CASE NUMBER: 2015 CV 05481 Docket ID: 28904424 GREGORY A BRUSH

CLERK OF COURTS MONTGOMERY COUNTY OHIO

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

ARUN AGGARWAL, M.D. :

Plaintiff, : Case No. 2015 CV 05481

v. : Judge Mary Katherine Huffman

:

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY, et al.

:

Defendants.

MOTION FOR DISSOLUTION OF TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Defendants Wright State University ("WSU"), Wright State University Boonshoft School of Medicine ("BSOM"), Margaret Dunn, Albert Painter, Arthur S. Pickoff, and Alan P. Marco (only in his capacity as Associate Dean for Clinical Affairs at BSOM), (collectively "WSU Defendants") respectfully move this Court, pur suant to Rule 65 of the Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure, for an order dismissing the temporary restraining order issued on October 20, 2015, because of Plaintiff's failure to comply with procedural requirements and because this Court is not a proper venue. A memorandum in support is attached.

EXHIBIT

7

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL DEWINE (0009181) Ohio Attorney General

s/ Michael C. McPhillips

MICHAEL C. MCPHILLIPS (0065329)
MARISSA J. PALUMBO (0089283)
Assistant Attorneys General
Education Section
30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Telephone: (614) 644-7250
Facsimile: (614) 644-7634
michael.mcphillips@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

marissa.palumbo@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

SLOAN T. SPALDING (0068054)

Assistant Attorney General Employment Law Section 30 E. Broad Street, 23rd Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 Telephone: (614) 644-7257

Telephone: (614) 644-7257 Facsimile: (614) 752-4677

sloan.spalding@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Counsel for Defendants Wright State University, Wright State University Boonshoft School of Medicine, Margaret Dunn, Albert Painter, Arthur S. Pickoff, and Alan P. Marco

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

Plaintiff A run A ggarwal, M.D. w as employed as a faculty member at W right S tate University's Boonshoft School of Medicine. A ggarwal's faculty employment a greement with BSOM was conditioned upon, among other things, his obtaining and maintaining hospital faculty privileges n ecessary for h is faculty r ole. In S eptember 2 015, B SOM officials I earned that Aggarwal's c linical privileges and medical staff a ppointment at D ayton C hildren's Medical

Center ha d be en t erminated. A ccordingly, BSOM not ified A ggarwal t hat hi s f aculty appointment was terminated effective September 14, 2015.

On O ctober 20, 2015, Dr. A ggarwal obtained an exparte temporary restraining or der ("TRO") in this C ourt, os tensibly in a ccordance with R ule 65 of the O hio R ules of C ivil Procedure and Local Rule 2.19. The TRO ordered "the Defendants enjoined from attempting to terminate the Plaintiff's employment until constitutionally and contractually sufficient process is afforded. The C ourt further or derst hat the Defendants immediately notify the United States Customs and Immigration Services ("USCIS") that the Plaintiff remains employed with BSOM and WSP."

1. Standard for Dissolution of a TRO.

Rule 65 pr ovides in part that, "[o]n two days' notice to the party who obtained the temporary restraining order without notice or on such shorter notice to that party as the court may prescribe, the adverse party may appear and move its dissolution or modification, and in that event the court shall proceed to hear and determine such motion as expeditiously as the ends of justice require." Local Rule 2.19, in turn, states, "[n]o ex parte applications, orders or entries shall be submitted unless expressly a uthorized by law. All motions for temporary restraining orders shall be made and proceed in compliance with Civ. R. 65(A)." Because 1) Plaintiff failed to comply with the letter and spirit of the notice requirements in Rule 65 and Local Rule 2.19, and 2) obtained the TRO in an improper venue, the WSU Defendants respectfully request that the Court dissolve the TRO.

¹ The present Motion should not be construed as a Motion to Dismiss for Improper Venue pursuant to Civ.R. 12(B). Should this case remain in this Court, the W SU D efendants reserve the right to raise all defenses permitted by Civ.R. 12.

