EFiled: Jan 29 2015 11:51AM EST Transaction ID 56684783 Case No. 10530-VCN

## COURT OF CHANCERY OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JOHN W. NOBLE VICE CHANCELLOR 417 SOUTH STATE STREET DOVER, DELAWARE 19901 TELEPHONE: (302) 739-4397 FACSIMILE: (302) 739-6179

January 29, 2015

David J. Margules, Esquire

Ballard Spahr LLP

919 N. Market Street, 11th Fl. Wilmington, DE 19801

R. Judson Scaggs, Jr., Esquire

Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP

1201 N. Market Street Wilmington, DE 19801

Re: Accountable Care Associates, Inc. v. Gaziano

C.A. No. 10530-VCN

Date Submitted: January 28, 2015

## Dear Counsel:

I write to supplement my comments at the end of Friday's telephonic argument. The basic elements required to support a temporary restraining order (colorable claim, irreparable harm, and favorable balance of the equities) are present.

If the dispute between ACA and the Defendants were merely a commercial (debt) matter, interim relief would not be warranted. ACA has not been paying for CareScreen services, and the Defendants should not be required to provide any services for free. What distinguishes this action is the fiduciary duty (or

Accountable Care Associates, Inc. v. Gaziano

C.A. No. 10530-VCN

January 29, 2015

Page 2

conversion of a corporate opportunity) aspect which calls into question the validity

of ACA's debt obligation. Further complicating the analysis are the arguably

distressed financial positions of parties on both sides.

The Defendants insist that the relief sought by ACA must be assessed as a

mandatory injunction. ACA seeks to prevent the discontinuance of CareScreen

services by Defendants. In a sense, the relief is mandatory: if one cannot stop

providing a service, then it would seem that the party must continue to provide the

service. The answer to this debate may be found in E.I. du Pont de Nemours and

Co. v. Bayer CropScience L.P.<sup>1</sup>

Interim injunctive relief is committed to the Court's discretion. The harm to

the Defendants from a temporary restraining order preventing them from

discontinuing delivery of CareScreen services to ACA would be minimal. The

problems the Defendants have been experiencing with payment would be

ameliorated under the terms of a temporary restraining order. Defendants would

<sup>1</sup> 958 A.2d 245 (Del. Ch. 2008). There, the Court concluded that an order enjoining the Defendant from taking any action discontinuing delivery under a

supply agreement was not a mandatory injunction. *Id.* at 251 n.17.

Accountable Care Associates, Inc. v. Gaziano

C.A. No. 10530-VCN

January 29, 2015

Page 3

continue to provide the services that they have been providing (and providing

without an immediate threat of cessation).

Although ACA's claim is colorable, it depends upon ACA's fiduciary

allegations which may not survive a probability of success on the merits analysis.

The irreparable harm to ACA from the cessation of CareScreen services and a

balancing of the equities favor interim relief; a temporary restraining order is

warranted. Ultimately, the decision to grant this relief turns upon the Court's

perception that it would not be imposing any material and immediate burden on the

Defendants.

The temporary restraining order is attached. It likely will need revision.

I ask that counsel confer to determine if they can agree on any necessary changes.

One issue is the amount of the bond, which I have attempted to tie to an

approximate monthly cost that includes three fees. The amount is somewhat

greater (but not much greater) than perhaps the best estimate of monthly cost, but

that difference reduces, to an extent, the risk that ACA's payments will not be

Accountable Care Associates, Inc. v. Gaziano

C.A. No. 10530-VCN

January 29, 2015

Page 4

promptly made.<sup>2</sup> If a shorter period for payment can be established, perhaps the

amount of the bond could be reduced. On the other hand, if a month expires and

payment has not been made, an increase in the amount of the bond will likely

become necessary.

In light of the foregoing, a prompt schedule needs to be established for a

preliminary injunction hearing, and counsel are requested to confer on that

schedule.

Very truly yours,

/s/ John W. Noble

JWN/cap

cc:

Register in Chancery-K

<sup>2</sup> One month was chosen over two months. The bond amount is substantially less than the anticipated billing for two months, but a two-month timeframe would also have been reasonable.