United States Courts
Southern District of Texas
FILED

MAY 0 8 2002 LF

Michael N. Milby, Clerk

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

MARK NEWBY, ET AL.,	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. H-01-3624
	§	AND CONSOLIDATED CASES
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	CLASS ACTION
	§	
ENRON CORPORATION, ET AL.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

REBECCA MARK-JUSBASCHE'S
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF HER MOTION TO DISMISS

GRAVES, DOUGHERTY, HEARON & MOODY, P.C.
John J. McKetta, III
State Bar No. 13711500
Federal ID No. 29895
Attorney in Charge
Helen Currie Foster
State Bar No. 24008379
Federal ID No. 29894
Eric G. Behrens
State Bar No. 02070500
515 Congress Avenue, Suite 2300
P.O. Box 98
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 480-5600
(512) 478-1976 Telecopy

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT REBECCA MARK-JUSBASCHE

MAY 8, 2002

598

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page(s)

I. **AS TO MARK-JUSBASCHE, THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO PLEAD WITH PARTICULARITY ANY FACTS WHICH COULD GIVE RISE TO A "STRONG INFERENCE" OF SCIENTER** 3

A. PLAINTIFFS' RELIANCE ON GROUP PLEADING HAS ALREADY BEEN REJECTED 3

B. PLAINTIFFS' ALLEGATIONS THAT ENRON INTERNATIONAL WAS "UNDER MARK-JUSBASCHE" WHEN IT CAPITALIZED EXPENSES DOES NOT STATE A CLAIM FOR FRAUD (OR EVEN NEGLIGENCE) 10

C. PLAINTIFFS' ALLEGATIONS AGAINST MARK-JUSBASCHE AS AN EXECUTIVE OF AZURIX FAIL UNDER THE PSLRA 12

1. THE ALLEGATIONS OF PARAGRAPH 121(H) ARE INSUFFICIENT 12

2. PLAINTIFFS' ALLEGATIONS THAT AZURIX WAS UNSUCCESSFUL DO NOT ALLEGE ANY WRONGDOING BY MARK-JUSBASCHE 15

3. THE ONLY TWO STATEMENTS ATTRIBUTED TO MARK-JUSBASCHE IN THE COMPLAINT ARE NEVER ALLEGED TO BE FALSE, NO SCIENTER IS ALLEGED, AND THE STATEMENTS ARE NOT ACTIONABLE AS A MATTER OF LAW 16

4. THE ALLEGATIONS OF PARAGRAPH 83(GG) STATE NO CLAIM. 19

D. THE "SIGNATURE" ALLEGATIONS OF ¶¶164 AND 221 ARE INSUFFICIENT 20

II. **PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO STATE ANY CLAIM AGAINST MARK-JUSBASCHE UNDER SECTION 20A OF THE 1934 SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT 21**

A. STOCK SALES BY A NON-SPEAKER SUCH AS MARK-JUSBASCHE DO NOT GIVE RISE TO THE REQUIRED "STRONG INFERENCE OF SCIENTER." 24

B. IN ANY EVENT, THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO ALLEGE ANY FACTS CONCERNING MARK-JUSBASCHE'S TRADES THAT GIVE RISE TO A "STRONG INFERENCE" OF SCIENTER 25

1. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO ALLEGE FACTS SHOWING THAT HER SALES WERE "OUT OF LINE" WITH HER OWN PRIOR TRADING HISTORY 25

2. THE "PREMATURE EXERCISE OF OPTION" THEORY FAILS TO STATE ANY CLAIM AS TO MARK-JUSBASCHE. THE ONLY TRADE WHICH THE

HAKALA STUDY TERMS "PREMATURE" IS CONSISTENT WITH PRIOR TRADES 27

C. PLAINTIFFS' FAILURE TO PLEAD WITH REQUIRED PARTICULARITY MANDATES DISMISSAL OF THE "INSIDER TRADING" CLAIM AS TO MARK-JUSBASCHE 32

D. THE SALES OF WHICH PLAINTIFFS COMPLAIN CAN RAISE NO INFERENCE OF SCIENTER. 33

E. THE HAKALA DECLARATION CONSTITUTES NON-FACTUAL IMPERMISSIBLE GROUP PLEADING AND VIOLATES THE PSLRA AND RULE 9(B)34 . . . . . .

