PLAINTIFF MARCIA STEIN'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff, MARCIA STEIN, brings this action for multiple violations

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1.1

of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 29 U.S.C. § 1001, et seq. (hereinafter, "ERISA"), the Consolidated Omnibus Budge Reconciliation Act of 1985, codified at 29 U.S.C. § 1166, et seq. ("COBRA"), and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, codified at 29 U.S.C. § 1181, et seq. ("HIPAA"). Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants KAISER

FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC., KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS,

INC. (hereinafter "Hospital"), THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC..

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, AND

**KAISER GROUP** DOCTOR'S) PLAN **MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION** 

(hereinafter these three entities shall collectively referred to as "Medical Group"),

acting by themselves or through their agents, violated certain provisions of ERISA

by refusing to enroll Plaintiff in Defendant's group benefit plans in accordance

with the plan documents and Plantiff's eligibility for such. All Defendants shall

collectively be referenced as "Kaiser." 16

# M. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action 2.1 pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1132(f) in that the Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Section 502(a)(1)(B), 502(c)(1) and 502(a)(3) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 1132(a)(1)(B), 1132(c)(1) and 1132(a)(3), respectively.
- 2.2 This Court has jurisdiction in that Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and the Constitution of the United States.
- 2.3 Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.
- 2.4 This Claim properly lies in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the Court may find Defendants and Plaintiff in this judicial district.

1	2.5 Venue of this action is proper in this Court pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §
2	1132(e)(2) in that the Court may find Defendants within this District and Division.
3	Also, this Claim, as herein alleged, arises from the violations that occurred in this
4	judicial district. Defendants transact business and this Court may find such
5	Defendants in this judicial district. Therefore, venue is proper under 29 U.S.C. §
6	1132(e)(2).
7	III. PARTIES
8	3.1.1 Plaintiff MARCIA STEIN ("Plaintiff"), is a former employee of
9	Defendant Volt Management Corporation. Plaintiff was a participant in the group
10	benefit plan sponsored by Defendants, and, due to the dual and joint nature of her
11	employment, should have also been enrolled in certain other plans. Plaintiff
12	resides in Los Angeles County, California
13	3.1.2 Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC. is a
14	citizen of the State of California with its principal place of business located in
15	Oakland, California.
16	3.1.3 Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS is a citizen of the
17	State of California with its principal place of business located in Oakland,
18	California.
19	3.1.4 Defendant THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC. is a
20	citizen of the State of California with its principal place of business located in
21	Oakland California.
22	3.1.5 Defendant SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL
23	GROUP is a citizen of the State of California with its principal place of business
24	located in Pasadena, California.
25	3.1.6 Defendant KAISER MEDICAL GROUP DOCTORS PLAN is a
26	citizen of the State of California with its principal place of business located in
27	Oakland, California.

3.1.7 The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate,

28

3.2 Secretary of Labor and the Secretary

3.2.1 Although not parties to this Complaint, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Treasury are being served with a copy of this Complaint as required under Section 502(h) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(h).

### IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 4.1 Plaintiff was hired to work for Defendant Kaiser Hospital in 1987. Plaintiff worked for the Hospital as the Director of Medical Records, during which time she reported to the Assistant Hospital Administrator. Plaintiff worked in this role for seven (7) years, and her entire paycheck was charged to the Hospital payroll.
- 4.2 In approximately 1994, the then-Clinic Director of Medical Records quit and Kaiser asked Plaintiff to take over the role of Medical Group Administrator for Clinic Records for the Doctors' Clinic Records. In this role, Plaintiff was to report to the Assistant Medical Group Administrator. Plaintiff was thus an employee of the Medical Group, as well as the Hospital.
- 4.3 From 1994 until her retirement in 2011, Plaintiff worked for both the Medical Group and the Hospital, and divided her time equally between the entities. Plaintiff's salary was paid in part by the Medical Group and in part by the Hospital.
- 4.4 Plaintiff was required to attend all Medical Group Administrator Meetings, create the budget, and supervised all Medical Group Medical Record employees. Simultaneously, Plaintiff reported to the Assistant Hospital Administrator.
  - 4.5 The organizational charts for the Hospital showed Plaintiff on it, and

reporting to the Hospital Assistant Administrator. The organizational charts for the Doctors Medical Group Clinic showed that Plaintiff reported to the Assistant Administrator for the Medical Group.

