No. 17-117439-A

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

ALYSIA R. TILLMAN and STORM FLEETWOOD,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

KATHERINE A. GOODPASTURE, D.O.,

 $Defendant ext{-}Appellee.$

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DEREK SCHMIDT,

Intervenor.

Appeal from the District Court of Riley County, Kansas Honorable John F. Bosch, District Judge District Court Case No. 2016-CV-94

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF INTERVENOR

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DEREK SCHMIDT

Bryan C. Clark, No. 24717 Assistant Solicitor General 120 SW 10th Avenue, 2nd Floor Topeka, Kansas 66612-1597 Telephone: (785) 296-2215

Fax: (785) 291-3767

E-mail: bryan.clark@ag.ks.gov

 $Attorney\ for\ Intervenor\ Office\ of\ Kansas$

Attorney General Derek Schmidt

TABLE OF CONTENTS AND AUTHORITIES

	Page
Arche v. U.S. Dep't of Army, 247 Kan. 276, 798 P.2d 477 (1990)	1, 2
Miller v. Johnson, 295 Kan. 636, 289 P.3d 1098 (2012)	1, 2
K.S.A. 38-2282	1, 2
K.S.A. 59-2124	1, 2
K.S.A. 60-1906	1, 2
Kan. Const. art. 2, § 1	2
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	3

This supplemental brief is filed in response to the Court's request at oral argument, and by Order dated February 21, 2018, for supplemental briefing on whether Kansas statutes provide Plaintiffs an adequate and viable substitute remedy for eliminating the wrongful birth cause of action first recognized by the Kansas Supreme Court in *Arche v. U.S. Dep't of Army*, 247 Kan. 276, 798 P.2d 477 (1990).

The Attorney General, as intervenor, contends that Sections 5 and 18 of the Bill of Rights of the Kansas Constitution do not apply to wrongful birth claims. The tort of wrongful birth was not cognizable at common law in 1859 when the Kansas Bill of Rights was adopted. As a result, the Legislature's power to eliminate the cause of action by enacting K.S.A. 60-1906 is unfettered. Accordingly, the Attorney General urges the Court not to reach the adequate-substitute-remedy question.

If the Court determines that the tort of wrongful birth was cognizable at common law in Kansas in 1859 (meaning that Sections 5 and 18 apply) and that an adequate substitute remedy is required, the Court "has the authority and duty" to uphold the statute if there is "any reasonable way to construe [it] as constitutionally valid." *Miller v. Johnson*, 295 Kan. 636, 646-47, 289 P.3d 1098 (2012). An adequate substitute remedy need not be enacted contemporaneous with the limitation or elimination of the right or remedy at issue. *Id.* at 661.

At oral argument, the Court specifically directed the parties to consider K.S.A. 38-2282 and K.S.A. 59-2124. These statutes are of a piece with K.S.A. 60-1906; all three further the State's policy of preserving and protecting the dignity of

all human life. By eliminating wrongful birth claims, K.S.A. 60-1906 reflects the Legislature's judgment that the life of every child, disabled or not, is to be valued and not to be used as the basis for claiming an injury because the child was allowed to be born. K.S.A. 38-2282 and K.S.A. 59-2124 likewise further the State's policy of valuing all human life by providing lawful options for parents who decide they are unable to, or for whatever reason choose not to, keep and raise a child.

The issues raised by the wrongful birth claim Plaintiffs assert are unlike any of the issues Kansas courts have faced in other Section 5 or Section 18 cases.

Compare Arche, 247 Kan. at 282 ("[I]n a wrongful birth case, the result of the tortious conduct is the existence, or benefit, of a child.") with Miller, 295 Kan. at 636 (challenging \$250,000 noneconomic damages cap in medical malpractice actions).

It is therefore unclear how (or whether) the adequate-substitute-remedy analysis would (or should) apply in this context. Nonetheless, it is clear that the Legislature understood that it was acting within its broad authority to prospectively eliminate wrongful birth claims, which are premised on an act that was a crime when the Bill of Rights was adopted and which are contrary to the State's prevailing public policy. There is no doubt the Legislature intended to enact a constitutional statute, and the State urges the Court to find K.S.A. 60-1906 a valid exercise of the legislative power entrusted by the People to their Legislature. *See* Kan. Const. art. 2, § 1.

The State respectfully requests that the Court affirm the District Court's decision.

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DEREK SCHMIDT

/s/ Bryan C. Clark
Bryan C. Clark, # 24717
Assistant Solicitor General
Dwight R. Carswell, # 25111
Assistant Solicitor General
Memorial Building, 2nd Floor
120 SW 10th Ave.
Topeka, KS 66612-1597
Telephone: (785) 296-2215
Fax: (785) 291-3767
bryan.clark@ag.ks.gov
dwight.carswell@ag.ks.gov

Attorneys for Intervenor Office of Kansas Attorney General Derek Schmidt

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 9th day of March 2018, this Supplemental Brief was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the Court's electronic filing system, which will send a notice of electronic filing to registered participants, and a copy was e-mailed to:

Lynn R. Johnson
David R. Morantz
Paige L. McCreary
Shamberg, Johnson & Bergman, Chtd.
2600 Grand Boulevard, Ste. 550
Kansas City, MO 64108
Telephone: (816) 474-0004
Fax: (816) 474-0003
ljohnson@sjblaw.com
dmorantz@sjblaw.com
pmccreary@sjblaw.com

Stanley R. Ausemus, Esq. Stanley R. Ausemus, Chtd. 413 Commercial P.O. Box 1083 Emporia, KS 66801 Telephone: (620) 342-8717

Fax: (620) 342-8717 Stanley@sraclaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants

Dustin J. Denning, KS 19348
Jacob E. Peterson, KS 25534
CLARK, MIZE & LINVILLE, CHARTERED
129 South 8th Street, POB 380
Salina, Kansas 67402-0380
Telephone: (785) 823-6325
Fax: (785) 823-1868
djdenning@cml-law.com
jepeterson@cml-law.com

Attorneys for Defendant-Appellee Katherine A. Goodpasture, D.O.

/s/ Bryan C. Clark

Bryan C. Clark, KS # 24717 Attorney for Intervenor Office of Kansas Attorney General Derek Schmidt