

VIA FAX

1 Michael T. Carr (CSBN 183085)
2 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL T. CARR, APC
3 2670 Myrtle Avenue, Suite 106
4 Monrovia, CA 91016-5077
5 Telephone: (626) 254-8901
6 Facsimile: (626) 254-8921
7 Email: mtcarr1@earthlink.net

8 Roman Otkupman, CSBN 249423
9 OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION
10 5950 Canoga Ave., Suite 550
11 Woodland Hills, CA 91367
12 Telephone: (818) 293-5623
13 Facsimile (888) 850-1310
14 Roman@OLFLA.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
16 BELINDA BRANCH

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
12 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

13 BELINDA BRANCH, an individual,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 KAISER PERMANENTE, SOUTHERN
17 CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL
18 GROUP; and DOES 1-100, Inclusive,

19 Defendant.

Case No.

BC 575850

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL BASED
UPON:

1. DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE IN VIOLATION OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT, Calif. Gov. Code §12940 et seq.
2. WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY
3. VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §1102.5
4. INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

CHECK: \$435.00
CASH: \$0.00
CHANGE: \$0.00
CARD: \$0.00

RECEIVED:
DATE PAID: 03/18/15 01:44 PM
AMOUNT: \$435.00
310

CIT/CASE: BC575850
LEA/DEF#: 1

///

1 Plaintiff BELINDA BRANCH hereby demands a jury trial and complains and alleges as
2 follows:

3 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 (Against Defendant, KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE
5 MEDICAL GROUP, and all DOE Defendants)

6 At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff, BELINDA BRANCH ("Plaintiff"), is and was a
7 resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Plaintiff is qualified and entitled to
8 protection under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, ("FEHA"), *California*
9 *Government Code* §12940, et seq.

10 Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all times herein mentioned, Defendant KAISER
11 PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP
12 ("Defendant") was a corporation doing business within the County of Los Angeles, and State of
13 California. Defendant employed Plaintiff at its Parkview Building, location at 1050 W. Pacific
14 Coast Highway, Harbor City, CA 90710. Defendant is a health insurance and medical provider.
15 Defendant is a qualified employer under FEHA, *Cal. Gov. Code*. §§ 12926(d).

16 Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or
17 associate, of those Defendants fictitiously sued as DOES 1 through 100 inclusive and so the
18 Plaintiff sues them by these fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the
19 DOE Defendants reside in the State of California and are in some manner responsible for the
20 conduct alleged herein. Upon discovering the true names and capacities of these fictitiously
21 named Defendants, the Plaintiff will amend this complaint to show the true names and capacities
22 of these fictitiously named Defendants.

23 Unless otherwise alleged in this complaint, the Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all
24 times herein mentioned, each codefendant was acting within the course, scope, and under their
25 authority of the agency, employment, or representative capacity, with the consent of her or his
26 codefendants.

27 5. Plaintiff began working for Defendant, in 1978 at Defendant's Parkview Building
28 location. Plaintiff held the position of Medical Assistant for over thirty-two (32) years and was

1 transferred to the position of Receptionist on the second floor and medical records department of
2 Defendant's Parkview Building location, during the last year of her employment. Plaintiff was a
3 devoted and loyal employee of thirty-four (34) years, who at all times while employed by
4 Defendant, performed her job in a satisfactory and/or exemplary manner.

5 6. Sometime in or around January of 2014, Plaintiff observed another Receptionist
6 working in her department, (Annabel, whose last name is not known), providing private medical
7 information of a Kaiser patient to other Kaiser employees, (whose names were only known as
8 Yvette and Shorty), without obtaining the consent from the patient to release said medical
9 information. Annabel, Yvette and Shorty were also substantially younger than Plaintiff. The
10 other Receptionist, Annabel knowingly and wrongfully released a patient's medical information
11 to Yvette and Shorty, whom knowingly and intentionally requested and obtained said private
12 medical information. This medical information released and obtained by the other employees of
13 Defendant contained private and sensitive medical information of a patient, including, *inter alia*,
14 information contained in the General Surgery file, without the patient's consent. Plaintiff was
15 informed and believed and based on her over thirty (30) years of experience working with
16 Defendant, KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL
17 GROUP, knew that the release of such private medical information regarding Kaiser patients,
18 without the consent of such patients, to be in violation of the *Health Insurance Portability and*
19 *Accounting Act of 1996*, 45 USC 1320, §§160.103 et seq., ("HIPAA").

