H

Į.

26

27

28

Timothy B. Sottile, Esq. SBN: 127026 Michael F. Baltaxe, Esq. SBN: 129532 Brenda L. Valle, Esq. SBN: 283652

SOTTILE EBALTAXE

4333 Park Terrace Drive, Suite 160 Westlake Village, California 91361

Telephone: (818) 889-0050 Facsimile: (818) 889-6050

Attorneys for Plaintiff DIANNA MARSH

FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles

AUG 22 2014

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DIANNA MARSH, an individual,

Plaintiff,

٧.

business entity, exact form unknown KAISER PERMANENTE SOUTH BAY MEDICAL CENTER, a business entity, exact form unknown; and Does 1 through 100, inclusive,

efendants.

BC 5 5 5 5 4 8

### SOMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:

- 1. DISCRIMINATION BASED ON TO RACE/NATIONAL ORIGIN/ETHNICITY, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, AND DISABILITY IN VIOLATION O FEHA:
- 2. RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF FEHA;
- 3. RETALIATION/ DISCRIMINATION FOR UTILIZING CFRA IN VIOLATION OF FEHA
- 4. FAILURE TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF FEHA;
- 5. TORTUOUS CONSTRUCTIVE TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY A 透
- 6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE M AND REST PERIODS, and?
- 7. FAILURE TO PAY ALLEVAGES DUE, INCLUDING STRAIG TIME AND OVERTIMES

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

- 1 -

့် 23

24⇒25

Plaintiff DIANNA MARSH alleges as follows:

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 1. Plaintiff DIANNA MARSH ("Marsh" or "Plaintiff") is an individual who at all times pertinent to this lawsuit was a resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Plaintiff is entitled to the protections of the Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA") because she is gay [sexual orientation], suffered from a disability as alleged below, is Caucasian (race/ethnicity/national origin) and was on FMLA leave all as pled below.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that the Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS ("KFH") is a business entity, exact form unknown, engaged in engaged in providing medical services to the public.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that the Defendant KAISER PERMANENTE SOUTH BAY MEDICAL CENTER ("KPSBMC") is a business entity, exact form unknown, engaged in providing medical services to the public.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants KFH, KPSBMC, and Does 1-100 are all the after egos of each other in that there is such a unity of interest between the said Defendants that to uphold the fiction of corporate separateness between the said Defendants would be to sanction an injustice against the Plaintiff and others. Said Defendants acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of each other, and carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each are legally attributable to the other. Alternatively, on information and belief, the said Defendants share the same shareholders and directors, the same locations, the same offices, and conducting the same business as each other under the same DBA, so that equity requires the said Defendants be liable for the obligations of each other.
- 5. Plaintiff was at all times relevant employed by the Defendants KFH, KPSBMC and Does 1-100. The Defendants KFH, KPSBMC and Does 1-100 will hereinafter be collectively referred to as the "Employer Defendants" or "KAISER".
  - 6. Plaintiff was at times, including at the time she was forced to resign/retire, employed by the

Employer Defendants at their location at 25975 Normandie Avenue, Harbor City, CA 90710 (hereinafter "the premises"). All the torts and statutory violations alleged below occurred at the premises.

- 7. The Employer Defendants are California employers who employ more than five people, and are accordingly subject to the provisions of FEHA.
- 8. Defendants Does 1 through 100 are sued under fictitious names pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each defendant sued under such fictitious names is in some manner responsible for the wrongs and damages as alleged below, and in so acting was functioning as the agent, servant, manager, supervisor, and/or employee of the Employer Defendants, and in doing the actions mentioned below was acting within the course and scope of his or her authority as such agent, servant.
- 9. Plaintiff was hired by the Employer Defendants in approximately 1998 as a Hospice case manager/nurse. She retained that position until she was forced to quit/retire in September 2013.
- 10. Plaintiff suffered from a physical disability as defined by the Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA") because the had been previously diagnosed with Multiple Sclerosis ("MS"). Plaintiff was diagnosed with MS in 2000. This diagnosis interfered with Plaintiff's major life activities, including but not limited to taking care of herself, engaging in social activities, walking, and working. Plaintiff had a drop foot, secondary to this diagnosis and disability, and was required to wear a special brace.
- Plaintiff would occasionally miss work as a result of the said diagnoses and disability. Plaintiff would take this time as intermittent leave under the California Family Rights Act ("CFRA"). Plaintiff would also periodically receive limitations of not working on call in the evenings or working on weekends. Plaintiff was accommodated until she was moved to the premises in approximately 2010.
- 12. In approximately 2010, Plaintiff was told by Dr. Hayes-Reams that she did not belong at the premises and needed to go back to Downey/Bellflower, that she "did not fit", and that she was not a "team player".

