the objectives of [PSLRA].” SLUSA, Pub. L. 105-353, at § 2(5).

6. To this end, SLUSA requires the removal to federal court of “[a]ny covered class action brought in any State court involving a covered security” and the dismissal of “covered class action[s] based upon the statutory or common law of any State [that] alleg[es] a misrepresentation or omission of a material fact in connection with the purchase or sale of a covered security.” 15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(b) & (c); 78bb(f)(1)(A) & (2). The statute defines a “covered class action” as

- (i) any single lawsuit in which –
 - (I) damages are sought on behalf of more than 50 persons or prospective class members, and questions of law or fact common to those persons..., without reference to issues of individualized

reliance on an alleged misstatement or omission, predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons or members; or

- ...
- (ii) any group of lawsuits filed in or pending in the same court and involving common questions of law or fact, in which ---
 - (I) damages are sought on behalf of more than 50 persons; and
 - (II) the lawsuits are joined, consolidated, or otherwise proceed as a single action for any purpose.

15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(f)(2)(A); 78bb(f)(5)(B). As noted by this Court, Congress, through the passage of PSLRA and SLUSA, has preempted all state law security actions falling within these parameters. Memorandum & Order, entered February 6, 2002 (Dkt. No. 279), at 12. In fact, the Senate Banking Committee explained:

[W]hile the Committee believes it has effectively reached those [State] actions that could be used to circumvent the reforms enacted by Congress in 1995 as part of [PLSRA], it remains the Committee's intent that the bill be interpreted broadly to reach mass actions and all other procedural devices that might be used to circumvent the class action definition.

S. Rep. No. 105-182, at 8 (1998) (emphasis added).

**II. *Ahlich* Case was Properly Removed to Federal Court:
This Court Should Disregard The Fleming Plaintiffs' Procedural Maneuvers That
Seek to Eviscerate the Protections of SLUSA**

7. The *Ahlich* Plaintiffs argue that the removal of their case was improper under the SLUSA and should, therefore, be remanded to the state court. The *Ahlich* Plaintiffs claim that their lawsuit does not qualify as a "covered class action." They have not challenged (and cannot challenge) the remaining requirements for removal under SLUSA.

8. To remand the case would permit Fleming and its plaintiffs to circumvent the protections provided by PLSRA and SLUSA to the nation's securities market by employing the procedural device of filing numerous lawsuits (using identical allegations) in numerous courts,

each with only an allegedly small number of named plaintiffs. As this Court has previously noted, “[c]learly, SLUSA was enacted to prevent just such gamesmanship.” Order & Memorandum (dated Feb. 15, 2002) at 4. The Court should not permit this abuse to continue unchecked.

9. A California federal district court recently faced a similar attempt by a plaintiff to undermine the effectiveness of the securities laws through procedural manipulation of pleadings. *Gibson v. PS Group Holdings, Inc.*, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. ¶ 90,921, 2000 WL 777818 (S.D. Cal. 2000). In that case, “[t]he procedural history of th[e] case suggests that Plaintiff selectively omitted the damages prayer from his Amended Complaint to defeat removal under [SLUSA].” *Id.* at *3. When the plaintiff then sought to remand the case to state court, alleging that it fell outside the definition of a “covered class action,” the court refused to remand the case as doing so “would eviscerate” SLUSA. *Id.*

A rule that allows a plaintiff to defeat a defendant’s right to remove a class action through ... a hollow procedural maneuver would surrender [SLUSA’s] application to the class action plaintiffs the statute seeks to keep at bay. *[SLUSA] demands that the Court look beyond the face of the [plaintiff’s] pleadings to discern whether this action is a “covered class action.”* Because Plaintiff has offered no explanation [for his procedural actions], the Court finds no reason why this action should not qualify as a “covered class action” under [SLUSA.]

Id. at *4 (emphasis added).

10. The procedural history and arbitrary number of plaintiffs assigned to each of the Fleming lawsuits suggest that Fleming is attempting to circumvent the class action definition through the mechanism of filing numerous lawsuits in numerous counties with arbitrary division of plaintiffs among the lawsuits. As this Court discussed in an earlier ruling, this artful pleading

doctrine applies where federal law preempts the field and prevents plaintiffs from precluding removal by failing to plead necessary federal questions. Memorandum & Order, entered February 6, 2002 (Dkt. No. 279), at 9. Because Congress has preempted securities fraud actions such as those pled in the Fleming Lawsuits, the artful pleading doctrine applies and prohibits subsets of the alleged 750 Fleming clients from precluding removal of their claims. Allowing Fleming to avoid the provisions of SLUSA and PLSRA through such creative pleadings would eviscerate the protections provided by those laws. As a result, Kopper respectfully requests that this Court deny the *Ahlich* Plaintiffs' motion to remand.

