

1 ALLEN J. RUBY (SBN 47109)
Allen.Ruby@skadden.com
2 JACK P. DICANIO (SBN 138782)
Jack.DiCanio@skadden.com
3 TIMOTHY A. MILLER (SBN 154744)
Timothy.Miller@skadden.com
4 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
525 University Avenue, Suite 1400
5 Palo Alto, California 94301
Telephone: 650-470-4500
6 Facsimile: 650-470-4570

7 DANIEL L. NASH (*pro hac vice*)
dnash@akingump.com
8 STACEY R. EISENSTEIN (*pro hac vice*)
seisenstein@akingump.com
9 MARLA S. AXELROD (*pro hac vice*)
maxelrod@akingump.com
10 AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
1333 New Hampshire Ave., NW
11 Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036
12 Telephone: 202-887-4000
Facsimile: 202-887-4288

13
14 Attorneys for DEFENDANT
NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE
15
16

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
19 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

20
21 RICHARD DENT, et al.,
22 Plaintiffs,
23 v.
24 NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE,
25 Defendant.
26

CASE NO.: 3:14-CV-02324-WHA

**DEFENDANT NATIONAL FOOTBALL
LEAGUE'S RESPONSE TO THE
PLAYERS ASSOCIATION'S
DECEMBER 2, 2014 LETTER BRIEF**

1 After the NFLPA filed its November 19, 2014 letter brief (ECF No. 92), the Court asked
2 the NFLPA two follow-up questions. In response to the first question, the Union provides no
3 explanation as “to what extent” former players could have filed grievances against their Clubs
4 concerning the “distribution” of, and “failure . . . to warn” about, prescription drugs. ECF No. 96
5 at 1. Instead, the Union gives the same answer it gave last time: that the players could not have
6 “grieved the *specific claims* asserted in *Dent*.” ECF No. 99 (Dec. 2, 2014) (emphasis added);
7 *compare* ECF No. 92 (Nov. 19, 2014) (NFLPA does not believe that “the specific claims” are
8 grievable).

9 The Court, however, may take guidance from the NFLPA’s positions in analogous cases,
10 including a recent grievance against “the NFL Clubs” for violating “various provisions of the CBA,
11 NFL Player Contract and longstanding custom and practice” by failing to provide medical care in
12 the players’ best interest. Declaration of Dennis L. Curran (“Curran Decl.”) (ECF No. 73) Ex. 18
13 (*NFLPA v. NFL Clubs & NFLMC* (Toradol Waivers) (2012)) at 1. That grievance claims that a
14 Club’s (or Club physician’s) improper disclosure and administration practices—including a failure
15 to sufficiently explain the “medical risk” and “long-term effects” of Toradol use, or otherwise act
16 for “the benefit of the player-patient”—would violate both new and longstanding CBA provisions.
17 *Id.* at 2; *see id.* (Article 39 “underscore[s]” existing “position and practice”). The Union cannot
18 explain why those allegations may be grieved but plaintiffs’ comparable failure-to-warn and like
19 allegations may not. The NFLPA’s position here is also at odds with other grievances filed against
20 the Clubs regarding player medical care. *See, e.g.,* Curran Decl. Ex. 16 (*Wilson v. Denver Broncos*
21 (2008) (Townley, Arb.)) at 3 (Wilson, with Union support, grieved “[w]hether the Broncos violated
22 the NFL Collective Bargaining Agreement Article XLIV when [Club physicians] did not inform Al
23 Wilson in writing that his physical condition could be significantly aggravated by continued
24 performance due to his injuries suffered on December 3, 2006”).

25 In response to the Court’s second question, the NFLPA asserts that it “does not take the
26 position that lawsuits by players against club doctors are prohibited by applicable CBAs[.]” ECF
27 No. 99. That is consistent with what the NFL told this Court. *See* Hr’g Tr. 20-21 (explaining that,
28 under court’s hypothetical, there “very well could be” a non-preempted malpractice lawsuit against

1 a Club doctor). Whether such a suit could proceed would depend on the specifics of the claim and
2 the relationship between the doctor and the Club, *see id.* 20-24, but there is no dispute that such
3 suits regularly are brought to verdict against Club physicians. *See, e.g., Jury finds doctor not*
4 *negligent in advice to former Bronco Al Wilson*, Denver Post, June 17, 2011, [http://](http://www.denverpost.com/ci_18296823)
5 www.denverpost.com/ci_18296823 (Broncos team physician); *Novak wins suit, \$5.3 million award*,
6 Florida-Times Union, July 20, 2002, [http://jacksonville.com/tu-online/stories/072002/](http://jacksonville.com/tu-online/stories/072002/met_9965297.html)
7 [met_9965297.html](http://jacksonville.com/tu-online/stories/072002/met_9965297.html) (Jaguars team physician); *Hoge Wins Lawsuit Against Doctor*, Chicago Tribune,
8 July 22, 2000, [http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2000-07-22/sports/0007220191_1_hoge-](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2000-07-22/sports/0007220191_1_hoge-concussions-brain-damage)
9 [concussions-brain-damage](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2000-07-22/sports/0007220191_1_hoge-concussions-brain-damage) (Bears team physician); *see also* Curran Decl. Ex. 15 (*Jeffers v.*
10 *Carolina Panthers* (2008) (Das, Arb.)) at 16 (noting that while Jeffers’ claims against the Panthers
11 must be arbitrated, his “claims against Dr. D’Alessandro and the Miller Clinic are proceeding in
12 state court”).

13 Finally, it bears noting that, earlier this week, the Union successfully asserted LMRA
14 preemption to defeat claims by a putative class of retired players who alleged that the Union did
15 not properly warn them of the long-term medical risks of concussions sustained during the retirees’
16 careers. *See Smith v. NFLPA*, No. 4:14CV01559 ERW, 2014 WL 6776306, at *5-7 (E.D. Mo. Dec.
17 2, 2014). Among other things, the district court agreed with the Union’s position that “[t]he fact
18 Plaintiffs are now retirees does not preclude [LMRA] preemption of claims based on events which
19 occurred while Plaintiffs were members of the bargaining unit.” *Id.* at *7. In addition, the Court
20 agreed with the NFLPA that, at a minimum, the retired players’ “negligent misrepresentation”
21 claim against the Union—asserting that it “knew the dangers and risks” associated with head
22 trauma but “knowingly concealed the information from Plaintiffs”—is preempted by the LMRA
23 because “it will substantially depend on interpretation of the CBA.” *Id.* at *2, *8; *compare* Second
24 Am. Compl. ¶¶ 354-369 (*Dent* plaintiffs’ “negligent misrepresentation” count alleges that the NFL,
25 despite knowing “risks” and “dangers” of medications, “did not inform the Class Members about
26 the Medications’ dangers and continually exposed the Class Members to those dangers”). Just as
27 those claims are preempted by federal labor law, so too are the claims of plaintiffs here.

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 4, 2014

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP

By: /s/ Allen J. Ruby
Allen J. Ruby

Attorneys for Defendant
National Football League