

Jarrod's Law Org Inc.
A 501(c)(3) Nonprofit Organization

wendyjarrodslaw@gmail.com | (805) 300-4727 | EIN 46-5728954

ARGUMENT COMPARISON: PREVIOUS vs. REWRITTEN SUBPOENA

PREVIOUS SUBPOENA ARGUMENT STRUCTURE:

THESIS: "Government-funded facilities work better than private operators"
EVIDENCE: 373 government-funded facilities identified • All operate under unified, integrated oversight • Comparison will show better compliance, safety, enforcement
IMPLICATION: ESCAPE Act should require all facilities to have unified oversight like government-funded facilities • Reform comes from data showing one model works better
WEAKNESS: Doesn't directly challenge DHCS's misleading presentation • Doesn't explain why public can't distinguish oversight regimes • Doesn't establish accountability for the regulatory fragmentation itself • More theoretical ("government-funded facilities work better")

REWRITTEN SUBPOENA ARGUMENT STRUCTURE:

THESIS: "If DHCS lists facilities together, it should regulate them uniformly"
FOUNDATIONAL PROBLEM: 1. DHCS presents 2,285+ facilities on a single "approved" list 2. This creates appearance of unified oversight 3. Reality is EXTREMELY FRAGMENTED oversight 4. This gap is where fraud hides (Sovereign Health case)
ARGUMENT: DHCS can't have it both ways • Either regulate them all uniformly, OR • Separate the lists and clearly explain which oversight regime applies • Sovereign Health was listed alongside government-funded facilities, but operated under vastly weaker oversight • Brandon Nelson's family had no way to know the difference
STRENGTH: Directly challenges DHCS's current practice • Establishes clear accountability principle • Frames problem as PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY issue (not just comparative analysis) • Sovereign Health becomes proof that fragmentation enables fraud • Gives ESCAPE Act clear reform target • Hard to argue against the logic: "list together = regulate together"

WHY THE REWRITTEN ARGUMENT IS STRONGER:

1. REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY (NOT JUST COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS)
Previous: "Let's show that government-funded facilities are better" Rewritten: "DHCS's unified list presentation is misleading the public. If they list facilities together, they must regulate them uniformly." Impact: This is a stronger indictment of DHCS's current practice. It's asking DHCS to either enforce what it's implying (unified standards) or stop implying it.
2. PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY PRINCIPLE
Previous: "We should use government-funded facilities as the oversight model" Rewritten: "Patients and families looking at DHCS's list can't tell which oversight regime applies to which facility. This is a public safety problem." Impact: Shifts from "internal regulatory policy" to "public health transparency." Much harder for DHCS to defend.
3. DIRECT ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SOVEREIGN HEALTH FRAUD
Previous: Sovereign Health used as example of private sector failure Rewritten: Sovereign Health used as PROOF that regulatory fragmentation enables fraud Impact: The fraud didn't happen because private operators are bad. It happened because DHCS's fragmentation made the fraud invisible for years.
4. BRANDON NELSON CONNECTION
Previous: Brandon Nelson mentioned as human cost Rewritten:

Brandon Nelson's family saw one unified list. They couldn't distinguish oversight regimes. They trusted DHCS's unified presentation. That trust was misplaced. Impact: Frames this as consumer protection issue. Family relied on DHCS's representation (unified list = vetted facilities). They were misled by the gap between presentation and reality. **5. LOGICAL FORCE** Previous: "Data will show we need uniform standards" Rewritten: "If you're willing to list them together, you should regulate them together. If not, separate the lists." Impact: Creates logical trap DHCS can't escape. **6. LEGISLATIVE REFORM TARGET** Previous: Vague: "implement government-funded oversight model" Rewritten: Clear options: A) Require unified standards for all listed facilities, OR B) Separate lists with clear explanations, OR C) Mandatory public disclosure of oversight regime Impact: ESCAPE Act work group has actionable reform options grounded in logical principle.

ARGUMENT COMPARISON SUMMARY:

PREVIOUS SUBPOENA: Type: Comparative analysis argument Logic: Data will show model X works better Target: Internal regulatory reform Risk: Sounds like policy preference rather than accountability issue **REWRITTEN SUBPOENA:** Type: Regulatory accountability & transparency argument Logic: If you list them together, regulate them together (or separate them) Target: DHCS's misleading public presentation + enabling fragmentation Strength: Directly challenges current practice + exposes public harm **WINNER: Rewritten subpoena is stronger because it:** ✓ Directly challenges DHCS's current deceptive practice ✓ Frames as consumer protection issue (not internal policy) ✓ Establishes clear logical principle (list together = regulate together) ✓ Connects to specific harms (Sovereign Health, Brandon Nelson) ✓ Gives ESCAPE Act clear, achievable reform targets ✓ Harder for DHCS to defend against

*This comparison shows the strategic strength of the rewritten subpoena argument.
Reference #L120514-081726*