11. Federal courts have traditionally scrutinized the structure of plaintiffs' lawsuits to ensure that plaintiffs do not thwart federal jurisdiction through the use of procedural maneuvers. According to the Supreme Court, "[a] district court can consider whether the plaintiff has engaged in any manipulative tactics when it decides whether to remand a case." *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 108 S. Ct. 614, 622 (1988) (question of whether to remand pendant state-law claims). For example, the federal courts have ruled that the fraudulent joinder of a nondiverse defendant will not stymie the removal of the case to federal court or the federal court's exercise of jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Triggs v. John Crump Toyota, Inc.*, 154 F.3d 1284, 1287 (11th Cir. 1998) ("Fraudulent joinder is a judicially created doctrine that provides an exception to the requirement of complete diversity.")

12. In its February 15, 2002 Order and Memorandum (Dkt. No. 296), this Court quoted *Winkler v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 101 F.3d 1196, 1202 (7th Cir. 1997): "Litigants who engage in forum-shopping, or otherwise take advantage of our dual court system for the specific purpose of

evading the authority of a federal court, have the potential ‘to seriously impair the federal court’s flexibility and authority to decide that case’” (citations omitted). The actions of Fleming seek to destroy the safeguards provided by PSLRA and SLUSA and interfere with this Court’s ability to manage the massive Enron-related litigation before it. It is appropriate under the circumstances of this case for the Court to retain jurisdiction and deny Plaintiffs’ motion to remand.³

IV. Procedure Following Removal

13. The Court has previously enforced the SLUSA provision requiring dismissal of a “covered class action based upon the statutory or common law of any state ... [brought] by any private party alleging ... (A) a misrepresentation or omission of a material fact in connection with the purchase or sale of a covered security; or (B) that the defendant used or employed any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance in connection with the purchase or sale of a covered security.” 15 U.S.C. § 78bb(f)(1)(A) & (B). The claims raised by the *Ahlich* Plaintiffs clearly fall within this definition. As this Court has previously held “dismissal with prejudice of claims within [the] ambit [of SLUSA] is in keeping with the language of 15 U.S.C. § 78bb(f).” Memorandum & Order, entered on Feb. 6, 2002 (Dkt. No. 279), at 21-22.

14. To the extent this Court determines that any of the claims raised by the *Ahlich* Plaintiffs fall outside of this group, the Court has recognized that it may exercise supplemental jurisdiction over such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367. The analysis used by this Court in

³Furthermore, as a practical matter, even if a particular suit filed by Fleming has technically fewer than 50 named plaintiffs, the artifice of the Fleming approach would eventually be exposed in state court through consolidation under the application of the Texas Rules of Judicial Administration. Kopper understands that other defendants are addressing the potential application of these rules, and joins in that briefing.

connection with the motion to remand filed by plaintiffs William Coy and Candy Mounter is equally applicable to the *Ahlich* lawsuit. This Court held that


[a]ll related Enron cases currently consolidated before this Court basically allege a fraudulent scheme by Enron, aided by Arthur Andersen, L.L.P., with claims based on the same conduct, arising from the same nucleus of operative fact, resulting in a strong nexus between federal and state claims that supports federal jurisdiction here.

Memorandum & Order, entered Feb. 6, 2002 (Dkt. No. 279), at 23. This Court recognized that a remand of the claims raised by Coy and Mounter could lead to “unwieldy problems regarding coordination of discovery between the federal and state cases.” *Id.* (quoting *In re Lutheran Brotherhood Variable Insurance Products Co. Sales Practices Litigation*, 105 F. Supp. 2d 1036, 1042 (D. Minn. 2000)). The same dangers are present in the *Ahlich* lawsuit.

