

1992

Jim Pratt Hansen; et al. v. George Sutton; et al. : Petition for Rehearing

Utah Court of Appeals

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Original Brief Submitted to the Utah Court of Appeals; digitized by the Howard W. Hunter Law Library, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

Scott B. Mitchell; Spafford & Spafford; Attorneys for Appellants.

Jan Graham; Attorney General; Bryce H. Pettet; Assistant Attorney General; Attorneys for Appellees.

Recommended Citation

Legal Brief, *Hansen v. Sutton*, No. 920686 (Utah Court of Appeals, 1992).
https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1/4660

This Legal Brief is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Court of Appeals Briefs by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. Policies regarding these Utah briefs are available at http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah_court_briefs/policies.html. Please contact the Repository Manager at hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu with questions or feedback.

UTAH
DOCUMENT
KFU
50

.A10

DOCKET NO. 920686 CA
Scott B. Mitchell (Of Counsel) (5111)

SPAFFORD & SPAFFORD
A Professional Corporation
425 East First South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 363-1234

Attorney for Plaintiffs/Appellants

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooo0ooo-----	
JIM PRATT HANSEN; et al.,	PETITION FOR REHEARING
Plaintiffs/Appellants,	
vs.	Case No. 920686-CA
GEORGE SUTTON; et al.,	Priority No. 16
Defendant.	
-----ooo0ooo-----	

APPEAL FROM THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT,
IN AND FOR SALT LAKE COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH
JUDGE TIMOTHY R. HANSEN

Jan Graham
State Attorney General
Bryce H. Pettey
Assistant Attorney General
36 South State Street, Suite 1100
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Scott B. Mitchell
(Of Counsel)
SPAFFORD & SPAFFORD
A Professional Corporation
425 East 100 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

FILED
Utah Court of Appeals

JUL 29 1993


Mary T. Noonan
Clerk of the Court

Scott B. Mitchell (Of Counsel)(5111)
SPAFFORD & SPAFFORD
A Professional Corporation
425 East 100 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 363-1234

Attorney for Plaintiffs/Appellants

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

* * * *

JIM PRATT HANSEN; et al.,

Plaintiffs/Appellants

vs.

GEORGE SUTTON; et al.,

Defendants.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Case No. 920686-CA

* * * *

Pursuant to Rule 35 of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure, Appellants respectfully petition the Court for a rehearing.

**I. THE STATE LAW CLAIMS ALLEGED IN "HARRIS" WERE DISMISSED
WITHOUT PREJUDICE ON JURISDICTIONAL GROUNDS.**

In its Opinion filed July 20, 1993, the Court affirmed the lower court's dismissal of Count One of the Complaint on the basis that "the final judgment, entered [in Harris on] June 6, 1989, specifically states that 'all claims in the Amended Complaint, together with the corresponding claims of the Second Amended Complaint are dismissed with prejudice.'" (July 20, 1993, Opinion at page 4).

The Court is, of course, correct that the June 6, 1989,

order entered in Harris¹ purported to dismiss all of Plaintiffs' causes of action with prejudice. However, Plaintiffs subsequently filed a motion under Rule 60(b), F.R.C.P., requesting that the Harris court amend its June 6, 1989, order to reflect its original intention to dismiss Plaintiffs' state law claims without prejudice on jurisdictional grounds. On July 20, 1990, Judge Sam issued his "Order Granting Relief Under Rule 60(b)(1)" in which he ruled as follows:

This court has already indicated in its Order dated February 27, 1990,² that it did not intend to dismiss [Plaintiffs' state law claims] with prejudice but that dismissal was only for lack of jurisdiction. Accordingly, the relief requested by plaintiffs is hereby granted.

(See Addendums To Appellants' Opening Brief, Exhibit F to Addendum 8, a copy of which is attached hereto for the Court's convenience).

Thus, Plaintiffs' state law claims were specifically dismissed without prejudice by the Harris court. Therefore, in accordance with Utah Code Ann. section 78-12-40, Plaintiffs were entitled to refile the case at bar within one year of the June 6, 1989, order of dismissal (as amended by the July 20, 1993, Order

¹It is not a coincidence that the form of that order was prepared by Defendants' counsel after the withdrawal of Plaintiffs' former counsel.