20 21 7. Plaintiff immediately reported the above described incident she witnessed,
22 (regarding HIPAA violations), to her immediate supervisor. In response Plaintiff's immediate
23 supervisor essentially told Plaintiff that she would look into it and that she (Plaintiff's immediate
24 supervisor), would take care of it. Plaintiff also immediately warned the patient about the above-
25 mentioned HIPAA violation committed by the Receptionist and the two (2) other Kaiser
26 employees (Yvette and Shorty).
27
28

1 8. Approximately one (1) month later, Plaintiff was called into the Human Resources
2 office and was met with HR manager Hazel Smith, ("Smith"), and two other individuals whom
3 identified themselves as compliance officers from Defendant's Compliance Department. During
4 this meeting Plaintiff informed them about the HIPAA violations committed by the other
5 Receptionist (Annabel) and the two (2) other Kaiser employees, (known as Yvette and Shorty).
6 More specifically, Plaintiff explained the circumstances of how Yvette and Shorty improperly
7 obtained private medical information from the other Receptionist and how the other Receptionist
8 released said private information without having the patient's consent, which was in violation of
9 HIPPA. Plaintiff also explained that she immediately warned the patient about the above-
10 mentioned HIPPA violation committed by the other Receptionist Annabel, along with the two (2)
11 other Kaiser employees (Yvette and Shorty). During this same meeting, Plaintiff was told by told
12 Hazel and the compliance officers that Plaintiff was not suspected of any misconduct, and assured
13 Plaintiff that she had done the right thing in reporting the HIPPA violations, and that Plaintiff
14 "had nothing to worry about and could breathe easy." In this same meeting, Plaintiff was
15 informed that Kaiser was investigating the HIPPA violations Plaintiff had reported.

17 9. On or about April 23, 2014, Plaintiff again was called into another meeting with
18 Smith and two (2) individuals whom identified themselves as compliance officers. During this
19 second meeting, the compliance officers and Smith became hostile and exhibited a threatening
20 demeanor towards Plaintiff, and, in an angry manner questioned Plaintiff about why Plaintiff
21 warned the patient that other Kaiser employees obtained this patient's medical information.
22 Through their hostile interrogating manner and conduct towards Plaintiff, along with the angry
23 tone of their questions, and including the barrage of repetitive questions regarding this incident,
24 Smith and the two (2) compliance officers clearly insinuated, implied and made Plaintiff feel as
25 though Plaintiff was a trouble maker and was causing Kaiser problems as a result of both Plaintiff
26 reporting this incident of HIPAA violations committed by other Kaiser employees, and, for
27 reporting this incident to the patient.
28

1 10. On or about April 23, 2014, following the above-described meeting, Plaintiff was
2 immediately placed on suspension pending an investigation.

