

05/08/2013

John A. Santos, Executive Officer/Clerk  
By VICTOR SINO-CRUZ, Deputy

BY FAX

Public Policy.

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff MICALAH TAFI is an individual residing in Orange County, California.

2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that at all times relevant hereto, Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC. was and is a California corporation doing business in Los Angeles County, California.

3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that at all times relevant hereto, Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS was and is a California corporation doing business in Los Angeles County, California.

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that at all times relevant hereto, Defendant SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC. was and is a California corporation doing business in Los Angeles County, California.

5. KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC., KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS, and SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC. are collectively referred to as Defendants.

6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of the Defendants named herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and therefore said Defendants are sued by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of said Defendants when the same become known to Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible for the wrongful acts alleged herein, and is therefore liable to Plaintiff as alleged hereinafter.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at all times relevant hereto, Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, employees, coconspirators,

1 parent corporation, joint employers, alter ego, and/or joint venturers of the other Defendants, and  
2 each of them, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting at least in part within the course  
3 and scope of said agency, employment, conspiracy, joint employer, alter ego status, and/or joint  
4 venture and with the permission and consent of each of the other Defendants.

5 8. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act or failure  
6 to act by a Defendant or co-Defendant, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to  
7 mean the acts and/or failures to act by each Defendant acting individually, jointly and severally.

8 9. Plaintiff Micaiah Tafai (Plaintiff) is a married 32 year-old African American  
9 woman and mother of five children. She is a licensed vocational nurse (LVN) by the State of  
10 California and has held this license since May 2009. Plaintiff began working for Defendants on  
11 or around November 2010 as an LVN. She was initially assigned to the Inglewood location until  
12 her transfer to the Harbor City location, 25975 South Normandie Avenue, Harbor City,  
13 California 90710, in or around May 2011 to the pediatrics department.

14 10. Two of Plaintiff's children have medical conditions for which she obtained  
15 FMLA certifications for and submitted to Defendants. One of Plaintiff's children was diagnosed  
16 with diabetes and another child was diagnosed with chronic ashtma. Kaiser Permanente Hospital  
17 (hereinafter "Kaiser") was the healthcare provider for Plaintiff's family, including Plaintiff,  
18 Plaintiff's husband and children, during the time period that Plaintiff was employed with  
19 Defendants. Therefore, it was Defendants' doctors who were aware of Plaintiffs and her  
20 families' medical conditions and completed the FMLA certifications on behalf of Plaintiff and  
21 her children.

22 11. In or around the latter part of 2011, Plaintiff's then one year-old suffered from  
23 health problems related to his asthma. He had been coughing a lot and having difficulties  
24 breathing. Plaintiff spoke to her supervisor, Phyllis Harris (Harris), about her son's disability.  
25 Plaintiff's other son, a three year-old at the time, suffered from diabetes. Plaintiff had also  
26 discussed his disability with Harris. There were times when Plaintiff required intermittent leaves  
27 of a couple of days when her children fell ill. Although doctor's notes were not required under  
28

1 Defendant's policies for various circumstances related to sick leave, Plaintiff would return to the  
2 workplace from a leave of a couple of days and Harris would confront Plaintiff asking for a  
3 doctor's note for doctor's visits for Plaintiff's children. Plaintiff complied with Harris' requests,  
4 even though Harris' requests were in violation of Defendants' policies.

5 12. Plaintiff's husband suffers from chronic back pain, from years of working in the  
6 construction business, and was not employed. He was under medical care concerning  
7 complications with his back. All the while Plaintiff was caring for her family's serious health  
8 conditions, Plaintiff was performing well in her position at Kaiser as an LVN.

9 13. In April 2012, Plaintiff obtained FMLA certification for her son who suffered  
10 from asthma. The FMLA certification indicated that he needed intermittent care from Plaintiff  
11 and that Plaintiff should be expected to take time off to care for him. The FMLA documents  
12 were submitted to Defendants.

13 14. Plaintiff also received FMLA certification in April 2012 for her son who suffered  
14 from diabetes. The FMLA certification indicated that he also needed intermittent care from  
15 Plaintiff, and Plaintiff should be expected to take off to care for him. The FMLA documents  
16 were submitted to Defendants.

17 15. Throughout her employment at Kaiser in Harbor City, Plaintiff had been having  
18 discussions with Harris about her children's medical conditions, informing Harris for whom she  
19 was taking time off work for, and the reasons why. In addition to taking time off for the medical  
20 conditions indicated in Plaintiff's children's FMLA documents, there were occasions when  
21 Plaintiff's children suffered from other illnesses, including the flu and vomiting. During these  
22 bouts of illnesses of her children, Plaintiff was required to take off time from work to care for  
23 them when necessary. Despite having notified Harris of her children's health conditions, when  
24 Plaintiff requested time off to take her children to the doctor, her requests for accommodation  
25 were denied.

26 16. On various occasions when Plaintiff needed to take off time to care for her  
27 children, Harris would interrogate Plaintiff. Harris would question Plaintiff about her children's  
28

1 illnesses and their conditions. Harris would sarcastically say, "What's going on today? Which  
2 one are you calling out for, your diabetic son or the one who has asthma?" Harris would  
3 interrogate Plaintiff, "Well your husband is not able to take care of them?" Plaintiff repeatedly  
4 explained to Harris that her husband suffered from his own serious health condition and was  
5 under doctor's care because of chronic back pain. Harris's excuse for denying Plaintiff's  
6 requests for time off were due to "scheduling reasons", even when Plaintiff submitted her  
7 requests several weeks in advance. Harris and Clerical Supervisor, Sandra Romero (Romero),  
8 would complete and post schedules weekly, in violation of the collective bargaining agreement,  
9 rather than give the proper notice.

10 17. In May 2012, Plaintiff's oldest child became ill. She had a discussion with Harris  
11 notifying her that it was neither of her two sons with asthma or diabetes that she was calling out  
12 sick for, but instead for Plaintiff's oldest child who was ill. Harris appeared irritated.

