ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY	
FRANK LEE DEARWESTER		į
P.O.BOX 8800, AP9119		
CORCORAN, CA 93212		
TELEPHONE NO: N / A FAX NO. (Optional): N / A		
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional):		
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): IN PRO PER		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO		
STREET ADDRESS: 720 NINTH STREET		
MAILING ADDRESS: SACRAMENTO, CA 95814		
CITY AND ZIP CODE:		
BRANCH NAME:		
PLAINTIFF: FRANK LEE DEARWESTER	\$\langle(\tilde{\sigma}\)	
DEFENDANT: UNIVERSITY MEDICAL IMAGING;		
(ADDITIONAL PARTIES ATTACHMENT FORM IS ATTACHED)		
DOES 1 TO	(%)~	
COMPLAINT—Personal Injury, Property Damage, Wrongful Death		
AMENDED (Number):		
Type (check all that apply):		ĺ
MOTOR VEHICLE XX OTHER (specify): MEDICAL MALPRAEDICE		1
Property Damage Wrongful Death		
Personal Injury Other Damages (specify):		
Jurisdiction (check all that apply):	CASE NUMBER:	
ACTION IS A LIMITED CIVIL CASE Amount demanded does not exceed \$10,000		ļ
exceeds \$10,000, but does not exceed \$25,000		į
XX ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (exceeds \$25,000)		
ACTION IS RECLASSIFIED by this amended complaint		
from limited to unlimited		
from unlimited to limited		
1. Plaintiff (name or names): FRANK LEE DEARWESTER		
alleges causes of action against defendant (name or names): UNIVERSITY MED	ical imaging;	
(ADDITIONAL PARTIES ATTACHMENT FORM IS ATTACHED)	
This pleading, including attachments and exhibits, consists of the following number of pa	ges: 36	
3. Each plaintiff named above is a competent adult		
a. except plaintiff (name):		
(1)a corporation qualified to do business in California		
(2) an unincorporated entity (describe):		
(3) a public entity (describe):		
(4) a minor an adult		
(a) for whom a guardian or conservator of the estate or a guardian	dian ad litem has been appointed	
(b) other (specify):		
(5) other (specify):		
b. except plaintiff (name):		
(1) a corporation qualified to do business in California		
(2) an unincorporated entity (describe):		
(3) a public entity (describe):		
(4) a minbr an adult	lian ad litam has been appointed	
(a) for whom a guardian or conservator of the estate or a guard	nan ao ilem nas peen appointed	
(b) other (specify):		
(5) other (specify):		
	ahan and 2	
Information about additional plaintiffs who are not competent adults is shown in Atta	ichment 3.	D 4-10

					PLD-PI-001
Г	SHORT TITLE:			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CABE NUMBER:
		LINET NO CATA			OAGE NOMOEIX.
	DEARWESTER VS	. UNIVERSITY			<u> </u>
····	Digintiff (nama)				
4	Plaintiff (name):	under the fictitious name (specify):			
	te month prisitions	пице не понявия натте (<i>врвыту).</i>			
	and has complied	with the fictitious business name laws.			
5.		above is a natural person			
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			ndant (name): U.S. HEALTHWORKS
	• • •		(1)		corporation form unknown
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	,	(2) (3)		unincorporated entity (describe):
	(v) tirrur	intodipolated drinty (dodding).	(4)	<u></u>	
	(4) a pul	plic entity (describe):	(4)	Пар	oublic entity (describe):
	()	, ,			
		144	(5)		ner (specify):
	CAL IM	AGING		MEUN	AL CROUP, INC.
	b. X except defend	ant (name): SUTTER MEMORIAL d. X	ежс	epi defe	ndant (name): SUTTER MEDICAL IMA-
		siness organization, form unknown	(A)	\ -~/	ousiness organization, form unknown
	(2) a cor	poration	(2)		corporation
	(3) an ur	nincorporated entity (describe):	(3)	an	unincorporated entity (describe):
	(4) o pub	lie ontity (deporting):	(4)		public entity (describe):
	(4) a put	blic entity (describe):	(~)	"	odbie entry (describe).
	(5) other	(specify):	(5)	oti	ner (specify):
	HOSPIT			GING	
	· [VV] 1-1	t additional defendants who are not natural persons	r ir	contains	d in Attachment 5
		(())	5 15	Containe	u III Attaciline it o.
6.		endants sued as Does are unknown to plaintiff.			
	a. Doe defenda	ants (specify Doe numbers):	r er		ere the agents or employees of other
			, 0,		e persons whose capacities are unknown to
	b Doe detenda plaintiff.	nts (epecify Doe numbers):		an	e persons whose capacities are difficiowin to
7.	•	are joined under Code of Civil Procedure section 3	382	are (nan	nes);
• •					
		·			
_	ment of the state	the second the second			
Ŭ.	This court is the prope	r court because defendant now resides in Its jurisdictional area.			
_		place of business of a defendant corporation or un	iinc	omorated	rassociation is in its jurisdictional area
		on or damage to personal property occurred in its			
	d. other (specif	·	-		
	-				
9.		ed to comply with a claims statute, and			
		with applicable claims statutes, or om complying because (specify):			
	b. Is excused to	om compising perange (abecily).			