Conclusion

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Defendant Michael J. Kopper respectfully requests that this Court deny the Fleming Plaintiffs’ motion to remand.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Eric J.R. Nichols
Federal I.D. No. 13066
State Bar No. 14994900
1221 McKinney Street, Suite 4500
Houston, Texas 77010-2010
Telephone: (713) 951-3700
Telecopier: (713) 951-3720
Attorney-in-Charge for Defendant
Michael J. Kopper

OF COUNSEL:


BECK, REDDEN & SECREST
A Registered Limited Liability Partnership

Felicia Harris Kyle
Federal I.D. No. 13838
State Bar No. 24002438
1221 McKinney Street, Suite 4500
Houston, Texas 77010-2010
Telephone: (713) 951-3700
Telecopier: (713) 951-3720

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
MICHAEL J. KOPPER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This pleading was served in compliance with the Rules 5b of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on February 28, 2002, by certified mail, return receipt requested or U.S. Mail to all counsel on the attached Service List.



Eric J.R. Nichols

Service List

Jeffery B. Kaiser
Kaiser & May, L.L.P.
1440 Lyric Centre, 440 Louisiana Street
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 227-3050 FAX (713) 227-0488

Robert Fritz
Fritz Law Firm
330 T.C. Jester Blvd.
Houston, Texas 77007
(713) 869-2000 FAX (713) 869-3850

James D. Baskin, III
The Baskin Law Firm
919 Congress Avenue, Suite 1000
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 381-6300 FAX (512) 322-9280

William B. Federman
Federman & Sherwood
120 N. Robinson, Suite 2720
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
(405) 235-1560 FAX (405) 239-2112

John G. Emerson
The Emerson Firm
2600 S. Gessner, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77063
(832) 723-8850 FAX (713) 789-0033

Steve W. Berman
Hagens Berman LLP
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 623-7292 FAX (206) 623-0594

Ronald G. Woods
5300 Memorial, Suite 1000
Houston, Texas 77007
(713) 862-9600 FAX (713) 864-8738

Charles F. Richards, Jr.
Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.
One Rodney Square, P.O. Box 551
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 658-6541 FAX (302) 658-6548

Robin C. Gibbs
Gibbs & Bruns, LLP
1100 Louisiana Street, Suite 5300
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 650-8805 FAX (713) 750-0903

Stephen D. Susman
Susman Godfrey LLP
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100
Houston, TX 77002-5096
(713) 651-9366 FAX (713) 654-6666

Jack C. Nickens
Paul D. Flack
Nickens, Lawless & Flack, LLP
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5360
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 571-9191 FAX (713) 571-9652

John J. McKetta, III
Graves Dougherty Hearon & Moody
515 Congress Avenue, Suite 2300
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 480-5600 FAX (512) 478-1976

J. Clifford Gunter, III
Bracewell & Patterson LLP
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2900
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 223-2900 FAX (713) 221-1212

H. Bruce Golden
Golden & Owens LLP
1221 McKinney Street, Suite 3600
Houston, Texas 77010-2010
(713) 223-2600 FAX (713) 223-5002

Russell Hardin, Jr.
Rusty Hardin & Associates
1201 Louisiana Street, Suite 3300
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 652-9000 FAX (713) 652-9800

Tom Alan Cunningham
Richard J. Zook
Cunningham Darlow et al
600 Travis Street, Suite 1700
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 659-5522 FAX (713) 659-4466

Martin D. Chitwood
Chitwood & Harley
2900 Promenade II
1230 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
(404) 873-3900 FAX (404) 876-4476

Jack Edward McGehee
McGehee & Pianelli, LLP
1225 North Loop West, Suite 810
Houston, Texas 77008
(713) 864-4000 FAX (713) 868-9393

Thomas E. Bilek
Hoeffner & Bilek LLP
400 Louisiana Street, Suite 720
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 227-7720 FAX (713) 227-9404

Theodore C. Anderson
Kilgore & Kilgore, PLLC
3131 McKinney Avenue, Suite 700-LB 103
Dallas, Texas 75204
(214) 969-9099 FAX (214) 953-0133

Thomas W. Sankey
Sankey & Luck LLP
600 Travis Street, Suite 6200
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 224-1007 FAX (713) 223-7737

Joseph A. McDermott, III
Attorney at Law
3100 Richmond Avenue, Suite 403
Houston, Texas 77098
(713) 527-9190 FAX (713) 527-9633

Blake Tartt
Beirne, Maynard & Parsons LLP
1300 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 2500
Houston, Texas 77056
(713) 623-0887 FAX (713) 960-1527

G. Sean Jez
Fleming & Associates LLP
1330 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 3030
Houston, Texas 77056-3019
(713) 621-7944 FAX (713) 621-9638

Stephen D. Oestreich
Slotnick, Shapiro & Crocker, LLP
100 Park Avenue, 35th Floor
New York, New York 10017
(212) 687-5000 FAX (212) 687-3080