²In accordance with federal procedural law, because the Harris case was before the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals on review at that time, Plaintiffs were first required to obtain Judge Sam's February 27, 1990, order indicating his willingness to grant Rule 60(b) relief in order to then be entitled to seek the Tenth Circuit's order partially remanding the case to the district court for entry of an order granting Rule 60(b) relief.

Granting Relief Under Rule 60(b)(1)) entered in Harris.

II. PLAINTIFFS CAN PROVE A SET OF FACTS WHICH WOULD SUPPORT THEIR CLAIMS AND WHICH WOULD NOT BE TIME-BARRED.

The Court's July 20, 1993, Opinion affirms the lower court's dismissal of Count Two of the Complaint on the ground that

"The defendants breached the [P & A Agreement] when the assets were retained longer than contractually agreed upon...The six-month period agreed upon by the plaintiffs and defendants for returning the assets ended on June 13, 1983, making the breach of the P & A Agreement a predissolution cause of action ... The savings statute does not prevent count II from being time-barred. The Nelson case, which arguably contained the same cause of action as that brought by the corporate plaintiffs in count II, was filed within the two year statutory period. The cause of action brought in Nelson failed on grounds other than the merits on November 10, 1986. However, the failure occurred before the two-year statutory limitation had expired, preventing invocation of the savings statute."

(July 20, 1993, Opinion at page 5).

Thus, the Court's ruling is premised upon its conclusion that defendants' breach of the P & A Agreement occurred at the expiration of the six month period alleged in paragraph XXX of Count Two of the Complaint, which the Court correctly identifies as taking place predissolution. Plaintiffs respectfully submit that the Court has failed to take into consideration the fact that paragraph XXXI of the Complaint alleges that

Alternatively, the P & A Agreement contained an implied promise that Sutton and the DFI would turn over the retained assets to MFT&L and terminate their role in connection therewith at the earliest possible time consistent with Sutton's statutory responsibilities.

(Emphasis added).

The reason for the alternative pleading is that there is a factual issue as to whether the November 5, 1982, letter

(Addendums to Appellants' Opening Brief, Exhibit F attached to Addendum 1) which contains the "six month" language was part of the P & A Agreement. In point of fact, it has always been Defendants' position that it was not. Accordingly, there is a question of fact as to when was "the earliest possible time consistent with Sutton's statutory responsibilities" that he could have relinquished control over the retained assets. Under the alternative construction of the P & A Agreement alleged in paragraph XXXI of the Complaint, it was only then that the defendants were required to "turn over the retained assets to MFT&L and terminate their role in connection therewith ...". It follows that it was only then, as the Court's Opinion recognizes, that "defendants breached the contract when the assets were retained longer than contractually agreed upon." (July 20, 1993, Opinion at page 5).

Following the logic of the Court's Opinion, if the "earliest possible time consistent with Sutton's statutory responsibilities" occurred post-dissolution, then section 78-12-40 would, in fact, be applicable. Therefore, because Count Two of the case at bar alleges the "same transaction or occurrence", see Foil v. Bollinger, 601 P.2d 141, 151 (Utah 1979), as was alleged in Harris, and (as demonstrated above) because Harris was dismissed otherwise than on the merits, Plaintiffs were entitled to refile the instant case within one year of the order of dismissal entered in Harris.

At page 3 of the July 20, 1993, Opinion, the Court

recognizes that

"When reviewing a motion to dismiss based upon Rule 12(b)(6), an appellate court must accept the material allegations of the complaint as true, and the trial court's ruling should be affirmed only if it clearly appears the complainant can prove no set of facts in support of his or her claims."


(Citing Anderson v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc., 841 P.2d 194, 196 (Utah App. 1991)).

Plaintiffs respectfully submit that based upon the alternative allegation of paragraph XXXI of the Complaint, i.e., that "the P & A Agreement contained an implied promise that Sutton and the DFI would turn over the retained assets to MFT&L and terminate their role in connection therewith at the earliest possible time consistent with Sutton's statutory responsibilities, Plaintiffs could indeed "prove a set of facts in support of [their] claims" which would not be time-barred.

CONCLUSION


Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiffs respectfully petition the Court for a rehearing.

DATED this 20th day of July, 1993.