1. THE HAKALA DECLARATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE "FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS" WHICH CAN BE CONSIDERED AT THIS STAGE 34

2. THE DECLARATION'S CONCLUSORY STATISTICS ARE IMPERMISSIBLE GROUP PLEADING, MANDATING DISMISSAL 36

a. EXHIBIT G IS GROUP PLEADING WHICH SUPPORTS NO INFERENCE AS TO MARK-JUSBASCHE 36

b. THE "PROBABILITY" TABLE CONSTITUTES GROUP PLEADING AND IMPERMISSIBLY ASSUMES CAUSATION FROM MERE CORRELATION38 . . . . . .

c. THE COMPLAINT'S PARAPHRASES OF THE HAKALA DECLARATION SHOULD BE DISMISSED AS IMPERMISSIBLE GROUP PLEADING AS WELL 39

III. SECTION 11 CLAIMS AGAINST MARK-JUSBASCHE MUST BE DISMISSED 41

A. AS TO MARK-JUSBASCHE, THE SECTION 11 CLAIMS MUST BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PLEAD WITH PARTICULARITY 41

B. PLAINTIFFS' LONE "SUBCLASS REPRESENTATIVE" CANNOT SUPPORT ANY CLAIM UNDER THE PSLRA AS TO THE 7% NOTES. HE BOUGHT AFTER THE OCTOBER 16, 2001 EARNINGS ANNOUNCEMENT, AND BOUGHT AGAIN AFTER THE NOVEMBER 8, 2001 EARNINGS RESTATEMENT 46

C. THE COMPLAINT IMPROPERLY ASSUMES MATERIALITY OF INFORMATION BUT FAILS TO ALLEGE FACTS DEMONSTRATING ANY MATERIAL OMISSION OR MISREPRESENTATION AS TO THE 7% NOTES 51

1. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO ALLEGE MATERIALITY OF ANY ALLEGED OMISSION OR MISREPRESENTATION AS TO THE 7% NOTES 53

2. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO PLEAD FACTS SHOWING MISREPRESENTATION OR OMISSION OF FACTS KNOWN AT THE TIME 54

D. THERE ARE NO ALLEGATIONS OF NEGLIGENCE AGAINST MARK-JUSBASCHE 54

IV. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO ALLEGE "CONTROLLING PERSON" LIABILITY AGAINST MARK-JUSBASCHE UNDER EITHER § 20(A) OF THE 1934 ACT, OR § 15 OF THE 1933 ACT 57

A. PLAINTIFFS' FAILURE TO ALLEGE A PREDICATE CLAIM FOR SECURITIES FRAUD REQUIRES DISMISSAL OF THE § 20(A) CLAIM 57

B. PLAINTIFFS' FAILURE TO STATE A FRAUD CLAIM, AND FAILURE TO ALLEGE FACTS SHOWING CONTROL, REQUIRE DISMISSAL OF THE § 15 CLAIM 60

CONCLUSION 62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Abbott v. Equity Group, Inc.,
2F.3d 613 (5th Cir. 1993), *cert denied*, 510 U.S. 1177 (1994) 58, 60,61

Abrams v. Prudential Sec. Lit.,
2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18541 (N.D. Ill. 2000) 15

AUSA Life Ins. Co. v. Ernst & Young,
119 F.Supp.2d 394 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) 50

Beanal v. Freeport-McMoran, Inc.,
197 F.3d 161 (5th Cir. 1999) 62

Branca v. Paymentech, Inc.,
2000 WL 145083 (N.D.Tex. Feb. 8, 2000) 57

Coates v. Heartland Wireless Comms., Inc.,
26 F.Supp.2d 910 (N.D. Tex. 1998) 6, 7, 15