2. The TRO Should be Dissolved because Plaintiff did not Comply with Rule 65's Notice Requirements.

For the purposes of the present Motion, Civ.R. 65 provides in relevant part:

A temporary restraining or der may be granted without written or oral notice to the adverse party or his attorney only if (1) it clearly appears from specific facts shown by affidavit or by the verified complaint that immediate and ir reparable in jury, loss or damage will result to the applicant before the adverse party or his attorney can be he ard in opposition, and (2) the applicant's attorney certifies to the court in writing the efforts, if any, which have been made to give notice and the reasons supporting his claim that no tice should not be required. The verification of such affidavit or verified complaint shall be upon the affiant's own knowledge, information or be lief; and sof ar a supon information and be lief, shall state that he be lieves this information to be true.

(Emphasis added).

The text of subsection (2), quoted above, makes it clear that a Plaintiff seeking a TRO must do both of the following: a) provide written certification to the court regarding the efforts that were made to give notice of the TRO application, and b) provide reasons why he believes notice should not be required. Plaintiff's counsel did not comply with these requirements.

In support of the TRO, Plaintiff a ttaches the A ffidavit of James P. Fleisher, Plaintiff's counsel. In the A ffidavit, a ttorney Fleisher refers to various exhibits, including E xhibits G through N of the Complaint, which he identifies as "true and accurate correspondence between me, the Defendants, and/or the Defendants' counsel." (Fleisher Aff., ¶ 18). A review of Exhibits G through N indicates two things: 1) Plaintiff's counsel was fully a ware of the most effective ways to contact Defendants and/or their counsel to notify them that he would be seeking an exparte TRO; and 2) Plaintiff's counsel never contacted Defendants or their counsel through these means to notify them that he would be seeking an exparte TRO.

Specifically, P laintiff's counsel had an email a ddress for A my Golian, the A ssistant Attorney General with whom he was corresponding about Dr. Aggarwal's matters; he regularly used that email a ddress and cc'd attorney Golian on correspondence with WSU of ficials. (Affidavit of Amy Nash Golian ¶ 3, 4; see also Exs. G, J, K, and M to Plaintiff's Complaint). Moreover, attorney Fleisher knew from telephone conversations that attorney Golian was temporarily assigned towork at the General Counsel's of fice at WSU, and he frequently contacted her at her temporary WSU telephone number. (Golian Aff. ¶ 5). However, nowhere in attorney Fleisher's "certification" does he indicate that he contacted or attempted to contact attorney Golian by email to indicate that he would be seeking an exparte TRO, nor did he contact her at her known WSU telephone number to give such notice. The only "notice" that Plaintiff's counsel provided to the Defendants that he would be seeking an exparte TRO is an 8:55 p.m. voice message left at the Columbus of fice of the Attorney General's Education Section. (Affidavit of Renee Matthewson, ¶ 1-4; Golian Aff. ¶ 7).

It would be injust to let a TRO stand – ironically a TRO grounded on a n alleged due process violation – when the fundamental requirement of attempting to provide notice to a n adverse party before obtaining an ex parte order has been so blatantly violated. Accordingly, the TRO should be dissolved.

3. This Lawsuit Should be Dismissed in its Entirety Due to Improper Venue

Irrespective of the inadequate notice issue, this lawsuit should be dismissed in its entirety due to improper venue.