Scott B. Mitchell
Attorney for Appellants

MAILING CERTIFICATE

Undersigned certifies that two copies of the foregoing were served this  day of July, 1993, via first class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Jan Graham
State Attorney General
Bryce H. Pettey
Assistant Attorney General
36 South State Street, Suite 1100
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111



Scott B. Mitchell (Of Counsel)(5111)
SPAFFORD & SPAFFORD
A Professional Corporation
425 East 100 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 363-1234

Attorney for Plaintiffs/Appellants

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

* * * *

JIM PRATT HANSEN; et al.,

Plaintiffs/Appellants

vs.

GEORGE SUTTON; et al.,

Defendants.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*


CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH

Case No. 920686-CA

* * * *

Pursuant to Rule 35 of the Utah Rules of Appellate
Procedure, undersigned certifies that Appellants' Petition For
Rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay.

DATED this 27th day of July, 1993.


Scott B. Mitchell
Attorney for Appellants

JUL 11 1990

BY _____
DEPUTY CLERK

CENTRAL DIVISION


GARY S. HARRIS, et al.,)
Plaintiff(s),)
vs.) ORDER GRANTING RELIEF
UNDER RULE 60(b)(1)
ELAINE B. WEIS, et al.,)
Defendant(s).) Civil No. 87-C-0041-S
)

Plaintiffs, Gary S. Harris, et al., have moved this court for relief from the June 5, 1989 Judgment of Dismissal to the extent that it relates to the ninth claim of the second amended complaint which alleges a state law claim for defamation.

This court has already indicated in its Order dated February 27, 1990, that it did not intend to dismiss that claim with prejudice but that dismissal was only for lack of jurisdiction. Accordingly, the relief requested by plaintiffs is hereby granted.

ccys 7/11/90sm

BY THE COURT:


DAVID SAM
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Sharon Green, Esq.
722 Montgomery St. #25
San Francisco, CA 94111

Roy G. Haslam, Esq.
BIELE, HASLAM, HATCH
50 West Broadway, 4th Floor
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

James R. Holbrook, Esq.
R. Willis Orton, Esq.
Russell Kearn, Esq.
CALLISTER, DUNCAN & NEBEKER
800 Kennecott Bldg.
Salt Lake City, UT 84133

Gary F. Bendinger, Esq.
Scott A. Call, Esq.
GIAUQUE, WILLIAMS, WILCOX & BENDINGER
500 Kearns Bldg.
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Peter W. Billings, Jr., Esq.
Michele Mitchell, Esq.
FABIAN & CLENDENIN
215 South State, 12th Floor
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Jack C. Helgesen, Esq.
HELGESEN & WATERFALL
2650 Washington Blvd. Suite 102
Ogden, UT 84401

R. Stephen Marshall, Esq.
VAN COTT, BAGLEY, CORNWALL & MCCARTHY
P. O. Box 45340
Salt Lake City, UT 84145

Leroy S. Axland, Esq.
Jerald G. Oldroyd, Esq.
SUITTER, AXLAND, ARMSTRONG & HANSON
175 South West Temple
Suite 700
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Geoffrey W. Mangum, Esq.
PRINCE, YEATES & GELDZAHLER
175 East Fourth South #900
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Kent H. Murdock, Esq.
Anthony B. Quinn, Esq.
RAY, QUINNEY & NEBEKER
P. O. Box 45385
Salt Lake City, UT 84145

Carman E. Kapp, Esq.
Gregory J. Sanders, Esq.
175 East Fourth South
City Centre I Suite 330
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Stephen J. Sorenson, Esq.
Bryce Pettey, Esq.
Asst. Atty. General
236 State Capitol
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Ray R. Christensen, Esq.
Jay E. Jensen, Esq.
Elwood P. Powell, Esq.
Denton Hatch, Esq.
CHRISTENSEN, JENSEN & POWELL
175 South West Temple #510
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Gayle F. McKeachnie, Esq.
NIELSEN & SENIOR
363 East Main St.
Vernal, UT 84078

J. Michael Wilkins, Esq.
LARSEN & WILKINS
Ten East South Temple #500
Salt Lake City, UT 84133

Dennis V. Haslam, Esq.
WINDER & HASLAM
175 West 200 South
Suite 4004
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Henry S. Nygaard, Esq.
BEASLIN, NYGAARD, COKE & VINCENT
333 North 300 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Richard A. Rappaport, Esq.
CORNE, RAPPAPORT & SEGAL
66 Exchange Place
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Allen M. Swan, Esq.
KIRSTON, MCCORMIE & BUSHNELL
330 South 300 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84111