(E)

Ŀ

13. Commencing in approximately December 2010, Plaintiff was told she would no longer be
accommodated and that unless her restrictions or limitations were lifted, she would no longer be
employed by the Employer Defendants. As a result, Plaintiff had her doctors lift her restrictions or
a trial basis.

- 14. In approximately July 2012, Plaintiff filed a written complaint, alleging race, disability and sexual orientation discrimination, to the Employer Defendants (hereinafter "the 20 (Deomplaint"). This was a protected activity:
- 15. Plaintiff, after she engaged in this protected activity, was subjected to retaliation by being suspended for pre textual reasons in January 2013.
- 16. Plaintiff also protested wage and hour violations being engaged in by the Employer Defendants, this was also protected activity. This included but was not limited to, in July 2013, protesting the fact that employees were being told not to take legally mandated breaks.
- 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that this conduct was also undertaken due to Plaintiff's race, disability, and sexual orientation, and for protesting the Employer Defendants' illegal wage policies
- 18. Plaintiff returned from suspension in approximately February 2013. She was then subjected to further retaliation (for filing the 2012 complaint) and discrimination, by being micromanaged, criticized, written up, suspended again, coerced into dropping her discrimination complaint, being given poor assignments, being given poor geographic assignments, and eventually being forced to quit/retire.
- 19) Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that this conduct was also undertaken due to Plaintiff's race, disability, and sexual orientation, and for protesting the Employer Defendants' illegal wage policies.
- 20. Plaintiff then went on a protected leave under the CFRA in March 2013 and she returned in June 2013.
- 21. Plaintiff, when she returned, was subjected to further retaliation and discrimination by being micromanaged, being given geographically undesirable assignments, being unfairly

Ōø

(E)

Li.

criticized, being suspended again, and eventually being forced to quit/retire.

- 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that this conduct was also undertaken due to Plaintiff's race, disability, and sexual orientation, in retaliation for discrimination for accessing CFRA rights, and for protesting the Employer Defendants' illegal wage policies.
- 23. Plaintiff, in her capacity as a registered nurse, was at all times a nonexempt employee as defined by California law, and the California Labor Code. Plaintiff, as a nonexempt employee, was entitled to all the protections of the Labor Code, including being afforded rest breaks, meal breaks, and being paid overtime when she worked overtime hours.
- 24. Plaintiff, during her employment, was required to work "off the clock" and was not paid either straight time or overtime for this off the clock work. The fact that Plaintiff and others were working off the clock was known to the Employer Defendants. Plaintiff was also not paid overtime for all the hours she worked. Plaintiff was also denied legally required rest breaks.
- 25. Plaintiff has duly and timely exhausted her Administrative Remedies by filing charges with the DFEH and receiving Right to Sue Notice.

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

# DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE/NATIONAL ORIGIN/ETHNICITY, SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND DISABILITY IN VIOLATION OF FEHA (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 26. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as though set forth in full herein, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive above.
- 27 Plaintiff is entitled to the protections of the FEHA because she is gay [sexual orientation], suffered from a disability (MS), and is Caucasian [race/ethnicity/national origin].
- 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes that she was repeatedly suspended, was micromanaged, unfairly criticized, written up, suspended again, coerced into dropping her discrimination complaint, given poor assignments, given poor geographic assignments, eventually was forced to quit/retire, and other adverse employment actions taken due to her sexual orientation, disability, and race/ethnicity/national origin.

(E)

N)

N.

29. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that her sexual orientation, disability,

6

7

9.