13 18. Even after Plaintiff had previously notified Harris and Romero that she had  
14 obtained FMLA for her two sons's related to asthma and diabetes, Plaintiff's requests for time  
15 off pertaining to them were denied. Both Harris and Romero would tell Plaintiff that her  
16 requests were denied due to staffing reasons. Harris and Romero threatened Plaintiff that if she  
17 took a day off for FMLA, after that they had denied her request, that they would classify Plaintiff  
18 as insubordinate and subject Plaintiff to discipline. Therefore, Plaintiff became torn between  
19 keeping her job and exercising her right to take protected leaves for herself and her family.

20 19. Combined with Harris' and Romero's threats were occasions when Plaintiff paged  
21 Harris and Romero notifying them that she needed to take off time for her children's illness, was  
22 their constant interrogation of Plaintiff as if she was lying about her need for time off when  
23 requested. Plaintiff received sarcastic comments such as "Who are you calling out sick for  
24 now?" When Plaintiff notified Harris that she had to take her husband to doctor's appointments  
25 for his back, Harris would ask Plaintiff "Why?". When Plaintiff reiterated that her husband had a  
26 chronic back problem, Harris would follow with another question, "Oh he's not able to drive  
27 himself?", usually followed by a denial of her request for time off.

28

1           20. Both Harris and Romero would ask for doctor's notes from Plaintiff. If Plaintiff  
2 took the day off for one of her children's illnesses or a doctor's appointment, Plaintiff returned to  
3 the workplace with Harris and Romero asking "Where is your doctor's note?" or "You need to  
4 watch how often you call out using CESLA?" On a particular occasion, Romero called Plaintiff  
5 into her office and told Plaintiff that "people were watching" Plaintiff to see if there are  
6 "patterns" for when Plaintiff was taking time off. Plaintiff informed Romero that she had five  
7 children and they randomly get ill beyond Plaintiff's control. Romero told Plaintiff to watch the  
8 "pattern" because "they" are looking to write you up, "they are saying you are having these sick  
9 calls too often".

10           21. After exercising her right to take protected leaves, Plaintiff's received paychecks  
11 with errors. Plaintiff had complained to Harris about her paycheck, and Romero's failure to  
12 process it correctly. Though Romero had the ability to immediately correct a paycheck error, it  
13 often took weeks for Plaintiff's paycheck to be corrected and for Plaintiff to receive payment.  
14 Plaintiff was thereafter met with objection from Romero who confronted Plaintiff stating "I am a  
15 supervisor and if you have concerns give them to me and if I cannot address them, I will give  
16 them to Phyllis". Romero would begrudgingly fix Plaintiff's paycheck, but would ensure it took  
17 an unreasonable period of time.

18           22. With five children, ages ranging from two to fourteen, there were a number of  
19 health issues that arose while Plaintiff was employed with Defendant. Plaintiff's children would  
20 get the flu. If one child contracts the flu, oftentimes it would infect the other children in the  
21 home. In May 2012, Plaintiff's oldest child was under medical care due to Kaiser placing him on  
22 a Scabies watch. Plaintiff was required to sanitize her entire home, and safeguard her children,  
23 since Scabies is highly contagious. When Plaintiff spoke to Romero about this, and notified  
24 Romero about the Scabies watch, Romero was unsympathetic about Plaintiff's situation and  
25 request for accommodation.

26           23. In early June 2012, Plaintiff became ill and was required to undergo emergency  
27 surgery for appendicitis. During her employment, Plaintiff had also previously disclosed that she  
28

1 had Wolf Parkinson White Syndrome and a heart condition to her supervisor. The surgery was  
2 performed at Kaiser, resulting in Plaintiff being out of work post surgery for approximately two  
3 weeks. Defendant did not approve the time off taken by Plaintiff under CFRA. Plaintiff ended  
4 up using her accumulated paid sick leave for the time taken for her surgery and post operative  
5 recovery. At the time Plaintiff was admitted to Kaiser for surgery, she was the sole financial  
6 provider of her family. She had no prior writes ups for attendance and her performance  
7 evaluations met expectations.

8 24. In early June 2012 before being hospitalized for appendicitis, Plaintiff requested  
9 to take her husband to the doctor for a June 2012 appointment. This request was denied,  
10 requiring that Plaintiff's husband reschedule his doctor's appointment to July 11, 2012. Plaintiff  
11 then promptly gave several weeks notice to Defendants of her need to take off July 11, 2012 and  
12 indicated that her husband suffered from chronic pain/arthritis of the spine.

13 25. On July 6, 2012, approximately two weeks after Plaintiff had returned to work  
14 following her surgery, she learned that her request to take off July 11, 2012 to take her husband  
15 to the doctor was denied by Romero. When Plaintiff asked Romero why the request was denied,  
16 Romero stated that someone with more seniority had requested the date before Plaintiff did.  
17 Plaintiff then checked with the two coworkers who had the day off and both denied having  
18 requested that day off. Contrary to what Romero represented, one of Plaintiff's coworker's was  
19 willing to switch days with Plaintiff, so that Plaintiff could take her husband to the doctor. When  
20 Plaintiff went back to Romero's office and disclosed the conversation she had just had with her  
21 two coworkers, Romero then changed her story stating that Plaintiff could not have the day off to  
22 take her husband to the doctor because of a "mandatory meeting".

23 26. Plaintiff questioned Romero on how there could be a mandatory meeting if two  
24 people were scheduled off for the day. When Plaintiff further questioned Romero about the  
25 "mandatory meeting", Romero said the meeting was about people signing the manual log all too  
26 often. Plaintiff asked Romero again if she could have the day off, to which Romero then replied  
27 that Plaintiff had to be present at the meeting and that the meeting is between "me, you and  
28

Phyllis". Later that day, Plaintiff inquired with Romero as to the reason for the "mandatory meeting", and Romero would offer no further explanation. Romero became irritated with Plaintiff's inquiries, and told Plaintiff that Harris was on vacation, and that while Harris was on vacation, Romero was the supervisor, and that if there was "something urgent" that Plaintiff needed, that Romero could page Harris. Even though Plaintiff insisted the matter was "urgent" and repeatedly asked Romero to contact Harris, Romero refused, knowing that Plaintiff needed an accommodation to take her husband to the doctor, and that Romero had denied Plaintiff's earlier request to have the day off to take her husband to the doctor.

