26

27

28

1

2

3

4

FILED SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM

2021 JUL -6 PM 1:13

CLERK OF COURT

By:

KEOGH LAW OFFICE 301 Frank H. Cushing Way, Apt. 801

Tamuning, Guam 96913 Phone: (671) 472-6895 Mobile: (671) 777-6895

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM

DAVID LUBOFSKY and CRISTINE SIMBAHAN,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GUAM MEMORIAL HOSPITAL AUTHORITY, DR. JOHN GARRIDO and DR. DENNIS SARMIENTO,

Defendants.

CIVIL CASE NO. CV1024-19

JOINT MOTION FOR ORDER OF GOOD FAITH SETTLEMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs and defendants, by and through their respective undersigned counsel, request a determination from the court that the parties' settlement is made and entered in good faith.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Plaintiffs filed this lawsuit against defendants pursuant to the requirements of the Government Claims Act. Plaintiffs also have a pending lawsuit against defendants Shishin Miyagi, Ethan Snider, Seventh Day Adventist Clinic, and John Doe Insurance Company in the Superior Court of Guam, Civil Case No. CV0558-19 also pertaining to the death of plaintiffs' son, Asher Dean Lubofsky.

No cross-claim has been filed by defendants in either civil action. This presents an atypical joint tortfeasor situation because the defendants herein are exclusively governed by 5 G.C.A. \$6101, et. seq. otherwise known as the Government Claims Act and the defendants in Civil Case No. CV0558-18 are governed by 10 G.C.A. \$10100, et. seq. otherwise known as the Medical Malpractice Mandatory Arbitration Act. The parties hereto are nevertheless seeking court approval of this settlement to assure no unforeseen consequences will arise as a result of the within settlement.

III. THE SETTLEMENT

The parties herein have agreed to settle plaintiffs' claims against defendants for payment of the sum of \$200,000.00. The amount of the settlement being made between plaintiffs and defendants is the maximum amount allowable under Guam law for a wrongful death claim against defendants under the Government Claims Act. See, 5 GCA \$6301(b) as amended by P.L. 35-111. This settlement is made in good faith.

IV. LEGAL STANDARD

The provisions of 7 G.C.A \$24606 provide the framework for obtaining court approval of a good faith settlement by joint tortfeasors.

Any party to an action wherein it is alleged that two or more parties are joint tortfeasors shall be entitled to a hearing on the issue of the issue of the good faith of a settlement entered into by the plaintiff or other

claimant and one or more alleged tortfeasors, upon giving notice at least twenty (20) days before the hearing. In addition, the notice may be served by mail but in those cases the period of notice shall be twenty-five (25) days if the place of address is within the territory of Guam, at least thirty (30) days if the place of address is outside of the territory of Guam within the United States, and at least forty (40) days if the place of address is outside the United States. Upon a showing of good cause, the court may shorten the time for giving the required notice to permit the determination of the issue to be made before the commencement of the trial of the action, or before the verdict or judgment if settlement is made after the trial has commenced.

There is very little Guam case law on the issue of good faith settlements. However, it has been recognized that a settlement is not in done good faith "if it is made for significantly less than the reasonable value of the claim for which it is made...." Maeda Pacific Corporation v. GMP Hawaii, Inc., 2010 W.L. 672849 at *9 (D. Guam). See also, Newby v. Government of Guam, 2010 Guam 4 at [34]. Since this settlement is made for the maximum amount allowed by law under 5 GCA \$6301(b) as amended by P.L. 35-111, there can be no credible argument that the settlement is not made in good faith.

V. CONCLUSION

The parties have settled for the maximum recoverable amount under the Government Claims Act. The moving parties have not entered into this settlement to prejudice any other non-settling party. They did not collude against non-settling parties and they did not defraud anyone. Instead, the settling parties have

1	fashioned an arm's length s	ettlement agreement that provides
2	maximum compensation to plaint	ciffs.
3		
4		Respectfully submitted,
5		LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT L. KEOGH Attorneys for Plaintiffs
6		Accordings for fluincing
7	DATE: 7/6/2021 BY:	13CH 1
8		ROBERT L. REOGH
9		** •
10		OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL Leevin T. Camacho, Attorney General
11		Attorneys for Defendants
12		gmlan Lam Fambula
13	DATE: July 2, 2021 BY:	JORDAN PAULUHN
14		Assistant Attorney General
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		