10

13

14

12

15 16

17

18 19

20

23

 $\odot$ 

Ī'n.

26 27

28

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

### RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF FEHA

### (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as though set forth in full herein, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 35, inclusive above.
- 37. In approximately July 2012, Plaintiff filed a written complaint (the 2012 complaint) alleging race, disability and sexual orientation discrimination to the Employer Defendants. This was a protected activity as defined by the FEHA.
- 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes that after she engaged in said protected activity, and others, she was repeatedly suspended, micromanaged, unfairly criticized, written up, suspended again, coerced into dropping her discrimination complaint, given poor assignments, given poor geographic assignments, eventually was forced to quivretire, and other adverse employment actions in retaliation for engaging in said protected activities.
- 39. The foregoing conduct by the Employer Defendants, and each of them, was in retaliation for Plaintiff protesting violations of the PEHA, and is accordingly a violation of Government Code § 12940(h), and other provisions of the FEHA, which preclude an employer from retaliating against an employee for opposing any practices forbidden under the FEHA.
- 40. As a proximate result of the said violation of FEHA, Plaintiff has suffered mental anguish and emotional suffering in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court and according to proof.
- 41. As a further proximate result of the said violation of FEHA as afore pled, Plaintiff has suffered a loss of tangible employment benefits including lost wages and fringe benefits in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court and according to proof.
- 42. As a further and proximate result of the said violation of FEHA as afore pled, Plaintiff was required to and did seek medical attention, and will need medical attention in the future, all to Plaintiff's damages in a sum according to proof.
  - 43. As a further proximate result of the Employer Defendants' violation of FEHA as afore pled,

Plaintiff was forced to and did retain attorneys, and is accordingly entitled to an award of attorneys' fees and costs according to proof at the time of trial.

44. The afore pled conduct constitutes oppression, fraud, and malice, thereby entitling Plaintiff to an award of punitive damages. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such conduct was taken by an owner, officer or managing agent of the Employer Defendants, or alternatively, authorized, ratified or approved by an owner, officer or managing agent of the Employer Defendants.

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

## RETALIATION/DISCRIMINATION FOR UTILIZING CFRAIN VIOLATION OF FEHA (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as though set forth in full herein, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 44, inclusive above.
- 46. Plaintiff suffered from a physical disability as defined by the FEHA because she had been previously diagnosed with MS. Plaintiff was diagnosed with MS in 2000. This diagnosis interfered with Plaintiff's major life activities, including, but not limited to, taking care of herself, engaging in social activities, walking, and working. Plaintiff had a drop foot, secondary to this diagnosis and disability, and was required to wear a special brace.
- 47. Plaintiff would occasionally miss work as a result of the said diagnoses and disability. Plaintiff would take this time as intermittent leave under the CFRA.
- 48 Plaintiff also went on a protected leave under the CFRA in March 2013 and she returned in June 2013.
- 49. An employer may not retaliate or discriminate against an employee for exercising any right under the CFRA. (Gov.C. §§ 12940(h), 12945.2(l).)
- 50. Plaintiff, when she returned from her CFRA leave, was subjected to retaliation and discrimination for accessing her CFRA rights by being micromanaged, being given geographically undesirable assignments, being unfairly criticized, being suspended again, and eventually being forced to quit/retire.

(E)

(F)

51. Said conduct violates	Government	Code section	ıs 12940(h) a	nd 12945.2(1) and other
provisions of the FEHA.	·	•		

- 52. As a proximate result of the said violation of CFRA, Plaintiff has suffered mental anguish and emotional suffering in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court and according to proof.
- 53. As a further proximate result of the said violation of CFRA as afore pled, Plaintiff has suffered a loss of tangible employment benefits including lost wages and fringe benefits in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court and according to proof.
- 54. As a further and proximate result of the said violation of CFRA as afore pled, Plaintiff was required to and did seek medical attention, and will need medical attention in the future, all to Plaintiff's damages in a sum according to proof.
- 55. As a further proximate result of the Employer Defendants' violation of CFRA as afore pled, Plaintiff was forced to and did retain attorneys, and is accordingly entitled to an award of attorneys' fees and costs according to proof at the time of trial.
- 56. The afore pled conduct constitutes oppression, fraud, and malice, thereby entitling Plaintiff to an award of punitive damages. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such conduct was taken by an owner, officer or managing agent of the Employer Defendants, or alternatively, authorized, ratified or approved by an owner, officer or managing agent of the Employer Defendants.

### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### FAILURE TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF FEHA

### (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as though set forth in full herein, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 58, inclusive above.
- 58. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the Employer Defendants failed to take all steps reasonably necessary to prevent discrimination and retaliation from occurring as required by

()

ĵ.

Government Code §12940(k). Such conduct violated Government Code §12940(k), and allowed Plaintiff to be discriminated and retaliated against, all as afore pled.

- 59. As a proximate result of the said violation of FEHA, Plaintiff has suffered mental anguish and emotional suffering past and future in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court and according to proof.
- 60. As a further proximate result of the said violation of FEHA as afore pled, Plaintiff has suffered a loss of tangible employment benefits past and future including lost wages and fringe benefits in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court and according to proof.
- 61. As a further and proximate result of the said violation of EEHA as afore pled, Plaintiff was required to and did seek medical attention, and will need medical attention in the future, all to Plaintiff's damages in a sum according to proof.
- 62. As a further proximate result of the Employer's Defendants' violation of FEHA as afore pled, Plaintiff was forced to and did retain attorneys, and is accordingly entitled to an award of attorneys' fees and costs according to proof at the time of trial.
- 63. The afore pled conduct constitutes oppression, fraud, and malice thereby entitling Plaintiff to an award of punitive damages. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that the Employer Defendants ratified or authorized the said conduct. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that said act of oppression, fraud, or malice or act of, ratification or authorization were on the part of a managing agent or owner acting on behalf of the Employer Defendants.

### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# TORTUOUS CONSTRUCTIVE TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 64. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as though set forth in full herein, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 63, inclusive above.
- 65. It is the Public Policy of the State of California, as expressed in the FEHA that an employer cannot discriminate against an employee based on their race, their disability, or their sexual orientation.

- 66. It is the Public Policy of the State of California, as expressed in the FEHA that an employer may not retaliate against an employee for protesting violations of the FEHA.
- 67. It is the Public Policy of the State of California, as expressed in the FEHA that an employer may not discriminate or retaliate against an employee for exercising any right under the CFRA. (Gov.C. §§ 12940(h), 12945.2(l).)
- 68. It is the Public Policy of the State of California as expressed in the Labor Code that an employer may not retaliate against, or take adverse employment actions against an employee who protests and reports violations of the Labor Code. Said public policy is expressed in Gould v. Maryland Sound Industries, Inc. (1995) 31 CA4th 1137, 1147, 37 CR20 718, 723.
- 69. These public policies were valid, fundamental, protected the public, and were binding on the Employer Defendants.
- 70. The Employer Defendants repeatedly discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of the FEHA all as afore pled. The Employer Defendants repeatedly retaliated against Plaintiff in violation of the FEHA, all as afore pled, for protesting violations of the FEHA and for exercising her rights under the CFRA. The Employer Defendants repeatedly retaliated against Plaintiff for protesting and reporting violations of the Labor Code all as afore pled. This discrimination and retaliation included, but was not limited to: being micromanaged, criticized, written up, repeatedly suspended, coerced into dropping her discrimination complaint, being given poor assignments, being given poor geographic assignments, and other conduct according to proof.
- 71 The Employer Defendants, by the acts and conduct set forth above, either intentionally created or knowingly permitted working conditions that were so intolerable that a reasonable employer would realize that a reasonable person in the employee's position would be compelled to resign. These conditions violated both FEHA and the Public Policy of California, all as afore pled.
- 72. As a proximate result of these intolerable working conditions, Plaintiff was in fact compelled to resign and was thereby constructively terminated. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times relevant the Employer Defendants had actual knowledge of these intolerable working conditions.
  - 73. As a proximate result Plaintiff suffered emotional distress damages according to proof.

