

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

Mary Smith as Special Administrator of the )  
Estate of Christopher Smith, )  
Plaintiff, ) Case No. 14 C 7718  
vs. )  
City of Chicago and Officer Brownfield, #15752 )  
Defendants. ) Honorable Judge Wood

**DEFENDANTS' JOINT RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL  
PAYMENT OF SETTLEMENT WITHOUT FACE-TO-FACE CONTACT**

NOW COMES Defendant, City of Chicago, by and through its attorney, Mark A. Flessner, Corporation Counsel for the City of Chicago, and Defendant Craig Brownfield, by and through one of his attorneys, Allison L. Romelfanger, Assistant Corporation Counsel Supervisor, (hereinafter the City and Defendant Brownfield shall be referred to herein as "Defendants"), and for their response to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Payment of Settlement without Face-to-Face Contact state as follows:

**Factual Background**

This case was settled after this Court approved the proposed settlement on March 5, 2020. (ECF. No. 116). This case converted to a dismissal with prejudice absent any motion to reinstate on or before May 18, 2020. (ECF No. 116). As no such motion was filed, the case was dismissed with prejudice on May 18, 2020. (ECF No. 116). This action ended the Court's jurisdiction over this case.

Separately, Plaintiff's counsel reached out to counsel for Defendant Brownfield, Allison L. Romelfanger on May 6, 2020 inquiring about the status of the settlement check and whether it

could be mailed. (See Correspondence between counsel regarding the settlement check, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, p. 5-6.) On May 11, 2020, defense counsel responded, informing Plaintiff's counsel that the check was ready and that while it could not be mailed, anyone from Plaintiff's counsel's office could pick up the check at a mutually-agreeable date and time in City Hall, as long as the individual picking up the check had a valid ID and business card. (Exh. 1, p. 3.) On May 18, 2020, defense counsel followed up with Plaintiff's counsel regarding picking up the check, as no response was received to their May 11, 2020 correspondence. (Exh. 1, p. 3). Plaintiff's counsel indicated they would get back to defense counsel regarding receipt of the settlement funds. (Exh. 1, p. 2).

Plaintiff waited until after the case was dismissed with prejudice to present Defendants with a motion to compel on May 27, 2020 if the City would not abandon its "antiquated practice" of requiring in-person check pick-ups in this case. (Exh. 1, p. 2). Victoria Benson, Deputy Corporation Counsel, responded on May 28, 2020, indicating that the City would be willing to mail the settlement check if Plaintiff would waive any claims against Defendants should the check not be received due to circumstances beyond the City's control. (Exh. 1, p. 1). Plaintiff's counsel rejected the City's offer and thereafter filed his Motion to Compel Payment of Settlement without Face-to-Face Contact on May 28, 2020, ten (10) days after the dismissal of the case with prejudice. (Exh. 1, p.1);(ECF No. 118).

### **Argument**

#### **I. The Court has no Jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Motion.**

When a suit is dismissed with prejudice, a district court cannot adjudicate disputes arising out of a settlement agreement without showing some independent basis for federal jurisdiction. *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America*, 511 U.S. 375, 114 S. Ct. 1673 (1994)

(enforcement of a settlement agreement is more than a continuation or renewal of a dismissed lawsuit and requires its own basis for jurisdiction); see also *Bond v. Utreras*, 585 F.3d 1061, 1079 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009); *Morisch v. U.S.*, 709 F. Supp.2d 672 (S.D.Ill., Apr. 6, 2010). Instead, any dispute Plaintiff has regarding the settlement agreement must be filed as a separate action in state court and is governed by Illinois law. *See Kokkonen*, 511 U.S. 375.

As this Court did not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the parties' settlement agreement, and Plaintiff failed to file any motion for relief prior to the case being dismissed with prejudice, Plaintiff cannot now bring this action in federal court without an independent basis for jurisdiction. (ECF No. 116). As this Court has no jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Motion, Plaintiff's Motion should be denied.

## **II. Plaintiff Cites no Authority Supporting Her Motion to Compel.**

Even if this Court did have jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Motion (which it does not), Plaintiff cites no authority, including no statute, rule, or case law, to support her Motion to Compel Payment of Settlement Funds without Face-to-Face Contact. (*See* ECF No. 118, *generally*). As Plaintiff has titled her motion as a motion to compel, she is presumably seeking to compel Defendants to act under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37. However, Rule 37 is a remedy in the discovery phase of pending litigation, and has no applicability here. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37.