3 11. On June 5, 2014, Smith called Plaintiff to a meeting and told Plaintiff that her
4 employment with Kaiser was being terminated, and gave Plaintiff an ultimatum of either
5 resigning and be allowed to receive unemployment benefits, or, being fired and to not be able to
6 obtain unemployment benefits. Smith specifically informed Plaintiff that if Plaintiff did not
7 immediately write and sign a resignation letter according to Smith's instructions, Plaintiff would
8 be fired and not be allowed to receive any unemployment benefits. Smith instructed Plaintiff to
9 immediately, (and in Smith's presence), write and sign a resignation letter and instructed Plaintiff
10 on exactly what words Plaintiff was required to write on the resignation letter. It was only under
11 the threat and coercion and the manipulating conduct committed by Smith under color of
12 authority, in this June 5th meeting, and under the threat that Plaintiff would lose her
13 unemployment benefits if Plaintiff did not immediately write and sign the resignation letter
14 exactly as Smith had instructed, that Plaintiff did so. It was only under the duress Plaintiff felt the
15 threat of Plaintiff losing her unemployment benefits that caused Plaintiff to write and sign the
16 resignation letter as Smith instructed Plaintiff to do. After thirty-four (34) years of loyal and
17 devoted service to Defendant, and someone who had essentially devoted her entire working
18 career to Defendant, and who at all times conscientiously performed her job in an exemplary
19 manner, Plaintiff was shocked to learn she had been terminated. Ironically Plaintiff was being
20 punished for following the law and reporting HIPAA violations and for doing the right thing in
21 looking out for the privacy rights of a Kaiser patient. Plaintiff asked for details of why she was
22 being terminated. Smith refused to provide any specific information in response to Plaintiff's
23 requests, and, in a vague manner Smith described Plaintiff as having "committed egregious acts"
24 and said Plaintiff "was no longer a trusted employee at Kaiser." At the time of Plaintiff's
25 termination, Plaintiff was earning approximately \$24.00 per hour.
26
27
28

1 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and alleges that no action was taken against the
2 other employees at Kaiser, whom Plaintiff reported as committing HIPAA violations regarding a
3 patient. Plaintiff further alleged that the other employees, (i.e., Annabel, Yvette and Shorty),
4 whom Plaintiff reported as violating HIPAA, were similarly situated individuals substantially
5 younger than Plaintiff and outside Plaintiff's protected class, and, whom were treated more
6 favorably than Plaintiff. In the June 5th 2014 meeting, Defendant offered no reason or
7 explanation as to why the other employees whom Plaintiff reported for violating HIPAA, were
8 believed over Plaintiff, and why no disciplinary action was taken against these other employees.

9 13. All of the aforementioned actions were done against Plaintiff due to and in
10 retaliation for her "whistle-blowing" regarding HIPAA violations and due to Plaintiff's age. But
11 for Plaintiff's age and Plaintiff's "whistle-blowing" regarding HIPAA violations, she would
12 currently be employed. Plaintiff is informed and believes and alleges that Plaintiff was
13 terminated for false and pretextual reasons, in retaliation for Plaintiff's "whistle-blowing" and
14 based on Plaintiff's age.

15 14. The actions toward Plaintiff that are alleged in this complaint were carried out by
16 managerial employees and agents of Defendant, acting in a deliberate, cold, callous, malicious,
17 oppressive, and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff
18

19 VENUE AND JURISDICTION

20 8. That venue is proper under California Code of Civil Procedure section 395, in that
21 Plaintiff's injuries were incurred within this jurisdiction, and the actions that give rise to
22 Plaintiff's complaint arose within this jurisdiction, and the amount in controversy exceeds the
23 minimum jurisdictional amount of this court.

24 9. On February 27, 2015, Plaintiff exhausted her administrative remedies under the
25 California Fair Employment and Housing Act by filing a charge that Defendant terminated
26 Plaintiff's employment and discriminated against Plaintiff due to her age. On February 27, 2015,
27 the Department of Fair Employment and Housing issued the Notice of Case Closure and Right-to-
28

1 Sue Letter in respect to said Defendant, true and correct copies of which have been attached
2 hereto as Exhibit 1, and made a part hereof.

3
4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
5 **FOR DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE,**
6 **IN VIOLATION OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT**

7 (Against Defendant, KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE
8 MEDICAL GROUP, and all DOE Defendants)

9 10. Plaintiff BELINDA BRANCH incorporates and re-alleges by reference all
10 previous paragraphs of this Complaint, and each and every part thereof, with the same force and
11 effect as though set forth at length herein.