- 4.6 Plaintiff retired from Kaiser on June 1, 2011.
- 4.7 To date, Plaintiff has only received retirement benefits from the Hospital, and not the Medical Group. Kaiser has refused to provide Plaintiff with the Summary of Plan Benefits for the Medical Group retirement plan.
- 4.8 Plaintiff is informed and believes she is eligible to receive retirement benefits under both the Hospital's retirement plan and the Medical Group's retirement plan, given that she was jointly employed and paid by both entities.

# V. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY FOR MISREPRESENTATIONS

# (Against All Defendants)

- 5.1 Plaintiff realleges the facts, statements and matters set forth in paragraphs 1.1 through 4.8 of this Complaint.
- 5.2 Defendants are fiduciaries of the Plan as contemplated by Section 404 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. \$1,04.
- 5.3 Defendants have certain fiduciary duties to participants of the Plan pursuant to Section 404 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1104, which include, but are not limited to: (i) providing participants with complete and accurate information; and (ii) correcting any misrepresentations made to participants; and (iii) discharging their duties solely in the interest of the participants of the Plan.
- 5.4 Defendants breached their fiduciary duties under Section 404 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1104, by stating to Plaintiff that she was ineligible to participate in the Plan and refusing to allow Plaintiff to participate in the Plan.
- 5.5 Defendants breached their fiduciary duties under Section 404 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1104, by refusing to provide Plaintiff with her election forms and notices as required under COBRA.

1	a plan administrator that fails or refuses to comply with a request for any
2	information that is required to be furnished to a participant under ERISA, shall be
3	personally liable to such participant in the amount of \$100 a day (now increased to
4	\$110), after 30 days from the date of such failure or refusal, and the court may in
5	its discretion order such other relief as it deems proper.
6	VII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR INTERFERENCE OF RIGHTS
7	UNDER ERISA IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 510 OF ERISA
8	(Against All Defendants)
9	7.1 Plaintiff realleges the facts, statements and matters set forth in
10	paragraphs 1.1 through 7.3 of this Complaint.
11	7.2 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Volt acting with and in conjunction
12	with Administrator, violated Section 5100 ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1140, by: (i)
13	refusing to enroll Plaintiff in the Medical Group's Plan in a timely manner and in
14	accordance with the terms of the Ran
15	7.3 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff PRAYS that the Court will do the following
16	pursuant to § 502(a)(3) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(3):

- lowing
  - 7.3.1 Award Plaintiff attorneys fees, court costs and all other reasonable costs incurred for filing this Claim.
  - 7.3.2 Fran Plaintiff such other and further relief, including past and future benefits, as the Court may deem just and proper.

# VIII. ADMINSTRATIVE CONDITIONS PRECEDENT

- Plaintiff realleges the facts, statements and matters set forth in paragraphs 1.1 through 10.5.3 of this Complaint.
- Plaintiff has completed all administrative conditions precedent for the 8.2 violations stated herein.
- Alternatively, Plaintiff contends that to resort to such remedies is futile and exhaustion is not required.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

	Case 2.14-cv-04196 Document 1 Filed 05/30/14 Page 8 018 Page ID #.8
1	// ·
2	
3	
4	
5	IX. JURY TRIAL
6	9.1 Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all violations alleged under Section
7.	510 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1140.
8	
9	Respectfully submitted, DATED: May 30, 2014  THE FIGARL AW FIRM
10 11	Billias, May 50, 2011
12	/s/ Barbara E. Figari
13	
14	BARBARA E. FIGARI, ESQ. Attorney for Plaintiff MARCIA STEIN
15	
16	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
17	Plaintiff Marcia Stein herewith demands a jury trial in this action.
18	
19	Respectfully submitted,
20	DATED: May 30, 2014 THE FIGARI LAW FIRM
21	
22	/s/ Barbara E. Figari
23	BARBARA E. FIGARI, ESQ.
24	Attorney for Plaintiff MARCIA STEIN
25	
26	
27	
28	
	8
	DI ADVETTED MAD CIA CETEDISCICIANEI ADVE EOD DAMACEC