Coates v. Heartland Wireless Communications,
100 F.Supp.2d 417 (N.D. Tex. 2000) 57

Dartley v. Ergobilt Inc.,
2001 WL 313964 (N.D.Tex. March 29, 2001) 58

Demarco v. Depotech Corp.,
149 F. Supp. 2d 12122 (S.D. Ca. 2001),
aff'd, 2002 WL 461217 (9th Cir. Feb. 21, 2002) 34, 35

Dennis v. General Imaging, Inc.,
918 F.2d 496 (5th Cir. 1990) 61

DiLeo v. Ernst & Young,
901 F.2d 624 (7th Cir. 1990) 10

Dirks v. SEC,
463 U.S. 646, 103 S.Ct. 3255, 77 L.Ed.2d 911 (1983) 22

Ellison v. American Image Motor Co.,
36 F.Supp.2d 628 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) 60

Grossman v. Novell, Inc.,
120 F.3d 1112 (10th Cir. 1997) 18

Head v. NetManage, Inc., 1998 WL 917794, *5 (N.D.Cal. Dec. 30, 1998) 24

In re Advanta Sec. Lit.,
180 F.3d 525 (3d Cir. 1999) 8,22

In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc. Sec. Lit.,
93 F.Supp.2d 424 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) 43, 60

In re Azurix Corp. Sec. Lit.,
2002 WL 562819 (S.D.Tex. March 21, 2002) 15, 16, 18, 19, 46-48, 60

In re Baker Hughes Sec. Lit.,
136 F.Supp.2d 630 (S.D.Tex. 2001) 22, 23

In re Cendant Corp. Sec. Lit.,
76 F.Supp.2d 539 (D.N.J. 1999) 6, 19, 21

In re Credit Acceptance Corp. Sec. Lit.,
50 F.Supp.2d 662 (E.D. Mich. 1999) 34

In re DNAP Sec. Lit.,
2000 WL 1358619 (N.D.Cal. 2000) 52, 55

In re K-Tel International, Inc. Sec. Lit.,
107 F. Supp. 2d 994 (D. Minn. 2000) 11

In re Livened Sec. Lit.,
148 F.Supp.2d 331 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 1, 48

In re Number Visual Technology Corp. Sec. Lit.,
51 F.Supp.2d 1 (D. Mass. 1999) 56

In re Pacific Gateway Exchange, Inc. Sec. Lit.,
169 F.Supp.2d 1160 (N.D. Cal. 2001) 11

In re Paracelsus Corp. Sec. Lit.,
6 F.Supp.2d 626 (S.D.Tex. 1998) 58, 61

In re Peoplesoft, Inc., Sec. Lit.,
2000 WL 1737936, *5 (N.D. Cal., May 15, 2000) 62

In re Scholastic Corp. Sec. Lit.,
2000 WL 91939 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 27, 2000) 24

In re Sec. Lit. BMC Software, Inc.,
183 F.Supp.2d 860 (S.D.Tex. 2001) . . . . . *Passim*

In re Silicon Graphics, Inc., Sec. Lit.,
183 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 1999) 24, 27

In re Smith-Gardner Sec. Lit.,
2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5268 (S.D. Fla. 2002) 21

In re Stac Electronics Sec. Lit.,
89 F.3d 1399 (9th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1105 (1997) 41, 43

In re Storage Technology Corp. Sec. Lit.,
630 F.Supp. 1072 51

In re Software Toolworks Inc. Sec. Lit.,
50 F.3d 615 (9th Cir. 1994) 55

In re Stratosphere Corp. Sec. Lit.,
1 F.Supp.2d 1096 (D. Nev. 1998) 43

In re Ultrafem Inc. Sec. Lit.,
91 F.Supp.2d 678 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) 43, 56