12 11. *California Government Code* § 12940(a) provides in pertinent part that, "It shall be
13 an unlawful employment practice . . . [f]or an employer, because of . . . age . . . to discharge . . . or
14 to discriminate against the person . . . in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment." In the
15 present case, FEHA protects Plaintiff from discrimination by her employer on the basis of her
16 age, because she is over the age of 40.

17 12. Plaintiff complained about other employees at Kaiser whom were substantially
18 younger than Plaintiff. Plaintiff reported to her supervisor said other employees violating HIPAA
19 and the privacy rights of a patient. However, no disciplinary action was taken against the other
20 employees at Kaiser, whom Plaintiff reported as committing HIPAA violations regarding a
21 patient. The other employees, (i.e., Annabel, Yvette and Shorty), whom Plaintiff reported as
22 violating HIPPA, were similarly situated individuals whom were substantially younger than
23 Plaintiff and outside Plaintiff's protected class, and, whom were treated more favorably than
24 Plaintiff. In the June 5th 2014 meeting, Defendant offered no reason or explanation as to why the
25 other employees whom Plaintiff reported for violating HIPAA, were believed over Plaintiff, and
26 why no disciplinary action was taken against these other employees.

15. Plaintiff was terminated for false and pretextual reasons, in retaliation for Plaintiff engaging in a protected activity of reporting HIPAA violations “whistle-blowing” and based on Plaintiff’s age.

16. As a proximate result of the acts of Defendant, as described above, Plaintiff suffered economic damages, including lost wages and benefits, and other compensatory damages. As a further proximate result of the acts of Defendant, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered humiliation, mental and physical distress, anxiety, nervousness and severe emotional distress.

17. As a direct and proximate result of the above-described acts of Defendant, Plaintiff has necessarily incurred attorney's fees and costs. Pursuant to the provisions of *Calif. Gov. Code* §12965, Plaintiff is entitled to the reasonable value of such attorney's fees.

18. The above-described acts of Defendant were willful, intentional, and malicious and done with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff. Said acts were done in willful disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Defendant was aware that their acts were illegal and were done in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Therefore, this case warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish said Defendant and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FOR WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

(Against Defendant, KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE
MEDICAL GROUP and all DOE Defendants)

19. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint, and each and every part thereof, with the same force and effect as though set forth at length herein.

20. Under California law, no employee can be terminated for a reason that is in violation of public policy. The public policy must be fundamental, substantial, and well established at the time of discharge. A fundamental public policy is any articulable constitutional

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

1 or statutory provision, or any regulation that is concerned with a matter affecting society at large
2 rather than a purely personal or proprietary interest of the employer or the employee.

3 21. The Defendant named in this cause of action terminated Plaintiff's employment in
4 violation of the FEHA by terminating her on the basis of her age and in retaliation for Plaintiff
5 engaging in a protected activity regarding Plaintiff's "whistle-blowing" for reporting HIPAA
6 violations. This wrongful termination of employment violates the following statutes that effect
7 society at large:

8 a. *California Government Code* § 12940 *et. seq.* which prohibits age discrimination;

9 b. *California Labor Code* § 1102.5 which prohibits terminating and retaliating
10 against an employee for reporting something they believe to be a violation of the law;

11 c. *California Civil Code* §56.10(a) which provides that no provider of health care,
12 health care service plan, or contractor shall disclose medical information regarding a patient of
13 the provider of health care or an enrollee or subscriber of a health care service plan without first
14 obtaining an authorization.

15 d. Terminating Plaintiff in retaliation for "whistle-blowing" regarding Plaintiff's
16 complaints and reporting of HIPAA violations being committed by other Kaiser employees.

17 e. Defendants conduct above described is in violation of public policy in that
18 Plaintiff was entitled to the rights and privileges afforded by, but not limited to, state law, e.g.,
19 *Green v. Rahlee* 19 Cal. 4th 66 (1983); *Hentz v. Singer Co.* (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d 290, *Collier*
20 *v. Superior Court*, (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d, 1117.