- 74. As a further proximate result Plaintiff lost employment benefits, including wages and fringe benefits, in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the court and according to proof.
- 75. As a further proximate result Plaintiff has needed and will need medical attention, and will incur medical expenses, past and future, to her damage according to proof.
- 76. The afore pled conduct constitutes oppression, fraud, and malice thereby entitling Plaintiff to an award of punitive damages. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that the Employer Defendants ratified or authorized the said conduct. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that said act of oppression, fraud, or malice or act of ratification or authorization were on the part of a managing agent or owner acting on behalf of the Employer Defendants.

### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAN AND REST PERIODS

### (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 77. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as though set forth in full herein, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 76, inclusive above.
- 78. Plaintiff was a nonexempt employee pursuant to California law, and Plaintiff was accordingly, entitled to regular rest breaks and lunch breaks.
- 79. At all times relevant herein, Labor Code §512 and other provisions of the California Labor Code require an employer to provide certain meal periods to nonexempt employees, and said meal periods are also mandated by the applicable orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"). Furthermore, Labor Code §226.7 requires payment to the employee of one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.
- 80. At all times relevant herein, Labor Code §512 and the applicable IWC wage order established meal period requirements for Plaintiff, wherein an employee working for more than five (5) hours was required to receive a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, and an employee working for ten (10) hours was required to be given a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes. At all times relevant herein, IWC Wage Order No. 8-2001 and other provisions

of the law provide that unless the employee is relieved of all duty during the 30 minute meal periods, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked.

- 81. At all times relevant herein, IWC Wage Order No. 8-2001 and other provisions of the law required that an employer failing to provide an employee a meal period, owed the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period was not provided. Furthermore, Labor Code §226.7 requires payment to the employee of one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.
- 82. At all times relevant herein, IWC Wage Order No. 8-2001, and other applicable California law, codes, and Wage Orders established rest periods, wherein an employer was required to permit all employees to take rest periods of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof.
- 83. At all times relevant herein, IWC Wage Order No. 8-2001 and other applicable California law, codes, and Wage Orders required that an employer failing to provide an employee a rest period, owed the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period was not provided.
- 84. Plaintiff was, at times, denied the right to take regular rest breaks and meal breaks during her employment with the Employer Defendants as afore pled. This constitutes a violation of California Wage and Hour law.
- 85. Plaintiff at no time received the requisite one (1) hour or two (2) hours of pay at the Plaintiff's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period or meal period were not provided.
- 86. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct alleged above, Plaintiff is entitled to recover all wages in lieu of meal periods denied, wages in lieu of rest periods denied, as well as interest thereon, and are further entitled to all penalties and/or liquidated damages provided for, and an award of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in recovering such amounts according to proof at the time of trial.

· 1

### SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE, INCLUDING

### STRAIGHT TIME AND OVERTIME

### (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 87. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as though set forth in full herein, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 86, inclusive above.
- 88. Plaintiff was at all times relevant a nonexempt employee covered by the wage and hour laws of the California Labor Code.
- 89. The Employer Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all wages, both straight time and overtime they owed Plaintiff for her labor, in violation of California Labor Code §§200 et seq., 500 et seq., 510 and §1171 et seq, all as afore pled.
- 90. Throughout the course of Plaintiff's employment the Employer Defendants required Plaintiff to work overtime or shifts in excess of eight (8) hours per day or forty (40) hours in one week, without compensating Plaintiff for such overtime as required by law.
- 91. The Employer Defendants also frequently required Plaintiff to work "off-the-clock", without compensating Plaintiff for this work, all as afore pled. This off the clock work included both straight time and overtime for which Plaintiff was not compensated or paid.
- 92. The Employer Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all straight time and overtime wages owed for Plaintiff's labor in violation of California Labor Code §§200 et seq., 500 et seq., 1171 et seq., 1194 and 1198.
- 93. As a result of such violations of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff is entitled to recover all compensation owed to her but not paid, as well as interest thereon (California Labor Code §218.6) and are further entitled to all penalties and/or liquidated damages provided for in the above referenced sections of the California Labor Code and an award of attorneys' fees and costs (California Labor Code §218.5) incurred in recovering such amounts according to proof at the time of trial.