PLD-PI-001

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:
DEARWESTER Vs. UNIVERSITY	
10. The following causes of action are attached and the statements above apply to eac causes of action attached): a Motor Vehicle b General Negligence c Intentional Tort d Products Liability e Premises Liability f Other (specify): MEDICAL MALPRACTICE; BREACH OF	
11. Plaintiff has suffered a wage loss b loss of use of property cX hospital and medical expenses d general damage e property damage fX loss of earning capacity g other damage (specify):	
 12. The damages claimed for wrongful death and the relationships of plaintiff to th a. listed in Attachment 12. b. as follows: 	ne deceased are
13. The relief sought in this complaint is within the jurisdiction of this court.	
 14. Plaintiff prays for judgment for costs of suit; for such relief as is fair, just, and equit a. (1)	
The amount of damages is (in cases for personal injury or wrongful death, you note in the amount of: \$	nust check (1)):
15 The paragraphs of this complaint alleged on information and belief are as follo	ws (specify paragraph numbers):
Date: 08/11/14 Fus 10/09/14	
FRANK LEE DEARWESTER (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	SIGNATURE OF PLAINTIFF OR ATTORNEY)

FRANK LEE DEARWESTER P.O.BOX 8800, AP9119 CORCORAN, CA 93212 1 PLD-PI-001 ATTACHMENT 5 2 e. CENTER FOR INTERVENTIONAL SPINE (1) a business organization, form unknown 3 f. KAISER PERMANENTE MEDICAL CENTER (1) a business organization, form unknown 4 g. VIBRANTCARE OUTPATIENT REHABILITATION OF CALIFORNIA, INC. (2) a corporation 5 h. JOHN M. O'BRIEN & ASSOCIATES, P.C. (2) a corporation 6 i. CLAYEO C. ARNOLD, P.C. (2) a corporation j. HUNG HOANG, PhD. (1) abusiness organization, form unknown, k. ALAN HASSAN, M.D., PhD. 8 (1) a business organization, form unknown, or natural person 1. SPINE SURGERY ASSOCIATES 9 (1) a business organization, form unknown m. RADIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATES 10 (1) a business organization, form unknown 11 n. MERCY METHODIST HOSPITAL (1) a business organization 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