27. On July 11, 2012, when Plaintiff arrived to work, she was approached by Romero who asked Plaintiff if she had a union representative and notified Plaintiff that she needed one for a meeting that was going to occur that day. A union representative was notified to attend the meeting whom Plaintiff had previously lodged discrimination complaints with about Harris. When Plaintiff arrived to the meeting later that day with her union representative, she was notified that Harris and Romero were accusing Plaintiff of a time card violation that allegedly had occurred on May 27, 2012. Neither Romero nor Harris provided an explanation of why Plaintiff was being presented with the alleged time card violation several weeks after its occurrence. Further, neither Harris nor Romero offered an explanation of why the alleged time card violation was being presented after Plaintiff's surgery and request for accommodation to take her husband to the doctor. Plaintiff complained about Defendant's discriminatory treatment against her.

28. Though Plaintiff denied the allegations against her concerning the time card violation, Plaintiff's employment was suspended on July 11, 2012 and a Level 5 Corrective Action was issued to her on August 9, 2012, resulting in Plaintiff's termination. Defendants bypassed Correction Action Levels 1-4, in violation of policy, and terminated Plaintiff's employment.



FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Discrimination Based on Disability and Failure to Accommodate in Violation of the Fair  
Employment and Housing Act Against All Defendants)

29. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 28 inclusive,  
of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

30. Defendant is an employer that regularly employs five (5) or more persons.

31. The unlawful practices complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County,  
California.

32. The Plaintiff was subjected to a continuous pattern of discrimination by  
Defendant and a hostile work environment based on her disability and medical condition, as well  
as her children's and husband's. This conduct comprised a pattern and practice of discrimination  
against Plaintiff.

33. During her employment with Defendant, Plaintiff, as well as her children and  
husband, suffered from a physical disability due to her medical condition. Defendants were  
aware of Plaintiff's disability and her husband's and children's, because Defendants were  
notified by Plaintiff.

34. Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff by failing to provide reasonable  
accommodations to Plaintiff.

35. The acts committed by Defendants, including Defendants' failure to accommodate  
Plaintiff's disability, her children's and husband's, and their ultimate termination of Plaintiff,  
constitutes unlawful disability discrimination in violation of the provisions of California's Fair  
Employment and Housing Act.

36. As a proximate result of Defendants' discriminatory actions against Plaintiff, as  
alleged above, Plaintiff has been harmed in that she has suffered the loss of wages, benefits, and  
additional amounts of money she would have received if she had not been terminated from her  
employment with Defendant. As a result of such discrimination and consequent harm, Plaintiff.

1 has suffered damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the Court, according  
2 to proof at time of trial.

3 37. As a further proximate result of Defendants' discriminatory actions against  
4 Plaintiff, Plaintiff has been harmed in that she has suffered extreme and continuing humiliation,  
5 mental anguish and emotional distress. As a result of such discrimination and consequent harm,  
6 Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the Court,  
7 according to proof at time of trial.

8 38. The above recited actions of Defendants in discriminating against Plaintiff and  
9 failure to accommodate Plaintiff were done with malice, fraud and/or oppression and in reckless  
10 disregard of the rights of Plaintiff under the Fair Employment and Housing Act. Plaintiff is  
11 informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the discriminatory acts taken towards her  
12 were carried out by managing agents of Defendants with the ratification and approval of officers  
13 and/or managing agents of Defendants in a malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner in order  
14 to harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby causing  
15 his unjust hardship, humiliation and/or emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable, and  
16 justifies an award of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter them  
17 from engaging in such conduct again in the future, in an amount according to proof at time of  
18 trial.

19 39. Within one year of the date of the discrimination alleged herein, Plaintiff filed  
20 charges of discrimination with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing  
21 ("DFEH").

22 40. The DFEH has issued to Plaintiff a Notice to Complainant of Right to Sue based  
23 on his charges of discrimination against Defendant.

24 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

25 (For Failure to Engage in Interactive Process in Violation of the Fair Employment and  
26 Housing Act Against All Defendants)

1 41. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 40 inclusive,  
2 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

3 42. Defendant is an employer that regularly employs five (5) or more persons.

4 43. The unlawful practices complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County,  
5 California.

6 44. Having been placed on notice of Plaintiff's medical condition and disability, in  
7 addition to her children's and husband's, and Plaintiff's request for a medical leave associated  
8 with her disability, Defendant had an affirmative duty to engage in a timely, good faith,  
9 interactive process with the Plaintiff, in order to determine effective reasonable accommodations.  
10 Defendant's failure to comply with this mandatory duty and thereby violated Plaintiff's rights  
11 under the FEHA.

12 45. Moreover, despite Plaintiff's efforts to seek accommodations, by way of bringing  
13 her disability and the serious health conditions of her children and husband to the attention of  
14 human resources, and notifying human resources of her prescribed medical leave of absence for  
15 her surgery and the FMLA certifications of herself and her children, Defendant failed to fulfill its  
16 affirmative duty to engage in the mandatory interactive process, in a timely, good-faith manner,  
17 or at all, in violation of Government Code Section 12940(n).

18 46. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, as alleged above,  
19 Plaintiff has been harmed in that she has suffered the loss of wages, benefits, and additional  
20 amounts of money she would have received if she had not been terminated from her employment  
21 with Defendant. As a result of such conduct and consequent harm, Plaintiff has suffered  
22 economic damages in an amount Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount in excess of the  
23 minimum jurisdiction of the Court, according to proof at time of trial.

24 47. As a further proximate result of Defendants' discrimination against Plaintiff,  
25 Plaintiff has been harmed in that she has suffered extreme and continuing humiliation, mental  
26 anguish and emotional distress. As a result of such discrimination and consequent harm,  
27  
28

1 Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the Court,  
2 according to proof at time of trial.