///

- 15 -COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

00

14.)

<u>(</u>)

Ţs.

28

OF GINAL

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar nu	mber, and address):	Cottle Vill 1250 Middles
Michael F. Baltaxe	SBN: 129532	
SOTTILE BALTAXE 4333 Park Terrace Drive, Suite 160, V	Westlake Village CA 91361	AUG 2 2 2014
TELEPHONE NO.: 818-889-0050	FAX NO.: 818-889-6050	000 400 4
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Dianna Marsh	FAX NO., 010-009-0000	Sherri R. Carter, by unive Officer/Clerk
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS	ANGELES	By Shaunya Bolden Deputy
STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street		Shaunya Doluen
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street		
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, 90012		
BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk Courthon	ise on Hill St.	·······················
CASE NAME: Dianna Marsh v. Kaiser For	undation Hospitals, et al.	
		CACCALINOED DO F
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER <b>BC</b> 5 5 5 5 4 8
Unlimited Limited	Counter Joinder	
(Amount (Amount demanded demanded demanded demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defenda	nt Judge:
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT:
	w must be completed (see instructions or	page 2).
1. Check one box below for the case type that	best describes this case:	
Auto Tort	Contract Pr	ovisionally Complex Civil Litigation at. Fules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)
Auto (22)	Diedoi of Corniaco warranty (00)	
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrus/Trade regulation (03)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10) Mass tort (40)
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Securities litigation (28)
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Product liability (24)  Medical malpractice (45)	Real Property  Eminent domain/Inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (4)	above listed provisionally complex case
Non-Pi/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	nforcement of Judgment
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer L	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)		liscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19)	Dings (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Professional negligence (25)		discellaneous Civil Petition
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	· ·
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	les of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
2. This case is ks not com factors requiring exceptional lucicial mana	dement:	
Company of the second s	conted parties d. Large number	of witnesses
The state of the s	difficult or novel a Coordination	with related actions pending in one or more courts
b. Extensive motion practice raising issues that will be time-consumin	n to resolve in other count	ies, states, or countries, or in a federal court
© c. Substantial amount of documents	ry evidence f. Substantial po	ostjudgment judicial supervision
		declaratory or injunctive relief c. X punitive
<ol> <li>Remedies solight (check all that apply).</li> </ol>	-	
4. Number of causes of action (specify): Set 5. This case is X is not a cla	ss action suit.	•
o. This case and thought related cases file	and serve a notice of related case. (You i	may use form CM-015.)
•	and solve a make a resident	
- Date: August 21, 2014	•	
Michael F. Baltaxe		SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
(7.11.2.31.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.	NOTICE	oc (except small claims cases or cases filed
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the	tirst paper filed in the action of proceeding waters and institutions Code). (Cal. Ru.	ng (except small claims cases or cases filed les of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
under the Probate Code, Family Code, of	Wellare and institutions code). (can see	· · · · ·
in sanctions.  • File this cover sheet in addition to any co	ver sheet required by local court rule.	umust same a copy of this cover sheet on all
If this case is complex under rule 3.400 e	t seq. or the Cambrilla Hules of Count, you	u must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
other parties to the action or proceeding.  • Unless this is a collections case under ru	le 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sh	eet will be used for statistical purposes only.

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007] CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

Cel. Rules of Courl, rules 2.30, 3.220, 3.400–3.403, 3.740,
Cal. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10
rvivv.courtinto.ca.gov
Westlow Doc & Form Builder

#### INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filling First Papers. If you are filling 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. Fallure 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 8.746 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 dist appearance a joinder in the plaintiffs 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.

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 Maloractice

Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip

and fall) Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/NO

(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 Torr/Unitair Business Q0

Practice (07) Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., stander, libel)

(13)Fraud (16)

人

٠,

 $|\cdot, \rangle$ 

(E)

Intellectual Property (19) Professional Negligence (25)

Legal Malpractice Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) Other Non-PI/PD/WD Ton (35)

Employment Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

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) Wronaful 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

Assel 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 type listed above) (41) Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20) Abstract of Judgment (Out of

> Confession of Judgment (nondomestic 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

Parlnership 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

Other Civil Petition

 $\odot$ 

 $(\bar{\varsigma})$ 

SHORT TITLE Marsh v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, et al.