21 f. all other state statutes, regulations, administrative orders, and ordinances which
22 affect society at large, and which discovery will reveal were violated by said Defendant by
23 retaliating, harassing, discriminating against the Plaintiff.

24 22. As a proximate result of the acts of Defendant, as described above, Plaintiff
25 suffered economic damages, including lost wages and benefits, and other compensatory damages.
26 As a further proximate result of the acts of Defendant, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered
27 humiliation, mental and physical distress, anxiety, nervousness and severe emotional distress.
28

1 23. As a direct and proximate result of the above-described acts of Defendant,
2 KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP
3 Plaintiff has necessarily incurred attorney's fees and costs, and therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to the
4 reasonable value of such attorney's fees.

5 24. The above-described acts of Defendant were willful, intentional, and malicious
6 and done with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff. Said acts were done in willful
7 disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Defendant was aware that their acts were illegal and were done
8 in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Therefore, this case warrants the imposition of
9 exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish said Defendant and to deter
10 others from engaging in similar conduct.

11
12 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
13 FOR VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §1102.5

14 (Against Defendant, KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE
15 MEDICAL GROUP and all DOE Defendants)

16 25. Plaintiff, BELINDA BRANCH, realleges the information set forth above, and by
17 this reference incorporates said paragraphs herein as though fully set forth at length herein and
18 made a part hereto.

19 26. Plaintiff hereby brings this cause of action under *California Labor Code*
20 §1102.5 which states *inter alia*: (b) An employer, or any person acting on behalf of the employer,
21 shall not retaliate against an employee for disclosing information, or because the employer
22 believes that the employee disclosed or may disclose information, to a government or law
23 enforcement agency, to a person with authority over the employee or another employee who has
24 the authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance, or for providing
25 information to, or testifying before, any public body conducting an investigation, hearing, or
26 inquiry, if the employee has reasonable cause to believe that the information discloses a violation
27 of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or
28

1 regulation, regardless of whether disclosing the information is part of the employee's job duties."

2 27. Plaintiff's contends that *California Labor Code* §1102.5 was violated by
3 Defendant, KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL
4 GROUP, terminating Plaintiff's employment, in retaliation for Plaintiff disclosing information
5 about HIPAA violations as described above in Paragraphs 6 thru 11.

6 28. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of the conduct of Defendant,
7 KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP,
8 and all Doe Defendants, named in this cause of action, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered,
9 and continues to suffer emotional distress, substantial losses in salary, bonuses, job benefits, and
10 other employment benefits which she would have received from said Defendant, plus expenses
11 incurred in obtaining substitute employment and not being regularly employed for months, being
12 without a source of income and medical insurance all to Plaintiff's damage in a sum within the
13 jurisdiction of this court, to be ascertained according to proof.

14 29. The grossly reckless, and/or intentional, malicious, and bad faith manner in which
15 said Defendant engaged in those acts as described in this cause of action by willfully violating the
16 statute enumerated in this cause of action and retaliating against the Plaintiff and terminating the
17 Plaintiff for said "whistleblowing" all in violation of the law, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive
18 damages against said Defendant in an amount within the jurisdiction of this court, to be
19 ascertained by the fact finder, that is sufficiently high to punish said Defendant, deter them from
20 engaging in such conduct again, and to make an example of them to others.

21 30. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and based thereon, alleges that the outrageous
22 conduct of said Defendant, as described above, were done with oppression and malice by
23 Plaintiff's supervisor and managers, and done with a conscious disregard for the Plaintiff's rights
24 and with the intent, design and purpose of injuring the Plaintiff. These unlawful acts were ratified
25 by those other individuals who were managing agents of said Defendant employer. By reason
26 thereof, the Plaintiff is entitled to punitive or exemplary damages against said Defendant, for their
27 acts as described in this cause of action in a sum to be determined at the time of trial.

