

ALEX SPIRO, ESQ.

Brafman & Associates, P.C.
767 Third Avenue, 26th Fl
New York, NY 10017
Phone: (212)-750-7800
Fax: (212)-750-3906

BRIAN MICHAELS, OSB # 925607

259 East Fifth Avenue, Suite 300-D
Eugene, Oregon 97401
Telephone: 541.687.0578
Fax: 541.686.2137
brian@brianmichaelslaw.com

ALAN C. MILSTEIN (Pro Hac Vice)

SHERMAN, SILVERSTEIN, KOHL, ROSE & PODOLSKY, P.A.
308 Harper Drive, Suite 200
Moorestown, NJ 08057
Telephone: 856-662-0700
Facsimile: 856-488-4744
E-Mail: amilstein@shermansilverstein.com

MARIANNE DUGAN (OSB #932563)

259 E. 5th Avenue, Suite 200-D
Eugene, OR 97401
Telephone: 541-338-7072
Facsimile: 866-650-5213
E-Mail: mdugan@mdugan.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON
EUGENE DIVISION

BRANDON AUSTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON; SANDY
WEINTRAUB; CHICORA MARTIN;
ROBIN HOLMES; and MICHAEL R.
GOTTFREDSON, all in their individual
capacities only,

Case No. 6:15-cv-02257-MC (Lead Case)
Case No. 6:16-cv-00647-MC (Member Case)

PLAINTIFFS' REPLY TO DEFENDANTS'
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR
COURT TO RECONSIDER ITS ORDER
DISMISSING PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS
FOR DUE PROCESS AND

Defendants.	QUALIFIED IMMUNITY
DOMINIC ARTIS and DAMYEAN DOTSON,	
Plaintiffs,	(Oral Argument Requested)
v.	
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON; SANDY WEINTRAUB; CHICORA MARTIN; ROBIN HOLMES; and MICHAEL R. GOTTFREDSON, all in their individual capacities only,	
Defendants.	

Plaintiffs appear by way of this Reply Memorandum to quickly address these salient and succinct points:

1. The inclusion of Plaintiffs' scholarship agreements/contracts in their Motion To Reconsider dispels the notion prompted by Defendants there is not new relevant materials worthy of reconsideration, by simultaneously dispelling the notion there was no benefit or pay or four-year contract for pay supplied by the scholarships similar to the of the medical residency analyzed in Stretten v. Wadsworth Veterans Hosp., 538 F.2d 361 (9th Cir. 1976)
2. Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Motion did not question the accuracy or authenticity of the scholarships, thereby accepting them as validly pled at this stage.
3. Defendants did not present for this court's review a copy of the contract for Residency analyzed in Stretten, Supra., or any contract for residency at the University to establish for this court an applicable contrast to Plaintiffs' scholarships as property interest.
4. At this stage of the proceedings, given the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we must accept as valid Plaintiffs' assertion that their scholarships

are an equivalent property interest as that for a medical residency as analyzed in Stretten.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 9th day of February 2017,
BY:

ALEX SPIRO, ESQ.
ALEX SPIRO, ESQ.
Pro Hac Vice

s/ BRIAN MICHAELS
BRIAN MICHAELS OSB 925607

Of Attorneys For Plaintiffs