3 48. The above recited actions of Defendants in discriminating against Plaintiff and  
4 failing to engage in the interactive process were done with malice, fraud and/or oppression and in  
5 reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff under the Fair Employment and Housing Act.  
6 Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the discriminatory conduct taken  
7 towards her were carried out by managing agents of Defendants and/or with the ratification and  
8 approval of officers and/or managing agents of Defendants in a malicious, oppressive and  
9 fraudulent manner in order to harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and conscious disregard of  
10 Plaintiff's rights, thereby causing him unjust hardship, humiliation and/or emotional distress.  
11 Such conduct was despicable, and justifies an award of punitive damages against Defendants in  
12 an amount sufficient to deter them from engaging in such conduct again in the future, in an  
13 amount according to proof at time of trial.

14 49. Within one year of the date of the discrimination alleged herein, Plaintiff filed a  
15 charge of harassment with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing  
16 ("DFEH").

17 50. The DFEH has issued to Plaintiff a Notice to Complainant of Right to Sue based  
18 on his charges of discrimination against Defendants.

19 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

20 (For Harassment in Violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act Against All Defendants)

21 51. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 50, inclusive,  
22 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

23 52. Defendant is an employer that regularly employs five (5) or more persons.

24 53. The unlawful practices complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County,  
25 California.

26 54. Plaintiff was subjected to a continuous pattern of harassment by Defendant and a  
27 hostile work environment based on her serious health condition, her children's serious health

1 condition and her husband's; Plaintiff taking time off to care for her serious health condition, her  
2 children's serious health condition and her husband's; and Plaintiff complaining about unlawful  
3 discrimination, harassment and retaliation.

4 55. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, Plaintiff has been  
5 harmed in that she has suffered economic losses and extreme and continuing humiliation, mental  
6 anguish and emotional distress.

7 56. The above recited actions of Defendants in harassing Plaintiff were done with  
8 malice, fraud and/or oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff under the Fair  
9 Employment and Housing Act. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that  
10 the harassing conduct taken towards her was carried out by managing agents of Defendants,  
11 and/or with the ratification and approval of officers and/or managing agents of Defendants in a  
12 malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner in order to harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and  
13 conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby causing her unjust hardship, humiliation and/or  
14 emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable, and justifies an award of punitive damages  
15 against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter them from engaging in such conduct again in  
16 the future, in an amount according to proof at time of trial.

17 57. Within one year of the date of the harassment alleged herein, Plaintiff filed a  
18 charge of harassment with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing  
19 ("DFEH").

20 58. The DFEH has issued to Plaintiff a Notice to Complainant of Right to Sue based  
21 on his charges of harassment against Defendants.

#### 22 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

23 (For Retaliation in Violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act Against All Defendants)

24 59. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 58 inclusive,  
25 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

26 60. Defendant is an employer that regularly employs five (5) or more persons.  
27  
28

61. The unlawful practices complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County, California.

62. Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff: (1) because of her serious health condition, her children's serious health condition and her husband's, (2) for requesting reasonable accommodations for her serious health condition, her children's serious health condition and her husband's, (3) for her association with her disabled children and husband, (4) because she took leave to care for her serious health condition, her children's serious health condition and her husband's, (5) because Plaintiff asserted her rights under the California Family Rights Act, (6) because she protested discrimination, harassment and retaliation by her supervisor, and (7) for making internal complaints and grievances against Defendant. Said conduct violated Government Code Sections 12940 and 12945.2. Rather than providing Plaintiff reasonable accommodations and engaging in the interactive process regarding her serious health condition, her children's serious health condition and her husband's, Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff, and terminated her employment.

63. As a proximate result of Defendants' retaliation against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has been harmed in that she has suffered the loss of wages, benefits, and additional amounts of money she would have received if she had not been terminated from her employment with Defendant. As a result of such retaliation and consequent harm, Plaintiff has suffered economic damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the Court, according to proof at time of trial.

64. As a further proximate result of Defendants' retaliation against Plaintiff, Plaintiff has been harmed in that she has suffered extreme and continuing humiliation, mental anguish and emotional distress. As a result of such retaliation and consequent harm, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the Court, according to proof at time of trial.

65. The above recited actions of Defendants in retaliating against Plaintiff were done with malice, fraud and/or oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff under the

1 Fair Employment and Housing Act. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges  
2 that the retaliatory conduct taken towards her were carried out by managing agents of Defendants  
3 and/or with the ratification and approval of officers and/or managing agents of Defendants in a  
4 malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner in order to harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and  
5 conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby causing him unjust hardship, humiliation and/or  
6 emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable, and justifies an award of punitive damages  
7 against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter them from engaging in such conduct again in  
8 the future, in an amount according to proof at time of trial.

9 66. Within one year of the date of the retaliation alleged herein, Plaintiff filed a  
10 charge of retaliation with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing  
11 ("DFEH").

12 67. The DFEH has issued to Plaintiff a Notice to Complainant of Right to Sue based  
13 on his charges of retaliation against Defendants.

14 FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

15 (For Violation of California Family Rights Act Against All Defendants)

16 68. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 67 inclusive,  
17 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

18 69. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants are covered employers, as that  
19 term is defined in Government Code §12945.2(c)(2), as well as applicable interpretive  
20 regulations.

21 70. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants for more than one year, and had in excess  
22 of 1250 hours of service during the 12 month period immediately preceding his medical leave.

23 71. Plaintiff was harassed and retaliated against because she took leave to care for her  
24 serious health condition, her children's serious health condition, and her husband's, and in  
25 retaliation for asserting her right to such leaves under California law. Defendants' conduct  
26 violated the California Family Rights Act, codified at Government Code §12945.2.

1           72. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, as alleged above,  
2 Plaintiff has been harmed in that she has suffered the loss of wages, benefits, and additional  
3 amounts of money she would have received if she had not been terminated from her employment  
4 with Defendant. As a result of such retaliation and consequent harm, Plaintiff has suffered  
5 economic damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the Court, according  
6 to proof at time of trial.

7           73. As a further proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, Plaintiff  
8 has been harmed in that she has suffered extreme and continuing humiliation, mental anguish and  
9 emotional distress. As a result of such retaliation and consequent harm, Plaintiff has suffered  
10 damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the Court, according to proof at  
11 time of trial.