Rose Ann Reeser, Deputy Chief, Consumer
Protection Division
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
(512) 463-2018 FAX (512) 477-4544

Michael D. Sydow
Ronald J. Kormanik
Sydow, Kormanik & Eckerson
1111 Bagby Street, Suite 4700
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 225-7285 FAX (713) 654-8186

Joseph A. Grundfest
The William A. Franke Professor of Law and
Business
Stanford Law School
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305-8610
(650) 723-0981 FAX (650) 723-8229

Ernest W. Wotring
Connelly Baker Wotring & Jackson LLP
700 Louisiana Street, Suite 1850
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 980-1700 FAX (713) 980-1701

Roger B. Greenberg
Schwartz Junell Campbell & Oathout LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 2000
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 752-0017 FAX (713) 752-0327

Charles R. Parker
Hill, Parker & Roberson LLP
5300 Memorial, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77007-8292
(713) 868-5581 FAX (713) 868-1275

R. Paul Yetter
Yetter & Warden LLP
600 Travis Street, Suite 3800
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 238-2000 FAX (713) 238-2002

Richard Bruce Drubel, Jr.
Boies Schiller et al
26 South Main Street
Hanover, N. H. 03755
(603) 643-9090 FAX (603) 643-9010

Craig Smyser
Smyser, Kaplan & Veselka, L.L.P.
700 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 221-2300 FAX (713) 221-2320

James E. Coleman, Jr.
Carrington, Coleman, Sloman & Blumenthal
200 Crescent Court, Suite 1500
Dallas, TX 75201
(214) 855-3000 FAX (214) 855-1333

Charles G. King
King & Pennington LLP
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 3100
Houston, Texas 77002-2734
(713) 225-8400 FAX (713) 225-8488

Zachary W.L. Wright
Tonkon Torp, LLP
1600 Pioneer Tower
888 Southwest Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 802-2041 FAX (503) 972-3741

Robin L. Harrison
Justin M. Campbell, III
Campbell Harrison & Dagley LLP
4000 Two Houston Center
909 Fannin Street
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 752-2332 FAX (713) 752-2330

Richard E. Norman
Crowley Douglas & Norman LLP
1301 McKinney Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 651-1771 FAX (713) 651-1775

Lee Squitieri
Squitieri & Fearon, LLP
521 Fifth Avenue, 26th Floor
New York, New York 10175
(646) 487-3049 FAX (646) 487-3095

Robert M. Stern
Elizabeth Baird
O'MELVENY & MYERS, L.L.P.
555 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 500 West
Washington, D.C. 20004-1109
(202) 383-5328 FAX (202) 383-5414

Daniel Gartner
Gartner Law Firm, P.C.
Three Riverway, 18th Floor
Houston, TX 77056
(713) 621-7340 FAX (713) 659-5302

W. Kelly Puls
Puls, Taylor & Woodson, LLP
2600 Airport Freeway
Fort Worth, TX 76111
(817) 338-1717
FAX (817) 338-1416

Steven E. Cauley
Cauley, Geller, Bowman & Coates, LLP
P.O. Box 25438
Little Rock, Arkansas 72221-5438
(501) 312-8500 FAX (501) 512-8505

Damon Young
Lance Lee
Young Pickett & Lee
4122 Texas Boulevard
Texarkana, Texas 75503
(870) 774-3206 FAX (903) 792-5098

Billy Shepherd
Cruse, Scott, Henderson & Allen, LLP
600 Travis Street, Suite 3900
Houston, Texas 77002-2910
(713) 650-6600 FAX (713) 650-1720

Randy J. McClanahan
McClanahan & Clearman, LLP
700 Louisiana Street, Suite 4100
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 223-2005 FAX (713) 223-3664

Linda L. Addison
Fulbright & Jaworski, LLP
1301 McKinney Street
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 651-5151 FAX (713) 651-5246

Mark K. Glasser
King & Spalding
1100 Louisiana Street, Suite 4000
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 751-3200 FAX (713) 751-3290

Deborah R. Gross
Law Offices of Bernard M. Gross
1515 Locust Street, Second Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102
(215) 561-3600 FAX (215) 561-3000

William S. Lerach
Helen J. Hodges
Milberg, Weiss, Bershad, Hynes & Lerach
401 B Street, Suite 1700
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 231-1058 FAX (619) 231-7423

Lynn Lincoln Sarko
Keller Rohrback, LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 623-1900 FAX (206) 623-3384