CASE NUMBER BC 5 5 5 5 4 8

### **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? X YES CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 5-7 HOURS! A DA
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.
Chan 2. L. O. Lynn, C. sinds the second for the court location chains that amplies to the type of action you have
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)
C. Lecetion of property or permanently granted vehicle
<ol> <li>Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district.</li> <li>May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).</li> <li>Location where cause of action arose.</li> <li>Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.</li> <li>Location where performance required or defendant resides.</li> <li>Location where performance required or defendant resides.</li> <li>Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.</li> <li>Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.</li> <li>Location where petitioner resides.</li> <li>Location where petitioner resides.</li> <li>Location where no or more of the parties reside.</li> <li>Location of Labor Commissioner Office</li> </ol>
Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page In Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.
Steb 4. Little the intollitation reducered on bases in result into activities

	Auto (22)	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	Applicable Reasons: [EseelStep 3 Above #1] [1, 2., 4.
Auto Tort	Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
≱ ج	Aebesios (04)	□ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage □ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2.
roper Starto	Product Liability (24)	☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
al Injury/ P	Medical Malpractice (45)	□ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons □ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4.
Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Other Personal Injury Properly Damage Wrongful Death (23)	□ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)     □ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)     □ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress     □ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

LACIV 109 (Rev. 03/11) LASC Approved 03-04

SHORT TITLE Marsh v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, et al.

CASE NUMBER

Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	lling page A page Gale a li #Free Civil Case Cover Sheet a li # Civil Category No. 1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1		Applicable Reasons Applicable Reasons (See Step 3 Above
	1		1., 3.
	Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
	Defamation (13)	□ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
	Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	(25)
on-Person amage/ Wi	Ornfoccional Modigance (25)	A6017 Legal Malpractice     A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3.
20	Other (35)	☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
nemt	Wrongful Termination (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Employment	Other Employment (15)	☑ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1. <b>(2)</b> 3.
Contract	Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	<ul> <li>□ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)</li> <li>□ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach Selfer Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence)</li> <li>□ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud)</li> <li>□ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)</li> </ul>	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
	Collections (09)	□ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff □ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
1	insurance Coverage (18)	☐ A6019 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	Other Contract (37)	A6009 Contractual Fraud  A6001 Tortious Interference  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)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
© ⊕ Property	Wrongfül Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	Other Real Property (26)	□ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure □ A6032 Quiet Title □ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Contawful Detainer	Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	☐ A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
<b>Ē</b> 4	Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	□ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE Marsh v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, et al.

CASE NUMBER

Recognition Constitution	Aleman Aleman Own Case Cover Sheet Bills III II Category No. 188	Type of Action 1 and 1 a	Applicable Reasons: -
		A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
ew	Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review	Writ of Mandate (02)	□ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus □ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter □ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	□ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
5	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
itigati	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Torf	1., 2., 8.
ly Cor	Securities Litigation (28)	□ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
sional	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Provi	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	☐ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	□ A6141 Sister State Judgment □ A6160 Abstract of Judgment □ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) □ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) □ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax □ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8.
. 2	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
ि Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Apove) (42)	□ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only □ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) □ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) □ A6000 Other Civit Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
Q#	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Niscellaneous CV CV V Wiscellaneous	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	□ A6121 Civil Harassment □ A6123 Workplace Harassment □ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case □ A6190 Election Contest □ A6110 Petition for Change of Name □ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law □ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., . 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 6. 2., 9.

SHORT TITLE: Marsh v. Kaiser Fou	ndation Hos	pitals, et al.	CASE NUMBER
			cident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.
REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.			25975 Normandie Avenue
□1. 図2. □3. □4. □5. □6. □7. □8. □9. □10.			
Harbor City	STATE: CA	ZIP CODE: 90710	
and correct and that the above-e	entitled matter	is properly file	erjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and for assignment to the Stanley Work courthouse in the critical County of Los Angeles (Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)].  Dated: August 21, 2014			
Dateu. August 51, 2014	-	,	(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.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- 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 hing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- 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.

 $(\xi)$ 

00