ULTED IN A RIGHT INGUINAL HERNIA AND L4-L5 DISC BULGE IN HIS SPINE. THIS

WORKER'S COMPENSATION MEDICAL ADVISOR / REPRESENTING THE INTEREST OF THE

WAS INITIALLY TREATED BY U.S. HEALTHWORKS MEDICAL GROUP, ACTING AS THE

13

14

DEARWESTER v UNIVERSITY CASE Nº: EMPLOYER. PLAINTIFF'S HERNIA WAS REPAIRED VIA SURGERY. THE DISC 2 BULGE RESULTED IN A CHRONIC-CARE SITUATION. THE INJURY WAS EXACER-3 BATED BY AN AUTO ACCIDENT IN 2007. PLAINTIFF WAS THEN TREATED BY 4 HUNG HUDANG, PhD., SUTTER MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, ALAN HASSAN, PhD., 5 CENTER FOR INTERVENTIONAL SPINE, AND VIBRANTCARE OUTPATIENT REHABI-6 LITATION OF CALIFORNIA, INC. PLAINTIFF ALSO OBTAIN VARIOUS FILMS 7 FROM SUTTER MEDICAL IMAGING, SUTTER MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, AND UNIVERSI-8 TY MEDICAL IMAGING. THE LATTER, MOST IMPORTANTLY BEING AN INDEPTH 9 MRI OF HIS L4-L5 DISC BULGE THAT SHOWED NOT ONLY THE BULGE, BUT 10 VERTIBRAL ARTHRITIS AS WELL. OTHER PROVIDERS RENDERED XRAYS AND 11 ULTRAS DUND FILMS. 12 | NOT RELATED TO THE AFFOREMENT PORT INJURY IS TREATMENT PLAINTIFF 13 WAS PROVIDED BY KAISER PERMANENTE MEDICAL CENTER IN SOUTH SACRAMENTO 14 ON HIS BILATERAL MENISCA TEARS, BY AMY BLACK, PhD., AN ORTHOPOD 15 RESIDING AT KAISER IN 2010. DR. BLACK PERFORMED AN ARTHROSCOPIC 16 REPAIR / TEAR REMOVAL ON PLAINTIFF'S RIGHT KNEE. THIS SURGERY 17 RENDERED SCORE PHOTOGRAPHS WHICH SHOWED THE MENISCAL TEAR, REPAIR, 18 AND A GREAT DEAL OF 'HAIRY' ARTHRITIS IN THAT KNEE. PLAINTIFF'S 19 HEALTHOARE INSURANCE ENDED BEFORE HE COULD HAVE HIS LEFT KNEE REPAI-20|| RED\ 21 PLAINTIFF HAS BEEN EXPERIENCING A GREAT DEAL OF PAIN AND RELATED 22 MOBILITY ISSUES DUE TO HIS KNEES AND BACK. DUE TO THE NATURE OF HIS 23 CURRENT LOCATION - BEING INCARCERATION IN LOCAL AND NOW STATE FACIL-24 ITIES THAT ARE DEEPLY INFLUENCED BY BUDGETARY CONSTRAINTS; HE IS NOT 25 | RECEIVING THE MEDICAL TREATMENT THAT HE NEEDS. HIS FACILITIES HAVE 26 PROVIDED CURRENT XRAYS, BUT OTHER FILMS ARE COST-PROHIBITIVE, SUCH 27 AS MRI S. PLAINTIFF IS NOW IN A POSITION WHERE HE MUST PROVE ANY 28 PREVIOUS CONDITION IF HE IS TO SEEK COOPERATION IN HIS FUTURE MEDIC-

DEARWESTER V UNIVERSITY CASE Nº: 1 AL TREATMENT. THESE RECORDS ARE VITAL TO PLAINTIFF'S CURRENT AND 2 | FUTURE | QUALITY OF LIFE. THERE ARE NO DUSTIFIABLE GROUNDS FOR DEFENDANTS TO WITHHOLD THESE 5 RECORDS AND FILMS. FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE DEFENDANTS TO NEGLECT 6 EVEN TO ANSWER PLAINTIFF'S MULTIPLE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RELEASE OF INFORMATION - REQUESTS, IS PROFESSIONAL / GENERAL DEGLIGENCE.

```
DEARWESTER V UNIVERSITY
    CASE Nº:
    SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION - MEDICAL MALPRACTICE
    ATTACHMENT TO COMPLAINT
 3
   MM-1 ALAINTIFF: FRANK LEE DEARWESTER
         ALLEGES THAT DEFENDANT: UNIVERSITY MEDICAL IMAGING; (ADDITION-
 4
 5
         AL PARTIES ATTACHMENT FORM IS ATTACHED)
        WAS THE LEGAL (PROXIMATE) CAUSE OF DAMAGES TO LAINTIFF. BY THE
 6
        FOLLOWING ACTS OR OMISSIONS TO ACT, DEFENDANT NEGLIGENTLY CAUS-
 7
        ED THE DAMAGE TO PLAINTIFF
 8
 9
        DN: 05/2011 - 07/2014
        AT: SACRAMENTO COUNTY MAIN JAIL; NORTH KERN STATE PRISON;
10
        CSP-LAC, LANCASTER; CSP-CORCORAR, DEUEL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION
111
12 FOR DEFENDANT TO OMIT TO PROVIDE THE RECORDS AND FILMS THAT PLAINTI-
13 FF AND PLAINTIFF'S INSTITUTED PROPERLY REQUESTED OF DEFENDANTS;
14 DEFENDANTS ARE COMMITTING MEDICAL MALPRACTICE. THERE IS NO PRECEDENT
15 FOR WITHHOLDING THE SAME, THE RECORDS AND FILMS ARE NEEDED FOR THE
16 CONTINUED HEALTH OF PLAINTIFF. THE PROPER RESPONSE FROM ANY MEDICAL
17 PROVIDER WOULD BE TO SIMPLY PROVIDE [A COPY OF] THE RECORDS AND FILM
18 REQUESTED, OR TO RESPOND WITH INFORMATION ABOUT THE DISPOSITION OF
19 THOSE RECORDS. THE MAJORITY OF THE NAMED DEFENDANTS DIDN'T HAVE THE
20 DECENCY) TO RESPOND AT ALL. THIS GOES AGAINST THE SENSIBILITIES OF
21 A HEALTHCARE PROVIDER OF GOOD STANDING. IT IS UNETHICAL TO WITHHOLD
  THE RECORDS AND FILMS WHEN THOSE SAME ARE REQUIRED FOR THE PREVENT-
23 ION OF [FUTURE] HARM. THESE OMISSIONS ARE A DERELICTION OF PROFESS-
   IDNAL DUTY THAT RESULTS IN PLAINTIFF'S INJURY, LOSS, AND DAMAGE;
25 THE VERY DEFINITION OF MALPRACTICE.
26
```