12           74. The above recited actions of Defendants in harassing and retaliating against  
13 Plaintiff because she exercised her right to leave under California's Family Rights Act were done  
14 with malice, fraud and/or oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff under the  
15 California Family Rights Act. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the  
16 retaliatory conduct taken towards her was carried out by managing agents of Defendants, and/or  
17 with the ratification and approval of officers and/or managing agents of Defendants in a  
18 malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner in order to harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and  
19 conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby causing her unjust hardship, humiliation and/or  
20 emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable, and justifies an award of punitive damages  
21 against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter them from engaging in such conduct again in  
22 the future, in an amount according to proof at time of trial.

23           75. Within one year of the date of the retaliation alleged herein, Plaintiff filed a  
24 charge of violation of the California Family Rights Act with the California Department of Fair  
25 Employment and Housing ("DFEH").

26           76. The DFEH has issued to Plaintiff a Notice to Complainant of Right to Sue based  
27 on her charges of violation of the California Family Rights Act against Defendants.  
28



SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Associational Discrimination in Violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act Against  
All Defendants)

77. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 76 , inclusive,  
of this Complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set  
forth.

78. Defendant is an employer that regularly employs five (5) or more persons.

79. The unlawful practices complained of occurred in Los Angeles County,  
California.

80. Defendant discriminated against, harassed, and retaliated against Plaintiff because  
of her association with her children and her husband, who had serious health conditions, and her  
need to take protected leaves of absence associated with them.

81. The above described conduct of Defendant in discriminating against, harassing  
and retaliating against Plaintiff violated Government Code Sections 12926 (m) and (n), and  
12940, et seq.

82. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, Plaintiff has been  
harmed in that she has suffered economic losses and extreme and continuing humiliation, mental  
anguish and emotional distress.

83. The above recited actions of Defendants in discriminating against Plaintiff and  
harassing and retaliating against Plaintiff were done with malice, fraud and/or oppression and in  
reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff under the Fair Employment and Housing Act.  
Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the discriminatory, harassing and  
retaliatory conduct taken towards her were carried out by managing agents of Defendants, and/or  
with the ratification and approval of officers and/or managing agents of Defendants in a  
malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner in order to harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and  
conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby causing her unjust hardship, humiliation and/or  
emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable, and justifies an award of punitive damages

1 against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter them from engaging in such conduct again in  
2 the future, in an amount according to proof at time of trial.

3 SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

4 (For Failure to Take All Reasonable Steps Necessary to Prevent Discrimination, Retaliation  
5 and Harassment Against All Defendants)

6 84. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 83 inclusive,  
7 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

8 85. Defendants failed to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent discrimination,  
9 retaliation and harassment from occurring. Defendants' conduct violated the provisions of  
10 Government Code Sections 12940 (k).

11 86. The unlawful practices complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County,  
12 California.

13 87. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, as alleged above, Plaintiff has been  
14 harmed in that she has suffered the loss of wages, benefits, and additional amounts of money she  
15 would have received if she had not been terminated from her employment with Defendant. As a  
16 result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered economic damages in an amount in excess of  
17 the minimum jurisdiction of the Court, according to proof at time of trial.

18 88. As a further proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, Plaintiff  
19 has been harmed in that she has suffered extreme and continuing humiliation, mental anguish and  
20 emotional distress. As a result of such conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount in  
21 excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the Court, according to proof at time of trial.

22 89. The above recited actions of Defendants were done with malice, fraud and/or  
23 oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff under the Fair Employment and  
24 Housing Act. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that managing agents of  
25 Defendant willfully failed and refused to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent  
26 discrimination and harassment in a malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner in order to harm  
27 Plaintiff, or with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby causing her unjust

1 hardship, humiliation and/or emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable and justifies an  
2 award of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter them from  
3 engaging in such conduct again in the future, in an amount according to proof at time of trial.

4 EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

5 (For Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress Against All Defendants)

6 90. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 89, inclusive,  
7 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

8 91. The following conduct by the defendants was extreme and outrageous, and an  
9 abuse of the authority and position of the defendants: (1) discriminating against Plaintiff because  
10 of her serious health condition, her children's serious health condition and her husband's; (2)  
11 discriminating against Plaintiff because she took time off for her own serious health condition,  
12 her children's serious health condition and her husband's; (3) harassing and retaliating against  
13 Plaintiff because she took protected leaves of absences; and (4) retaliating against Plaintiff for  
14 protesting the discrimination, retaliation and harassment.

15 92. Said conduct was outside the scope of the compensation bargain between Plaintiff  
16 and Defendants, and was motivated by personal enmity against Plaintiff because of the exercise  
17 by Plaintiff of her right to take leave to care for her serious health condition, her children's  
18 serious health condition and her husband's, and her opposition to unlawful discrimination,  
19 harassment and retaliation by Defendants.

20 93. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, Plaintiff has been  
21 harmed in that she has suffered economic losses and extreme and continuing humiliation, mental  
22 anguish and emotional distress.

23 94. Said conduct by Defendants was knowing, intentional and willful, and done with a  
24 reckless disregard of the probability of causing Plaintiff emotional distress.

25 95. The above recited actions of Defendants were done with malice, fraud and/or  
26 oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes  
27 and on that basis alleges that the discriminatory and retaliatory acts taken towards her were  
28

1 carried out by managing agents of Defendants, and/or with the ratification and approval of  
2 officers and/or managing agents of Defendants, in a malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner  
3 in order to harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby  
4 causing her unjust hardship, humiliation and/or emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable  
5 and justifies an award of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter  
6 them from engaging in such conduct again in the future, in an amount according to proof at time  
7 of trial.

8 NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

9 (For Negligence/Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress Against All Defendants)

10 96. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 95 inclusive,  
11 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

12 97. Defendants owed to Plaintiff, as her employer, a duty not to allow the  
13 discriminatory conduct of its employees towards Plaintiff. Defendant breached this duty by  
14 allowing such conduct as alleged herein above.

