Exhibit A

-1-

Case No. 1:14-cv-20281-GEB-SMS

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

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 36, Defendant CANNON ASSOCIATES, LLC, dba POLARIS GROUP ("Defendant") responds under oath to Plaintiff DAKOTA MEDICAL, INC., d/b/a GLENOAKS CONVALESCENT HOSPITAL's ("Plaintiff") First Set of Requests for Admission.

INTRODUCTION

The responding party has not fully completed its investigation of the facts relating to this case, and has not fully completed its discovery in this action, nor has it completed its preparation for trial. All of the responses contained herein are based only upon such information and documents which are presently available to and specifically known to this responding party and disclose only those contentions which are presently known to such responding party. It is anticipated that further discovery, independent investigation, legal research and analysis will supply additional facts, add meaning to the known facts, as well as establish entirely new factual conclusions and legal contentions, all of which may lead to substantial additions to, changes and variations from the responses herein set forth.

The following responses are given without prejudice to this responding party's right to produce evidence of any subsequently discovered fact or facts which this responding party may later recall or locate. Responding party accordingly reserves the right to change any and all responses herein as additional facts are ascertained, analyses are made, legal research is completed and contentions are made. The responses contained herein are made in a good faith effort to supply as much factual information and as much specification of legal contentions as are presently known, but should in no way be to the prejudice of Defendant in relation to further discovery, research or analysis.

REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND RESPONSES THERETO **REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 1:**

Admit that YOU did not have an ESTABLISHED BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP with GLENOAKS at the time the GLENOAKS FAXES were sent via facsimile transmission to (818 247-0949.

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

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 1:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds it is premature.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 1:

Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it calls for a legal conclusion, particular with respect to use of the defined term "Established Business Relationship". Without waiving the foregoing General Objections and specific objections, responding party responds as follows: Defendant admits that to date it has been unable to locate any evidence of a business relationship with Plaintiff. However, Defendant's investigation and discovery is continuing. Defendant has directly or indirectly done business with hundreds of entities. Accordingly, there may exist some evidence, of which Defendant is not presently aware, regarding some form of prior business relationship with Plaintiff, either directly or through parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, officers, directors, employees or agents of Plaintiff. Therefore, Defendant reserves the right to modify or amend this response based upon such later acquired or discovered evidence.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 1:

Defendant objects to this request on the ground that it calls for a legal conclusion, particular with respect to use of the defined term "Established Business Relationship". Without waiving the foregoing objection, responding party responds as follows: Defendant admits that to date it has been unable to locate any evidence of a business relationship with Plaintiff. However, Defendant's investigation and discovery is continuing. Defendant has directly or indirectly done business with many hundreds of entities. Accordingly, there may exist some evidence, of which Defendant is not presently aware, regarding some form of prior business relationship with Plaintiff, either directly or through parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, officers, directors, employees or agents of Plaintiff. Therefore, Defendant reserves the right to modify or amend this response based upon such later acquired or discovered evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 2:

Admit that GLENOAKS did not give PRIOR EXPRESS INVITATION OR PERMISSION to be sent the GLENOAKS FAXES via facsimile transmission to (818) 247 0949.

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

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 2:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds it is premature.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 2:

Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it calls for a legal conclusion. particular with respect to use of the defined term "Prior Express Invitation or Permission". Without waiving the foregoing General Objections and specific objections, responding party responds as follows: Deny. Plaintiff was a member of California Association of Health Facilities (CAHF) during all relevant times. As such, Plaintiff provided its contact information, including its facsimile number, to CAHF for inclusion in the CAHF Membership Directory so that it could be contacted by other CAHF members. As such, Plaintiff gave the members of CAHF the requisite prior permission/consent to contact Plaintiff, including via facsimile during all relevant periods. Defendant refers Plaintiff to the CAHF Membership Directory for the years 2010-2014, which are equally available to Plaintiff. Furthermore, Defendant has directly or indirectly communicated with hundreds of entities over the course of its existence and, in that regard, has received direct requests from those entities to send them information regarding Defendant, such as, for example, by being given a business card with the recipient's contact information, including facsimile number. Accordingly, there may exist some additional evidence, of which Defendant is not presently aware, regarding other forms of prior permission/consent from Plaintiff, either directly or indirectly through parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, officers, directors, employees or agents of Plaintiff. Therefore, Defendant reserves the right to modify or amend this response as its investigation and discovery continue.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 2:

Defendant objects to this request on the ground that it calls for a legal conclusion, particular with respect to use of the defined term "Prior Express Invitation or Permission". Without waiving the foregoing objection, responding party responds as follows: Deny. Plaintiff was a member of California Association of Health Facilities (CAHF) during all relevant times. As such, Plaintiff provided its contact information, including its facsimile number, to CAHF for

ase 1:14-cv-02081-DAD-BAM Document 179-4 Filed 08/01/17 Page 6 of 11

Gordon & Rees LLP 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111

2.5

inclusion in the CAHF Membership Directory so that it could be contacted by other CAHF members. As such, Plaintiff gave the members of CAHF the requisite prior permission/consent to contact Plaintiff, including via facsimile during all relevant periods. Defendant refers Plaintiff to the CAHF Membership Directory for the years 2010-2014, which are equally available to Plaintiff. Furthermore, Defendant has directly or indirectly communicated with many hundreds, if not thousands, of entities over the course of its existence and, in that regard, has received direct requests from those entities to send them information regarding Defendant, such as, for example, by being given a business card with the recipient's contact information, including facsimile number. Accordingly, there may exist some additional evidence, of which Defendant is not presently aware, regarding other forms of prior permission/consent from Plaintiff, either directly or indirectly through parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, officers, directors, employees or agents of Plaintiff. Therefore, Defendant reserves the right to modify or amend this response as its investigation and discovery continue.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 3:

Admit that the sending of the GLENOAKS FAXES via facsimile transmission to (818 247-0949 violated the TCPA.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 3:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds it is premature.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 3:

Defendant objects to this request on the ground that it calls for a legal conclusion. Without waiving the foregoing General Objections and specific objections, responding party responds as follows: Deny. See response to Request No. 2, incorporated herein by this reference. Further, Defendant was granted a retroactive waiver by the FCC, which waived the opt-out requirements concerning facsimile transmissions. In addition, there is no evidence that Plaintiff ever received the Faxes.

28 1///

1//

ase 1:14-cv-02081-DAD-BAM Document 179-4 Filed 08/01/17 Page 7 of 11

275 Battery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111

Gordon & Rees LLP

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 3:

Defendant objects to this request on the ground that it calls for a legal conclusion.				
Without waiving the foregoing objection, responding party responds as follows: Deny. See				
response to Request No. 2, incorporated herein by this reference. Further, Defendant was				
granted a retroactive waiver by the FCC, which waived the opt-out requirements concerning				
facsimile transmissions. In addition, there is no evidence that Plaintiff ever received the Faxes				

Dated: February 1, 2016

GORDON & REES LLP

By:

David L. Jordan

Daniel S. Kubasak

Attorneys for Defendant: CANNON & ASSOCIATES, LLC dba

POLARIS GROUP

VERIFICATION I, Chuck Cave, declare: I am the President of Cannon & Associates, LLC, dba Polaris Group, a company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, and which is a Defendant in the above-entitled action. I am authorized to make this verification on its behalf. I have read the foregoing Second Supplemental Response to Dakota Medical, Inc.'s Request for Admissions (Set One) on file herein and know the contents thereof. To the extent I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth therein, the same are true and correct. Insofar as said matters are a composite of the information of many individuals, I do not have personal knowledge concerning all of the information contained in said Response, but I am informed and believe that the information set forth therein for which I lack personal knowledge is true and correct. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the ng is true and correct.

Executed at Tampa, Florida on this Aday of Flebruary, 2016.

Aday of Flebruary, 2016. foregoing is true and correct.

se 1:14-cv-02081-DAD-BAM Document 179-4 Filed 08/01/17 Page 9 of 11

Case 1:14-cv-02081-DAD-BAM Document 179-4 Filed 08/01/17 Page 11 of 11

Gordon & Rees LLP 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111	1	Jon Martin Wilson, Esq. Broad and Cassel	Attorneys for Defendant:
	2	1 Biscayne Tower	REHABCARE GROUP, INC.
	3	2 S. Biscayne Blvd. Miami, FL 33131	
	4	Tele: (305) 373-9489 Fax: (305) 373-9443	·
	5	Email: jwilson@broadandcassel.com	
	6	Oliver W. Wanger, Esq.	
	7	Wanger Jones Helsley PC 265 E. River Park Circle, Suite 310	
	8	P.O. Box 28340 Fresno, CA 93729	· •
	9	Tele: (559) 233-4800 Fax: (559) 233-9330	
	10	Email: <u>owanger@wjhattornevs.com</u>	
	11		
	12		
	13		•
	14		
	15		
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		
	21	·	
	22		
	23		
	24		
	25		
	26		
	27	•	
10 12 10 10 10 11	28		

1108430/26560645v.1