

No. S272113

**IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

MICHAEL R. RATTAGAN,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Defendant and Respondent.

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Case No. 20-16796
Appeal from U.S. District Court for Northern California
Case No. 3:19-cv-01988-EMC
Honorable Edward M. Chen

RESPONSE TO AMICUS BRIEFS

STEYER LOWENTHAL BOODROOKAS ALVAREZ & SMITH LLP

Andrew A. August, SBN 112851
aaugust@steyerlaw.com
235 Pine Street, 15th Floor
San Francisco, California 94104
(415) 421-3400 / Fax (415) 421-2234

GREINES, MARTIN, STEIN & RICHLAND LLP

*Cynthia E. Tobisman, SBN 197983
ctobisman@gmsr.com
Alana H. Rotter, SBN 236666
arotter@gmsr.com
Jeffrey E. Raskin, SBN 223608
jraskin@gmsr.com
Laura G. Lim, SBN 319125
llim@gmsr.com
6420 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90048
(310) 859-7811 / Fax (310) 276-5261

Attorneys for Petitioner MICHAEL R. RATTAGAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	3
INTRODUCTION	4
ARGUMENT	5
I. This Court has already explained that the predictability and fairness rationales for the economic loss rule do not apply when fraud is involved.	5
II. The Chamber’s floodgates argument ignores the elements of a fraud claim, and, in any event, is no basis for the blanket rule that the Chamber urges.	7
III. The Chamber’s professed concerns about increasing litigation ignore the societal value of meritorious fraud suits.	9
IV. This Court has long allowed tort damages for fraudulently inducing a contract, without any limitation as to the mode of fraud.	10
V. No “new exception” is necessary: Fraudulent concealment is <i>already</i> outside the economic loss rule.	11
CONCLUSION	13
CERTIFICATION	14
PROOF OF SERVICE	15
SERVICE LIST	16