15 98. Defendant knew or should have known of the discriminatory conduct against  
16 Plaintiff, yet negligently hired, supervised and retained employees who participated in such  
17 conduct. Further, Defendant did not take steps to insure that said employee's conduct did not  
18 continue to occur or would not occur.

19 99. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, Plaintiff has been  
20 harmed in that she has suffered economic losses and extreme and continuing humiliation, mental  
21 anguish and emotional distress.

22 100. The above recited actions of Defendants were done with malice, fraud and/or  
23 oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes  
24 and on that basis alleges that the discriminatory and retaliatory acts taken towards her were  
25 carried out by managing agents of Defendants, and/or with the ratification and approval of  
26 officers and/or managing agents of Defendants, in a malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner  
27 in order to harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby  
28

1 causing her unjust hardship, humiliation and/or emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable  
2 and justifies an award of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter  
3 them from engaging in such conduct again in the future, in an amount according to proof at time  
4 of trial.

5 TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

6 (For Violation of Labor Code Section 233 Against All Defendants)

7 101. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 100, inclusive,  
8 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

9 102. Under *Labor Code Section 233*, "Kin Care", allows employees to use up to half of  
10 their accrued sick leave benefits to care for a sick family member, including a child, parent,  
11 spouse or registered domestic partner.

12 103. Plaintiff was retaliated for taking time off to care for her children's serious health  
13 condition.

14 104. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct against Plaintiff, Plaintiff has been  
15 harmed in that she has suffered economic losses and extreme and continuing humiliation, mental  
16 anguish and emotional distress.

17 ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

18 (Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy Against All Defendants)

19 105. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 104 inclusive,  
20 of this complaint, and by reference thereto, incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth.

21 106. In failing to reasonably accommodate Plaintiff's serious health condition, failing  
22 to engage in a good faith, interactive process, and terminating Plaintiff in retaliation for  
23 requesting a reasonable accommodations for her own serious health conditions, as well as her  
24 children's and husband's, Defendants violated various laws prohibiting discrimination and  
25 retaliation including, but not limited to, California Government Code §§12940, et seq.

26 107. In terminating, and discriminating, harassing and retaliating against, Plaintiff  
27 because of her serious health condition, her children's serious health condition and her  
28

1 husband's, Defendants violated the public policy of the State of California, and various laws  
2 prohibiting discrimination and retaliation, including, but not limited to California Government  
3 Code §§12940, et seq.

4 108. In terminating, and discriminating, harassing and retaliating against Plaintiff,  
5 because of Plaintiff's protests and opposition to unlawful discrimination, harassment and  
6 retaliation by Defendants, Defendants violated the public policy of the State of California, and  
7 various laws prohibiting discrimination and retaliation, including, but not limited to California  
8 Government Code §§12940, et seq.

9 109. In terminating, and discriminating, harassing and retaliating against Plaintiff  
10 because she took leave protected leaves of absence, Defendants violated various laws prohibiting  
11 discrimination and retaliation including, but not limited to, Government Code §§ 12940 and  
12 12945.2 et seq.

13 110. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, as alleged above, Plaintiff has been  
14 harmed in that she has suffered the loss of wages, benefits and additional amounts of money she  
15 would have received if she had not been terminated from her position with Defendant, in an  
16 amount according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint  
17 when the exact amount of damages has been ascertained, or will prove the same at time of trial.

18 111. As a further proximate result of Defendants' actions as alleged hereinabove,  
19 Plaintiff has been harmed in that she has suffered extreme and continuing humiliation, mental  
20 anguish and emotional distress, in an amount an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of  
21 the Court, according to proof at time of trial.

22 112. The above recited actions of Defendants were committed with malice, fraud  
23 and/or oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and  
24 believes and on that basis alleges that the acts alleged herein taken towards her were carried out  
25 by managing agents of Defendants and/or with the ratification and approval of officers and/or  
26 managing agents of Defendants in a malicious, oppressive and fraudulent manner in order to  
27 harm Plaintiff, or with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, thereby causing her  
28

1 unjust hardship, humiliation and/or emotional distress. Such conduct was despicable and  
2 justifies an award of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter them  
3 from engaging in such conduct again in the future, in an amount according to proof at time of  
4 trial.

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as  
6 follows:

- 7 1. Loss of earnings, including commissions and bonuses, and back pay including any  
8 increased tax liability thereon;
- 9 2. Loss of future earnings (including commissions and bonuses), promotions,  
10 opportunities to promote, front pay and all other employment benefits, such as pension rights;
- 11 3. All other lost pension, insurance and other employment benefits;
- 12 4. Medical, hospital and psychological bills, including past, present and future bills;
- 13 5. General damages (pain, suffering, emotional distress and other non economic  
14 damages);
- 15 6. Punitive Damages where applicable;
- 16 7. Litigation costs;
- 17 8. Attorneys fees;
- 18 9. Civil Penalties as authorized by statutes set out herein above;
- 19 10. Interest;
- 20 11. Damages for increased income tax payments;
- 21 12. Injunctive relief; and
- 22 13. Any other relief or damages allowed by law, or statutes not set out above and such  
23 further relief as the Court deems just and proper at conclusion of trial.

24 DATED: May 7, 2013

LAW OFFICE OF TWILA S. WHITE

25  
26  
27 TWILA S. WHITE  
Attorney for Plaintiff MICALAH TAFI

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demands a jury trial.

DATED: May 7, 2013 LAW OFFICE OF TWILA S. WHITE

  
TWILA S. WHITE  
Attorney for Plaintiff MICAIAH TAFAL

05/08/2013



SHORT TITLE: Micaiah Tafal v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.

CASE NUMBER

**CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND  
STATEMENT OF LOCATION  
(CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)**

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:

JURY TRIAL? ☒ YES CLASS ACTION? ☐ YES LIMITED CASE? ☐ YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL ☐ HOURS/ ☒ DAYS

Item II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):

**Step 1:** After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.

**Step 2:** Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case.

**Step 3:** In Column C, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0.

**Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)**

1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district.
2. May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).
3. Location where cause of action arose.
4. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.
5. Location where performance required or defendant resides.
6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.
7. Location where petitioner resides.
8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
9. Location where one or more of the parties reside.
10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office

**Step 4:** Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category/No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons (See Step 3 Above)
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death - Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6070 Asbestos Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
	Product Liability (24)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons	1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4.
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)	1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress	1., 3.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4.