28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FOR INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

3 (Against Defendant, KAISER PERMANENTE; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE
4 MEDICAL GROUP and all DOE Defendants)

5
6 30. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges by reference all previous paragraphs of this
7 Complaint, and each and every part thereof, with the same force and effect as though set forth at
8 length herein.

9 31. The Defendant named in this cause of action subjected the Plaintiff to severe
10 emotional distress by doing the humiliating, degrading, deceitful, and outrageous acts described
11 in the above Paragraphs through the individual agents of Defendant and Plaintiff's supervisors.
12 Although Defendant knew that Plaintiff's job performance was very good because she had thirty-
13 four, (34), years of experience and took pride in her work, Defendant attempted to deceive
14 Plaintiff by telling her that her employment was being terminated on a pretextual basis falsely
15 accusing Plaintiff of "committed egregious acts." Defendant did not provide Plaintiff with
16 specific details of its false accusations which it referred to and refused to give Plaintiff a chance
17 to respond to this false accusation. Defendant intentionally made false accusations in order to
18 embarrass, shame, and humiliate Plaintiff and in an attempt to conceal its age discrimination and
19 animus, and to conceal its retaliation motives against Plaintiff for engaging in a protected activity.

20 32. As a result of Defendant's termination of Plaintiff's employment due to age
21 discrimination, and in retaliation for Plaintiff's "whistle-blowing" Plaintiff suffered severe stress,
22 loss of sleep, headaches, panic attacks, and other physical and psychological damage that has
23 adversely affected Plaintiff's life. The financial burden of becoming abruptly unemployed, after
24 devoting thirty-four years of employment with Defendant, caused Plaintiff severe economic
25 hardship and severe stress and anguish.

26 33. The above-described acts of Defendant were willful, intentional, and malicious
27 and done with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff. Said acts were done in willful
28 disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Defendant was aware that their acts were illegal and were done

1 in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Therefore, this case warrants the imposition of
2 exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish said Defendant and to deter
3 others from engaging in similar conduct.

4
5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief, to be determined by the finder of
6 fact at the time of trial, as follows:

7 For All Causes of Action:

- 8 1. for general damages in an amount according to proof, but in excess of the
9 minimum jurisdiction of this court;
- 10 2. for special damages in an amount according to proof, but in the excess of the
11 minimum jurisdiction of this court, in order to compensate the Plaintiff for
12 Plaintiff's loss of past and future earnings, and all damages flowing from the
13 Plaintiff's loss of earnings, loss of job security, failure to properly advance within
14 Plaintiff's career, damage to Plaintiff's reputation; and for loss of all future
15 earnings and benefits and job promotions and privileges Plaintiff would have had;
- 16 3. for all costs and disbursements incurred in this suit;
- 17 4. for all interest as allowed by law;
- 18 5. where available and proper, for attorneys fees and costs incurred pursuing this
19 claim against Defendant, pursuant to *Calif. Gov. Code* §12965;
- 20 6. for all emotional distress damages that properly compensate Plaintiff for Plaintiff's
21 pain and suffering as a result of Defendants' actions as fully described in this
22 Complaint for damages;
- 23 7. for all applicable and appropriate punitive and exemplary damages; and
- 24 8. for all other relief the Court deems just, proper, and appropriate.

25
26 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial.


27 ///

28 ///

1 Dated: March 12, 2015

LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL T. CARR, APC

2
3 By


Michael T. Carr
Attorneys for Plaintiff

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

03/18/2015

Courthouse News Service

03/18/2015

EXHIBIT 1



DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
800-884-1684 | TDD 800-700-2320
www.dfeh.ca.gov | email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

AMENDED

February 27, 2015

Michael Carr
2670 Myrtle Avenue Suite 106
Monrovia California 91016

RE: Notice to Complainant or Complainant's Attorney
DFEH Matter Number: 164469-148253-R
Right to Sue: Branch / Kaiser Permanente

Dear Complainant or Complainant's Attorney:

Attached is a copy of your complaint of discrimination filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Government Code section 12900 et seq. Also attached is a copy of your Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue. Pursuant to Government Code section 12962, DFEH will not serve these documents on the employer. You or your attorney must serve the complaint. If you do not have an attorney, you must serve the complaint yourself. Please refer to the attached Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue for information regarding filing a private lawsuit in the State of California.