Nor does Plaintiff cite to anything in the parties' settlement agreement that allows Plaintiff to dictate that Defendants mail the settlement check to Plaintiff *and assume all of the risk* entailed by transmitting substantial sums of money through the U.S. mail. The settlement agreement is silent as to the manner of transmission of payment, and Plaintiff has not even tried to state a claim for breach of contract or specific performance. Defendants have had Plaintiff's

settlement funds ready for pick-up since May 11, 2020 and have attempted to coordinate pick-up of the same. (Exh. 1, *generally*). So even assuming *arguendo* that this Court had jurisdiction over implementation of the settlement agreement, there is no basis for compelling Defendants to mail the check to Plaintiff under circumstances which potentially put their monies at risk and/or which Defendants assume additional risks, including claims for interest. As Plaintiff cites to no authority supporting her Motion, Plaintiff's Motion should be denied.

**III. Defendants' Procedure for Picking up Settlement Funds is not Unreasonable nor a Breach of its Obligations under the Settlement Agreement.**

In the alternative, Defendants' procedure for picking up settlement funds is not unreasonable. Generally speaking, the City of Chicago requires individuals to pick-up settlement funds in order to obtain a signature as an acknowledgement of receipt of the check. This is in an effort to avoid claims of lost or stolen funds, in which the City could potentially incur additional liability and/or costs, including claims of interest. Nothing in the settlement agreement requires Defendants to mail or wire settlement amounts to Plaintiff, especially without any protections and agreements for Defendants should the mailing go awry or the check be misappropriated.

The City understands the current health issues surrounding COVID19, and has set up reasonable procedures for individuals picking up settlement funds. As defense counsel has communicated to Plaintiff's counsel, Defendants are willing to set up a date and time for pick-up convenient for Plaintiff. Any individual from Plaintiff's counsel's firm may pick up the check with a valid ID, business card, or in the alternative, a short statement on firm letterhead indicating the individual with authority to receive the check. Arrangements are additionally made so that any meeting is in the large lobby of City Hall, which allows for six (6) foot social distancing, and masks are required to be worn by all parties during the short exchange of the

settlement funds. The City has successfully used this procedure throughout the pandemic crisis in numerous cases with other plaintiffs' counsels.

In further effort to protect the health of the citizens of Chicago, the City has also installed new hand sanitizer stations, placed markings in the building to assist with social distancing guidelines, and installed thermal scanners. Any individual that enters City Hall must enter where thermal scanners are installed and individuals who register with a fever will be asked to leave. This is in compliance with all guidelines currently set in Illinois and Chicago. *See for example* <https://www.nbcchicago.com/news/local/illinois-phase-3-heres-a-look-at-whats-changing-friday/2279376/>; <https://www.nbcchicago.com/news/local/chicago-will-enter-phase-3-of-reopening-as-planned-lightfoot-says/2282601/> (gatherings of 10 or less permitted, non-essential businesses permitted to reopen under certain guidelines). As the City's procedures are reasonable and comport with all safety guidelines set forth both generally for Illinois and Chicago, Plaintiff's motion should be denied.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated above, Defendants respectfully request this Court deny Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Settlement without Face-to-Face Contact and any other relief this Court deems just.

Dated this 8th day of June, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Allison L. Romelfanger  
Allison L. Romelfanger  
Assistant Corporation Counsel Supervisor  
City of Chicago, Department of Law  
Federal Civil Rights Litigation Division  
30 N. LaSalle, Suite 900  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Allison.Romelfanger@cityofchicago.org  
Attorney No. 6310033

*Attorneys for Defendant Brownfield*

/s/ Marques Berrington

Marques Berrington  
Assistant Corporation Counsel III  
City of Chicago, Department of Law  
Federal Civil Rights Litigation Division  
30 N. LaSalle, Suite 900  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Marques.Berrington@cityofchicago.org  
*Attorney for Defendant City of Chicago*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that she has filed the foregoing motion with the United States' District Court for the Northern District of Illinois ECF System on this 8<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2020, thereby serving a copy on all parties.

/s/ Allison L. Romelfanger

Assistant Corporation Counsel Supervisor