SHORT TITLE:

Micaiah Tafai v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.

CASE NUMBER

Non-Personal Injury/Property  
Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

Employment

Contract

Real Property

Unlawful Detainer

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons (See Step 3 Above)
Business Tort (07)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
Civil Rights (08)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Defamation (13)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6017 Legal Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
Other (35)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2., 3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case <input type="checkbox"/> A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) <input type="checkbox"/> A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach - Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) <input type="checkbox"/> A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) <input type="checkbox"/> A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
Insurance Coverage (18)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Other Contract (37)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6009 Contractual Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> A6031 Tortious Interference <input type="checkbox"/> A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation      Number of parcels _____	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Other Real Property (26)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> A6032 Quiet Title <input type="checkbox"/> A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE:

Micalah Tafai v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.

CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of A010 (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons (See Step 2 Above)
Judicial Review	Asset Forfeiture (05)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
	Petition re Arbitration (11)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
	Writ of Mandate (02)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus <input type="checkbox"/> A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter <input type="checkbox"/> A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
	Construction Defect (10)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6008 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
	Securities Litigation (28)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6141 Sister State Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> A6160 Abstract of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) <input type="checkbox"/> A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) <input type="checkbox"/> A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax <input type="checkbox"/> A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8., 9.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	RICO (27)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6030 Declaratory Relief Only <input type="checkbox"/> A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) <input type="checkbox"/> A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) <input type="checkbox"/> A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6121 Civil Harassment <input type="checkbox"/> A6123 Workplace Harassment <input type="checkbox"/> A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case <input type="checkbox"/> A6190 Election Contest <input type="checkbox"/> A6110 Petition for Change of Name <input type="checkbox"/> A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law <input type="checkbox"/> A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8. 2., 9.

SHORT TITLE:

Micalah Tafal v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.

CASE NUMBER

**Item III. Statement of Location:** Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other circumstance indicated in Item II., Step 3 on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.

<b>REASON:</b> Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.  <input type="checkbox"/> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 7. <input type="checkbox"/> 8. <input type="checkbox"/> 9. <input type="checkbox"/> 10.			<b>ADDRESS:</b> 25975 South Normandie Avenue Harbor City, CA 90710
<b>CITY:</b> Harbor City	<b>STATE:</b> CA	<b>ZIP CODE:</b> 90710	

**Item IV. Declaration of Assignment:** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that the above-entitled matter is properly filed for assignment to the Los Angeles courthouse in the Central District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)].

Dated: May 7, 2013

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

**PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:**

1. Original Complaint or Petition.
2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
4. Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.

ORIGINAL

CM-010

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Twila S. White State Bar #207424 LAW OFFICE OF TWILA S. WHITE 6101 West Centinela Ave. Suite 360 Culver City, CA 90230 TELEPHONE NO.: (213) 381-8749 FAX NO.: (213) 381-8799 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Micaiah Tafai		FILED ONLY SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  MAY 03 2013  John A. [Signature] Executive Officer/Clerk By [Signature] Deputy INPTON SMO-PD17
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los Angeles STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90012 BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk		CASE NUMBER: <b>BC507944</b>  JUDGE: DEPT:
CASE NAME: Micaiah Tafai v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.		
<b>CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Unlimited</b> (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000) <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Limited</b> (Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)		<b>Complex Case Designation</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Counter <input type="checkbox"/> Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)

Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2).

1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:
- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Auto Tort</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Auto (22)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Uninsured motorist (46)<br><b>Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Asbestos (04)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Product liability (24)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Medical malpractice (45)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other PI/PD/WD (23)<br><b>Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Business tort/unfair business practice (07)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Civil rights (08)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Defamation (13)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Fraud (16)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property (19)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Professional negligence (25)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)<br><b>Employment</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wrongful termination (36)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other employment (15) | <b>Contract</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Breach of contract/warranty (06)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Rule 3.740 collections (09)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other collections (09)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage (18)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other contract (37)<br><b>Real Property</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Eminent domain/inverse condemnation (14)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful eviction (33)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other real property (26)<br><b>Unlawful Detainer</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (31)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Residential (32)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Drugs (38)<br><b>Judicial Review</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Asset forfeiture (05)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Petition re: arbitration award (11)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Writ of mandate (02)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other judicial review (39) | <b>Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation</b><br>(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Construction defect (10)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Mass tort (40)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Securities litigation (28)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/Toxic tort (30)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41)<br><b>Enforcement of Judgment</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of judgment (20)<br><b>Miscellaneous Civil Complaint</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> RICO (27)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other complaint (not specified above) (42)<br><b>Miscellaneous Civil Petition</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Partnership and corporate governance (21)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other petition (not specified above) (43) |
|---|--|---|
2. This case ☐ is ☒ is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of separately represented parties   | d. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of witnesses  |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve | e. <input type="checkbox"/> Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court |
| c. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial amount of documentary evidence   | f. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision  |
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. ☒ monetary b. ☐ nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. ☒ punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 11
5. This case ☐ is ☒ is not a class action suit.
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)

Date: May 7, 2013

Twila S. White, State Bar #207424

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)

## NOTICE

- Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result in sanctions.
- File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.
- If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.
- Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

Page 1 of 2

CLERK  
JUDICIAL OFFICE  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

STOS & O YAM

Shirley Ann  
Quinn  
[Signature]  
[Signature]

VE 170000

Courthouse News Service

## INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

**To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers.** If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

**To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases.** A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

**To Parties in Complex Cases.** In complex cases only, parties must also use the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

## CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

## Auto Tort

- Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death
- Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

## Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort

- Asbestos (04)
  - Asbestos Property Damage
  - Asbestos Personal Injury/Wrongful Death
- Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24)
- Medical Malpractice (45)
  - Medical Malpractice—Physicians & Surgeons
  - Other Professional Health Care Malpractice
- Other PI/PD/WD (23)
  - Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)
  - Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism)
  - Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
  - Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress
  - Other PI/PD/WD

## Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

- Business Tort/Unfair Business Practice (07)
- Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil harassment) (08)
- Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13)
- Fraud (16)
- Intellectual Property (19)
- Professional Negligence (25)
  - Legal Malpractice
  - Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)
- Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

## Employment

- Wrongful Termination (36)
- Other Employment (15)

## Contract

- Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)
  - Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)
  - Contract/Warranty Breach—Seller Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)
  - Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty
  - Other Breach of Contract/Warranty
- Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09)
- Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff
- Other Promissory Note/Collections Case
- Insurance Coverage (not provisionally complex) (18)
  - Auto Subrogation
  - Other Coverage
- Other Contract (37)
  - Contractual Fraud
  - Other Contract Dispute

## Real Property

- Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)
- Wrongful Eviction (33)
- Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)
  - Writ of Possession of Real Property
  - Mortgage Foreclosure
  - Quiet Title
  - Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure)

## Unlawful Detainer

- Commercial (31)
- Residential (32)
- Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise, report as Commercial or Residential)

## Judicial Review

- Asset Forfeiture (05)
- Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)
- Writ of Mandate (02)
  - Writ—Administrative Mandamus
  - Writ—Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter
  - Writ—Other Limited Court Case
- Review
  - Other Judicial Review (39)
  - Review of Health Officer Order
  - Notice of Appeal—Labor Commissioner Appeals

## Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400–3.403)

- Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)
- Construction Defect (10)
- Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)
- Securities Litigation (28)
- Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)
- Insurance Coverage Claims (arising from provisionally complex case types listed above) (41)

## Enforcement of Judgment

- Enforcement of Judgment (20)
  - Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)
  - Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)
  - Sister State Judgment
  - Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)
  - Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes
  - Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

## Miscellaneous Civil Complaint RICO (27)

- Other Complaint (not specified above) (42)
  - Declaratory Relief Only
  - Injunctive Relief Only (non-harassment)
  - Mechanics Lien
  - Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)
  - Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)

## Miscellaneous Civil Petition

- Partnership and Corporate Governance (21)
- Other Petition (not specified above) (43)
  - Civil Harassment
  - Workplace Violence
  - Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse
  - Election Contest
  - Petition for Name Change
  - Petition for Relief From Late Claim
  - Other Civil Petition

SHORT TITLE:

Micaiah Tafai v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.

CASE NUMBER

BC507944

**CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND  
STATEMENT OF LOCATION  
(CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)**

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

**Item I.** Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:

JURY TRIAL? ☒ YES CLASS ACTION? ☐ YES LIMITED CASE? ☐ YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL <sup>8</sup> ☐ HOURS/ ☒ DAYS

**Item II.** Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):

**Step 1:** After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column **A**, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.

**Step 2:** Check one Superior Court type of action in Column **B** below which best describes the nature of this case.

**Step 3:** In Column **C**, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0.

**Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. | 6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.    |
| 2. May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).  | 7. Location where petitioner resides.                      |
| 3. Location where cause of action arose.   | 8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly. |
| 4. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.                       | 9. Location where one or more of the parties reside.       |
| 5. Location where performance required or defendant resides.                     | 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office                  |

**Step 4:** Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

	Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of Action (Check only one)	Applicable Reasons (See Step 3 Above)
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death - Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6070 Asbestos Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
	Product Liability (24)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons	1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4.
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)	1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress	1., 3.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4.



SHORT TITLE:

Micaiah Tafai v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.

CASE NUMBER

Non-Personal Injury/Property  
Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

Employment

Contract

Real Property

Unlawful Detainer

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons (See Step 3 Above)
Business Tort (07)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
Civil Rights (08)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Defamation (13)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6017 Legal Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
Other (35)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2,3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case <input type="checkbox"/> A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) <input type="checkbox"/> A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) <input type="checkbox"/> A6018 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) <input type="checkbox"/> A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
Insurance Coverage (18)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Other Contract (37)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6009 Contractual Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> A6031 Tortious Interference <input type="checkbox"/> A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation      Number of parcels _____	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Other Real Property (26)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> A6032 Quiet Title <input type="checkbox"/> A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE:

Micalah Tafai v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.

CASE NUMBER:

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons (See Step 2 Above)
Judicial Review	Asset Forfeiture (05)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
	Petition re Arbitration (11)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
	Writ of Mandate (02)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus <input type="checkbox"/> A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter <input type="checkbox"/> A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
	Construction Defect (10)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6006 Claims involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
	Securities Litigation (28)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6141 Sister State Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> A6160 Abstract of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) <input type="checkbox"/> A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) <input type="checkbox"/> A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax <input type="checkbox"/> A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8., 9.
	RICO (27)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6030 Declaratory Relief Only <input type="checkbox"/> A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) <input type="checkbox"/> A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) <input type="checkbox"/> A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6121 Civil Harassment <input type="checkbox"/> A6123 Workplace Harassment <input type="checkbox"/> A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case <input type="checkbox"/> A6190 Election Contest <input type="checkbox"/> A6110 Petition for Change of Name <input type="checkbox"/> A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law <input type="checkbox"/> A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8. 2., 9.

SHORT TITLE:

Micalah Tafai v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., et als.

CASE NUMBER

**Item III. Statement of Location:** Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other circumstance indicated in Item II., **Step 3** on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.

<b>REASON:</b> Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.  <input type="checkbox"/> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 7. <input type="checkbox"/> 8. <input type="checkbox"/> 9. <input type="checkbox"/> 10.			<b>ADDRESS:</b> 25875 South Normandie Avenue Harbor City, CA 90710
<b>CITY:</b> Harbor City	<b>STATE:</b> CA	<b>ZIP CODE:</b> 90710	

**Item IV. Declaration of Assignment:** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that the above-entitled matter is properly filed for assignment to the Los Angeles courthouse in the Central District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local Rule 2.0, subs. (b), (c) and (d)].

Dated: May 7, 2013

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

**PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:**

1. Original Complaint or Petition.
2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
4. Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.