Be advised that the DFEH does not review or edit the complaint form to ensure that it meets procedural or statutory requirements.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

03/18/2015



DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
800-884-1684 | TDD 800-700-2320
www.dfeh.ca.gov | email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

AMENDED

February 27, 2015

RE: Notice of Filing of Discrimination Complaint
DFEH Matter Number: 164469-148253-R
Right to Sue: Branch / Kaiser Permanente

To All Respondent(s):

Enclosed is a copy of a complaint of discrimination that has been filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) in accordance with Government Code section 12960. This constitutes service of the complaint pursuant to Government Code section 12962. The complainant has requested an authorization to file a lawsuit. This case is not being investigated by DFEH and is being closed immediately. A copy of the Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue is enclosed for your records.

Please refer to the attached complaint for a list of all respondent(s) and their contact information.

No response to DFEH is requested or required.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

03/18/2015



DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
800-884-1684 | TDD 800-700-2320
www.dfeh.ca.gov | email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

AMENDED

February 27, 2015

Belinda Branch
1684 255th Street Apt. #2
Harbor City California 90710

RE: Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue
DFEH Matter Number: 164469-148253-R
Right to Sue: Branch / Kaiser Permanente

Dear Belinda Branch,

This letter informs you that the above-referenced complaint was filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) has been closed effective February 27, 2015 because an immediate Right to Sue notice was requested. DFEH will take no further action on the complaint.

This letter is also your Right to Sue notice. According to Government Code section 12965, subdivision (b), a civil action may be brought under the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act against the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency named in the above-referenced complaint. The civil action must be filed within one year from the date of this letter.

To obtain a federal Right to Sue notice, you must visit the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to file a complaint within 30 days of receipt of this DFEH Notice of Case Closure or within 300 days of the alleged discriminatory act, whichever is earlier.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

03/18/2015



STATE OF CALIFORNIA | Business and Consumer Services and Housing Agency

GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
800-884-1684 | TDD 800-700-2320
www.dfeh.ca.gov | email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

AMENDED

Enclosures

cc:

Courthouse News Service

03/18/2015

1 **COMPLAINT OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION**

2 **BEFORE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

3 **DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING**

4 **Under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act**

5 **(Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.)**

6 In the Matter of the Complaint of
7 Belinda Branch, Complainant.
8 1684 255th Street Apt. #2
9 Harbor City California 90710

DFEH No. 164469-148253-R

10 vs.

11 Kaiser Permanente Respondent.
12 1050 West Pacific Coast Highway
13 Harbor City, California 90710

14 Complainant alleges:

15 1. Respondent **Kaiser Permanente** is a **Private Employer** subject to suit under the California Fair
16 Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) (Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.). Complainant believes respondent is
subject to the FEHA.

17 2. On or around **June 05, 2014**, complainant alleges that respondent took the following adverse actions against
18 complainant: **Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation Denied a good faith interactive process, Denied a**
19 **work environment free of discrimination and/or retaliation, Denied employment, Denied reinstatement,**
Forced to quit, Terminated, . Complainant believes respondent committed these actions because of their: **Age**
- 40 and over, Engagement in Protected Activity .