Civ.R. 3 provides in relevant part:

Proper venue lies in any one or more of the following counties: (1) The c ounty i n which the defendant r esides; (2) The c ounty i n which the defendant has his or her principal place of business; (3) A county in which the defendant conducted activity that gave rise

to the c laim for relief; (4) A county in which a public officer maintains his or her principal office if suit is brought against the officer in the officer's official capacity (6) The county in which all or part of the claim for relief arose . . . [or] (12) If there is no available forum in divisions (B)(1) to (B)(10) of this rule, in the county in which plaintiff resides, has his or her principal place of bus iness, or regularly and s ystematically c onducts bus iness activity. 2

Wright S tate U niversity, B SOM, and D efendant W right S tate Physicians, Inc. are all located in Fairborn, in Greene C ounty, Ohio. The principal place of business for all of these entities is in Greene C ounty. The claims for relief arise out of Dr. Aggarwal's employment in Greene C ounty. All of the individually named defendants – Alan P. Marco, Margaret Dunn, Albert Painter, and Arthur Pickoff – have been sued in their official capacities and each of them has their principal office in Greene County.

In the c ase c aption, D r. A ggarwal i ndicates t hat hi s a ddress i s i n Dayton, Ohio, presumably in Montgomery County. However, Civil Rule 3 makes clear that the residence of the Plaintiff only becomes relevant for venue purposes "[i]f there is no available forum in divisions (B)(1) t o (B)(10)" of t he r ule. S ince t here i s a n a vailable f orum i n Greene C ounty under subsections (B)(1), (2), (3), (4), and (6), Montgomery County is not a proper venue under Rule 3.3

4. Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, Defendants respectfully request that the Court dissolve the TRO issued on October 20, 2015.

² Subsections (5) and (7) through (11) of Rule 3 address special situations that are not relevant to the present action.

³ In the c aption to the C omplaint, P laintiff lists G reene C ounty a ddresses for all of the D efendants except for Margaret Dunn, the current Dean of the B SOM. For Dean Dunn, Plaintiff mysteriously lists an address at Miami Valley Hospital in Dayton that has no relationship to this lawsuit. Dean Dunn's BSOM office is at 725 University Boulevard in Fairborn, in Greene County.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL DEWINE (0009181) Ohio Attorney General

s/ Michael C. McPhillips

MICHAEL C. MCPHILLIPS (0065329)
MARISSA J. PALUMBO (0089283)
Assistant Attorneys General
Education Section
30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Telephone: (614) 644-7250

Facsimile: (614) 644-7634

michael.mcphillips@ohioattorneygeneral.gov marissa.palumbo@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

SLOAN T. SPALDING (0068054)

Assistant Attorney General Employment Law Section 30 E. Broad Street, 23rd Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 Telephone: (614) 644, 7257

Telephone: (614) 644-7257 Facsimile: (614) 752-4677

sloan.spalding@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Counsel for Defendants Wright State University, Wright State University Boonshoft School of Medicine, Margaret Dunn, Albert Painter, Arthur S. Pickoff, and Alan P. Marco

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing *Motion* for Dissolution of Temporary Restraining Order was served upon the following individuals via U.S. Mail and email this 23rd day of October, 2015:

James P. Fleisher, Esq.
Curtis G. Moore, Esq.
Bieser, Greer & Landis, LLP
400 PNC Center, 6 N. Main Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402
jpf@bgllaw.com
cgm@bgllaw.com

s/Michael C. McPhillips

MICHAEL C. MCPHILLIPS (0065329)
Assistant Attorney General

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

ARUN AGGARWAL, M.D. :

Plaintiff, : Case No. 2015 CV 05481

:

v. : Judge Mary Katherine Huffman

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY, et al.

:

Defendants.

AFFIDAVIT OF AMY NASH GOLIAN

I, Amy Nash Golian, being duly cautioned and sworn, depose and state that I am competent to testify to the facts contained herein, that I have personal knowledge of the facts contained herein, and that the facts contained herein are true and accurate to the best of my belief.

- I am employed as the Assistant Section Chief of the Education Section of the Ohio Attorney General's Office in Columbus, Ohio.
- 2. Until May 2015, my primary work place as Assistant Section Chief was in Columbus, Ohio. However, in May 2015, the former General Counsel of Wright State University was placed on paid administrative leave; she subsequently retired. From May 2015 to the present, I have worked most days of the work week out of the General Counsel's Office at Wright State University. My primary duties during this time have been handling the legal matters of Wright State University until the position of General Counsel is filled.

