

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Harvey L. Leiderman 55838 Reed Smith LLP 101 Second Street, Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94105 TELEPHONE NO.: 415-543-8700 FAX NO. (Optional): 415-391-8269 E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): hleiderman@reedsmith.com ATTORNEY FDR (Name): Real Party in Interest, Board of Administration	FOR COURT USE ONLY
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Santa Clara STREET ADDRESS: 191 N. First Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Jose, CA 95113 BRANCH NAME:	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: SAN JOSE RETIRED EMPLOYEES ASSOC., et al.	CASE NUMBER: 1-12-cv-233660
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: CITY OF SAN JOSE, et al.	JUDICIAL OFFICER:
NOTICE OF RELATED CASE	DEPT: 2

Identify, in chronological order according to date of filing, all cases related to the case referenced above.

1.
 - a. Title: San Jose Police Officers' Assoc. v. City of San Jose, et al.
 - b. Case number: 1-12-cv-225926
 - c. Court: same as above
 other state or federal court (name and address):
 - d. Department: 2
 - e. Case type: limited civil unlimited civil probate family law other (specify):
 - f. Filing date: June 6, 2012
 - g. Has this case been designated or determined as "complex?" Yes No
 - h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above (check all that apply):
 - involves the same parties and is based on the same or similar claims.
 - arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
 - involves claims against, title to, possession of, or damages to the same property.
 - is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.
 - Additional explanation is attached in attachment 1h
 - i. Status of case:
 - pending
 - dismissed with without prejudice
 - disposed of by judgment

2.
 - a. Title: Saplen, et al. v. City of San Jose, et al.
 - b. Case number: 1-12-cv-225928
 - c. Court: same as above
 other state or federal court (name and address):
 - d. Department: 2

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER: 1-12-cv-23660
--	-------------------------------

2. (continued)

- e. Case type: limited civil unlimited civil probate family law other (specify):
- f. Filing date: June 6, 2012
- g. Has this case been designated or determined as "complex?" Yes No
- h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above (check all that apply):
 - Involves the same parties and is based on the same or similar claims.
 - arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
 - involves claims against, title to, possession of, or damages to the same property.
 - is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.
 - Additional explanation is attached in attachment 2h
- i. Status of case:
 - pending
 - dismissed with without prejudice
 - disposed of by judgment

3. a. Title: Harris, et al. v. City of San Jose, et al.

b. Case number: 1-12-cv-226570

- c. Court: same as above
- other state or federal court (name and address):

d. Department: 2

e. Case type: limited civil unlimited civil probate family law other (specify):

f. Filing date: June 15, 2012

g. Has this case been designated or determined as "complex?" Yes No


- h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above (check all that apply):
 - involves the same parties and is based on the same or similar claims.
 - arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
 - involves claims against, title to, possession of, or damages to the same property.
 - is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.
 - Additional explanation is attached in attachment 3h

- i. Status of case:
 - pending
 - dismissed with without prejudice
 - disposed of by judgment

4. Additional related cases are described in Attachment 4. Number of pages attached: 1

Date: Dec. 18, 2012

Harvey L. Leiderman
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY)


(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY)

Notice of Related Case, Attachment 4

San Jose Police Retired Employees Assoc. v. City of San Jose, et al.

Case No. 1-12-cv-233660

Additional related cases:

5.
 - a. Title: *Mukhar, et al. v. City of San Jose, et al.*
 - b. Case Number: 1-12-cv-226574
 - c. Court: Same as above
 - d. Dept. 2
 - e. Case type: unlimited civil
 - f. Filing date: June 15, 2012
 - g. Has this case been determined as complex? No
 - h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above:
 - (x) Arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
 - (x) Is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges

6.
 - a. Title: *AFSCME v. City of San Jose, et al.*
 - b. Case Number: 1-12-cv-227864
 - c. Court: Same as above
 - d. Dept. 2
 - e. Case type: unlimited civil
 - f. Filing date: July 5, 2012
 - g. Has this case been determined as complex? No
 - h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above:
 - (x) Arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
 - (x) Is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges

7.
 - a. Title: *Jaeger v. City of San Jose, et al.*
 - b. Case Number: 1-12-cv-234048
 - c. Court: Same as above
 - d. Dept. 20
 - e. Case type: unlimited civil
 - f. Filing date: Oct. 15, 2012
 - g. Has this case been determined as complex? No
 - h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above:
 - (x) Arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
 - (x) Is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

PROOF OF SERVICE

(*San Jose Retired Employees Assoc. v. City of San Jose, et al.*
Santa Clara Superior Court Case No. 1-12-cv-233660)

9 I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to
10 the within action. My business address is REED SMITH LLP, 101 Second Street, Suite 1800, San
11 Francisco, CA 94105-3659. On December 18, 2012, I served the following document(s) by the
12 method indicated below:

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

NOTICE OF RELATED CASE

13 by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully
14 prepaid, in the United States mail at San Francisco, California addressed as set forth below.
15 I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing of correspondence
16 for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that
17 same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware
18 that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date
19 or postage meter date is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing in this
20 Declaration.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Attorneys for Defendant

City of San Jose

Arthur A. Hartinger
Meyers, Nave, Riback, Silver & Wilson
555 - 12th St., Suite 1500
Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: (510) 808-2000
Facsimile: (510) 444-1108

Attorneys for Plaintiff

San Jose Police Officers Association

(Case No. 112cv225926)
Gregg McLean Adam
Jonathan Yank
Carroll, Burdick & McDonough LLP
44 Montgomery St., Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94101
Telephone: (415) 989-5900
Facsimile: (415) 989-0932

1 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Robert Saplen,
2 Marty Kathleen McCarthy, Thanh Ho,
3 Randy Sekany and Ken Heredia
(Case No. 112cv224928)

4 AND

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Teresa Harris, Jon
6 Reger and Moses Serrano
(Case No. 112cv226570)

7 AND

8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs John Mukhar, Dale
9 Dapp, James Atkins, William Buffington
10 and Kirk Pennington
(Case No. 112cv226574)

11 John A. McBride
12 Christopher E. Platten
13 Wylie, McBride, Platten & Renner
14 2125 Canoas Garden Ave., Suite 120
15 San Jose, CA 95125
16 Telephone: (408) 979-2920
17 Facsimile: (408) 979-2934

18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Petitioners
19 San Jose Retired Employees Association,
20 Howard E. Fleming, Donald S. Macrae,
21 Frances J. Olson, Gary J. Richert and
22 Rosalinda Navarro
(Case No. 112cv233660)

23 Stephen H. Silver
24 Richard A. Levine
25 Jacob A. Kalinski
26 Silver, Hadden, Silver, Wexler & Levine
27 1428 Second St., Suite 200
28 P.O. Box 2161
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2161
Telephone: (310) 393-1486
Facsimile: (310) 395-5801

Attorneys for Plaintiff American Federation
of State, County, and Municipal Employees
Local 101
(Case No. 112cv227864)

Teague Pryde Paterson
Vishtasp Mehr Soroushian
Beeson, Tayer and Bodine
483 Ninth St., Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94607-4051
Telephone: (510) 625-9700
Facsimile: (510) 625-8275

Attorney for Plaintiff
George Nathan Jaeger, In Propria Persona
(Case No. 112cv234048)

George Nathan Jaeger
15118 San Jose Street
Mission Hills, CA 91345
Telephone: (818) 361-4145

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on December 18, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

Ann H. Devor