27

```
DEARWISTER V UNIVERSITY
    CASE Nº:
   THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION - BREACH OF CONTRACT
    ATTACHMENT TO COMPLAINT
   BC-1 ALAINTIFF: FRANK LEE DEARWESTER
 4
        ALLEGES THAT DEFENDANT: UNIVERSITY MEDICAL IMAGING;
 5
        (ADDITIONAL PARTIES ATTACHMENT FORM IS ATTACHED)
        WAS THE LEGAL (PROXIMATE) CAUSE OF DAMAGES TO ALAINTIFF, BY THE
 6
        FOLLOWING ACTS OR OMISSIONS TO ACT, DEFENDANT DID BREACH THEIR
 7
 8
        CONTRACT WITH PLAINTIFF AND CAUSED DAMAGE TO PLAINTIFF
 9
        0N: 05/2011 - 07/2014
        AT: SACRAMENTO COUNTY MAIN JAIL; NORTH KERN STATE PRISON;
10
        CSP-LAC, LANCASTER; CSP-CORCORAR; DEUEL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION
111
12 WHEN DEFENDANT RENDERED MEDICAL SERVICES TO PLAINTIFF, DEFENDANT
13 DID ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH PLAINTIFF TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT
14 MEDICAL CARE AND TO MAKE MAILABLE, THE DOCUMENTATION OF THE VARIOUS
15 PROCEDURES; INCLUDING THE XRAY FILMS, ULTRASOUND FILMS, MRI IMAGES,
16 AND OTHER FILMS AND RELATED DIAGNOSTICS THEREFROM. THOUGH RENDERED
17 BY THE DEFENDANT PROVIDERS, THE OWNERSHIP OF THE FILMS IS PLAINTIFF 'S.
18 REGARDLESS WHERE THE RECORDS AND FILMS ARE STORED BY DEFENDANT,
19 OWNERSHOP STILL RESTS WITH PLAINTIFF, AS THE SUBJECT MATTER IS PLAI-
20 NTIA PHYSICAL BEING AND HIS FUTURE MEDICAL NEEDS.
21 DEFENDANTS DID BREACH THIS CONTRACT WHEN THEY REFUSED TO RENDER THE
22 | REQUESTED RECORDS AND FILMS. PLAINTIFF DID NOT AGREE TO DEFENDANTS!
23 HOLDING THOSE RECORDS 'HOSTAGE' FOR WHATEVER REASON DEFENDANT MAY
24 HAVE FOR DOING SO. DEFENDANT SHOULD BE HELD LIABLE FOR THE FUNDS
25 THAT THEY COLLECTED ON THAT CONTRACT. ADDITIONALLY, DEFENDANT SHOULD
26 ALSO BE HELD LIABLE FOR RELATED CURRENT AND FUTURE DAMAGE TO PLAINT-
27 || IFF AS | A RESULT OF THEIR BREACH.
28
```

01

02

03

04

05

06

07

08

09

10

11

12

13

14

15

a. X not shown, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.