- During the periods that I have worked at the Wright State offices, I have maintained my Attorney General's email address, amy.golian@ohioattorneygeneral.gov. I had instant access to this email address whether I was working in Columbus, at Wright State, or was away from work in the mornings and evenings. I regularly check this email address in the early mornings before I begin my work day and in the late evening after work.
- 4. Plaintiff's counsel was aware of my Attorney General's email address. He regularly emailed me or cc'd me on emails pertaining to his client, Dr. Aggarwal, as evidenced by Exhibits G, J, K, M, and N of the attachments to Dr. Aggarwal's Complaint. All of these emails predated October 20, 2015. On October 22, 2015, Plaintiff's counsel also sent me a courtesy copy at this email address of a motion for a show cause order that he filed in this case.
- Since I have been temporarily assigned to work at Wright State, I have used a telephone number in the WSU General Counsel's office as my primary point of telephone contact for Wright State matters. Plaintiff's counsel was aware of and regularly contacted me at this phone number to discuss matters regarding Dr. Aggarwal prior to October 20, 2015.
- 6. Prior to obtaining a temporary restraining order on October 20, 2015, Plaintiff's counsel did not notify me at amy.golian@ohioattorneygeneral.gov that he intended to go to Montgomery County Common Pleas Court on that date to seek an ex parte temporary restraining order in this case. Plaintiff's counsel also did not contact me or leave a message at the telephone number in the WSU General

Counsel's office on or before October 20, 2015 to indicate that he would be seeking an ex parte TRO.

7. The only contact that Plaintiff's counsel had with my office on or before October 20, 2015 to indicate that he would seek an ex parte TRO was a voice message left at 8:55 p.m. at the Education Section of the Attorney General's Office in Columbus on the evening of October 19, 2015. Plaintiff's counsel and I had not used this telephone number in our numerous communications prior to October 20, 2015.

Further affiant sayeth naught.

Sworn to before me and signed in my presence this day of October, 2015.

My commission expires on Sept 24, 7019

TRACY SILVERT, Notary Public In and for the State of Ohio My Commission Expires Sept. 24, 2019

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

:

ARUN AGGARWAL, M.D.

:

Plaintiff, : Case No. 2015 CV 05481

v. : Judge Mary Katherine Huffman

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY, et al.

Defendants.

AFFIDAVIT OF RENEE MATTHEWSON

I, Renee Matthewson, being duly cautioned and sworn, depose and state that I am competent to testify to the facts contained herein, that I have personal knowledge of the facts contained herein, and that the facts contained herein are true and accurate to the best of my belief.

- I am employed as an Administrative Professional 3 for the Education Section of the Ohio Attorney General's Office in Columbus, Ohio.
- 2. In my typical work day, I arrive at the office at 7:30 a.m. and one of the first things that I do is to check voice messages that have been left at the Education Section's General telephone number, (614) 644-7250, during the period between when the last Legal Secretary left the office on the previous work day (usually 5:30 p.m.) and when I arrive.
- 3. On the morning of October 20, 2015, I checked the voice messages that had been left on the aforementioned telephone number.

4. One message, which indicated that it was left at 8:55 p.m. on October 19, 2015, stated that the caller was calling because Dr. Aggarwal had received information that his immigration status and that of his family was in immediate jeopardy; that he would be seeking injunctive relief in Montgomery County on October 20th; and left a telephone number. The caller did not leave his name. I emailed this information to Amy Nash Golian.

Further affiant sayeth naught.

RENEE MATTHEWSON

RESECCA ALBERS
Attorney of LarNotary Politic, \$15.5 of Chico
My Communication Here No Expiration
Section 147.03

Notary Public

My commission expires on