In re Vantive Corp. Sec. Lit.,
283 F.3d 1079 (9th Cir. 2001) 24, 26-27, 33, 62

In re VeriFone Sec. Lit.,
11 F.3d 865 (9th Cir. 1993) 22

Kowal v. MCI Com. Corp.,
16 F.3d 1271 (D.C. Cir. 1994) 13

Krim v. BancTexas Group, Inc.,
989 F.2d 1435 (5th Cir. 1993) 54

Kurtzman v. Compaq Computer Corp.,
Cause No. H-99-779, slip op. (Dec. 12, 2000) . . . . . *Passim*

Lemmer v. Nu-Kote Holding, Inc.,
2001 WL 1112577, *9 (N.D.Tex. 2001) 8, 57, 62

Lone Star Ladies Inv. Club v. Schlotzky's Inc.,
238 F.3d 363 (5th Cir. 2001) 43

Lovelace v. Software Spectrum, Inc.,
78 F.3d 1015 (5th Cir. 1996) 11, 13, 35

Melder v. Morris,
27 F.3d 1079 (5th Cir. 1994) . . . . . *Passim*

Metz v. United Counties Bancorp,
61 F.Supp.2d 364 (D.N.J. 1999) 50

Munoz v. Orr,
200 F.3d 291 (5th Cir. 2000) 39

Nathenson v. Zonagen,
267 F.3d 400 (5th Cir. 2001) 22

Paul F. Newton & Co. v. Texas Commerce Bank,
630 F.2d 1111 (5th Cir. 1980) 57

Picard Chem. Inc. Profit Sharing Plan v. Perrigo Co.,
940 F.Supp. 1101 (W.D. Mich. 1996) 62

Ratner v. Sioux Natural Gas Corp.,
770 F.2d 512 (5th Cir. 1985) 51

Ronconi v. Larkin,
253 F.3d 423 (9th Cir. 2001) 26, 33

Santa Fe Industries, Inc., v. Green,
430 U.S. 462 (1977) 52

Sears v. Likens,
912 F.2d 889 (7th Cir. 1990) 42

Shapiro v. UJB Financial Corp.,
964 F.2d 272 (3rd Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, 113 S.Ct. 365 (1992) 42

Shushany v. Allwaste, Inc.,
992 F.2d 517 (5th Cir. 1993) 41

Smolen v. Deloitte, Haskins & Sells,
921 F.2d 959 (9th Cir. 1990) 51

Taam Associates Inc. v. Housecall Medical Resources, Inc.,
1998 WL 1745361, *12 (N.D.Ga. 1998) 42, 60

Tagatz v. Marquette Univ.,
861 F.2d 1040 (7th Cir. 1988) 39

Thornton v. Micrografx, Inc.,
878 F.Supp.931 (N.D. Tex. 1995) 22, 24

Tuchman v. DSC Com. Corp.,
14 F.3d 1061 (5th Cir. 1994) 13

Wenger v. Lumisys, Inc.,
2 F.Supp.2d 1231 (N.D. Cal. 1998) 20

RULES

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 8 . . . . . *Passim*

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 9(b) . . . . . *Passim*

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 10(c) 35

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 12(b)(6) 62

Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 10b-5, 17 CFR 240.10b-5 . . . . . *Passim*

STATUTES

Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. §§ 772-1, et seq., and 15 U.S.C. §78u-4, et seq. . . . . *Passim*

Securities Act of 1933 § 11, 15 U.S.C. § 77k . . . . . *Passim*

Securities Act of 1933 § 15, 15 U.S.C. § 77*o* . . . . . *Passim*

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 § 10(b), 15 U.S.C. § 78j . . . . . *Passim*

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 § 20(a), 15 U.S.C. § 78t . . . . . *Passim*

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 § 20A, 15 U.S.C. § 78t-1 . . . . . *Passim*

The Exhibit(s) May

Be Viewed in the

Office of the Clerk