20 3. Complainant **Belinda Branch** resides in the City of **Harbor City**, State of **California**. If complaint includes
21 co-respondents please see below.
22

1
2 **Additional Complaint Details:**

3 During my approximate thirty year employment with Kaiser Permanente, I was
4 subjected to discrimination and retaliation due to my age and because I complained to
5 my supervisor about violations in the work environment. After I complained, my
6 supervisor and human resources representative participated in the illegal conduct.
7 Thereafter, I was terminated from my employment.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Courthouse News Service

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

VERIFICATION

I, **Michael T. Carr**, am the Attorney for Complainant in the above-entitled complaint. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

On February 27, 2015, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Monrovia, California
Michael T. Carr

Courthouse News Service

FOR COURT USE ONLY

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, Bar number, and address):

Michael T. Carr (CSBN 183085)
 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL T. CARR, APC
 2670 Myrtle Avenue, Suite 106
 Monrovia, California 91016

TELEPHONE NO.: (626) 254-8901

FAX NO.: (626) 254-8921

ATTORNEY FOR (Name): BELINDA BRANCH

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los Angeles

STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street

MAILING ADDRESS:

CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles 90012

BRANCH NAME: Stanley Most Courthouse

CASE NAME:

Belinda Branch v. Kaiser Permanente et. al.

FILED
 Superior Court Of California
 County Of Los Angeles

MAR 18 2015

Sherrill A. [Signature] Clerk

By [Signature] Deputy
Jud. Law

CASE NUMBER:

BC 575850

JUDGE:

DEPT:

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

- ☒ Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000) ☐ Limited (Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)

Complex Case Designation

- ☐ Counter ☐ 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:

Auto Tort

- ☐ Auto (22)
☐ Uninsured motorist (46)

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

- ☐ Asbestos (04)
☐ Product liability (24)
☐ Medical malpractice (45)
☐ Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

- ☐ Business tort/unfair business practice (07)
☐ Civil rights (08)
☐ Defamation (13)
☐ Fraud (16)
☐ Intellectual property (19)
☐ Professional negligence (25)
☐ Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)

Employment

- ☒ Wrongful termination (36)
☒ Other employment (15)

Contract

- ☐ Breach of contract/warranty (06)
☐ Rule 3.740 collections (09)
☐ Other collections (09)
☐ Insurance coverage (18)
☐ Other contract (37)

Real Property

- ☐ Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)
☐ Wrongful eviction (33)
☐ Other real property (26)

Unlawful Detainer

- ☐ Commercial (31)
☐ Residential (32)
☐ Drugs (38)

Judicial Review

- ☐ Asset forfeiture (05)
☐ Petition re: arbitration award (11)
☐ Writ of mandate (02)
☐ Other judicial review (39)

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation
(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)

- ☐ Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
☐ Construction defect (10)
☐ Mass tort (40)
☐ Securities litigation (28)
☐ Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
☐ Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41)

Enforcement of Judgment

- ☐ Enforcement of judgment (20)

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

- ☐ RICO (27)
☐ Other complaint (not specified above) (42)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

- ☐ Partnership and corporate governance (21)
☐ 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. ☐ Large number of separately represented parties
 b. ☐ Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve
 c. ☐ Substantial amount of documentary evidence
 d. ☐ Large number of witnesses
 e. ☐ Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
 f. ☐ 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): 3

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: March 12, 2015

Michael T. Carr

(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

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 type 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

VIA FAX

SHORT TITLE:

Branch v. Kaiser Permanente, et. al.

CASE NUMBER

BC 575850

**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 5 ☐ 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.

Auto Tort
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons (See Step 3 Above)
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.
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 <input type="checkbox"/> A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) <input type="checkbox"/> A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress <input type="checkbox"/> A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

SHORT TITLE:

Branch v. Kaiser Permanente, et. al.

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:

Branch v. Kaiser Permanente, et. al.

CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 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.
	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	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:

Branch v. Kaiser Permanente, et. al.

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.

REASON: 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 checked="" 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.		ADDRESS: 1050 West Pacific Coast Highway
CITY: Harbor City	STATE: CA	ZIP CODE: 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 Stanley Mosk 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: March 12, 2015

 (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.
- 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.