Case3:15-cv-01335-LB Document1 Filed03/23/15 Page1 of 3

1 2 3	Laurence F. Padway, #89314 Law Offices of Laurence F. Padway 1516 Oak Street, Suite 109 Alameda, California 94501 Telephone: (510)814-6100 Facsimile: (510)814-0650
4	
5	Attorneys for plaintiff Peggy Roach
6	
	INITED STATES DISTRICT COLUDT
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	PEGGY ROACH,
10	α (α) α
11	Plaintiff, Plaintiff, ERISA BENEFITS AND
12	vs. FOR VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INSURANCE
13	KAISER PERMANENTE FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN and
	METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE ((%)
14	COMPANY,
15	Defendants.
16	
17	Comes now limitiff allowing of defendant as follows:
18	Comes now plaintiff alleging of defendant as follows:
19	
20	Jurisdiction
	1. This suit seeks review of a wrongful termination of benefits under a long term
21	disability plan covered by ERISA, 28 U.S.C. 1132. Federal jurisdiction arises under 28 U.S.C.
22	1132(f).
23	
24	
25	First Claim for Relief - ERISA Benefits
26	2. Plaintiff Peggy Roach participates in the Kaiser Permanente Flexible Benefit Plan,
27	which is regulated by ERISA. The plan is funded, in relevant part, by a group long-term disability
	insurance policy issued by defendant Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (hereafter, "MetLife").
28	
	Complaint 1

1 2

The plan, and Ms. Roach both reside within this judicial district.

3. Defendant Metropolitan Life Insurance Company ("MetLife") is an insurance company which acts as the claims administrator of the plan, insures the plan and made the decisions concerning the claim in issue.

4. Plaintiff became disabled in 2001, during her employment by Kaiser Permanente and while covered under the Plan. The Plan provides for payment in the event of disability. This disability was paid, for various periods of time, as claim no. 21304013502.

Long Term Disability Claim

5. Plaintiff applied for long term disability benefits under the plan. The plan paid some benefits but then terminated payment on May 31, 2003. Plaintiff filed suit on September 1, 2004 in the U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV04-1081 JVS. The parties filed a stipulation regarding payments of plaintiff's benefits on May 20, 2005 and benefits were reinstated. That order was entered on May 23, 2005.

Following an administrative appeal, on October 16, 2014, Metlife approved benefits as of January 31, 2012 contending this was a new claim, and imposing a new 90 day elimination period. Metlife assigned a new claim number, 701406248320. In fact, benefits should have been approved as a continuation of the original claim from 2001. Thus, Metlife also found Ms. Roach "unable to perform the duties of any occupation," which is the wrong definition of disability for a new claim, and is only consistent with the 2014 decision being a continuation of the old claim. Because Metlife treated this as a new claim, in addition to imposing the 90 day waiting period, Metlife miscalculated the benefit due, and has significantly underpaid it.

1	7. As a proximate result thereof plaintiff has been damaged by the loss of benefits,
2	and underpayment of them, from January 18, 2012, to the present and continuing into the future.
3	
4	8. Plaintiff has been compelled to retain counsel to collect the benefits owed, and is
5	entitled to reasonable attorneys fees under ERISA in an amount dependent upon the extent of
6	litigation required and estimated at \$150,000 through trial.
7	
8	Wherefore, plaintiff prays for relief as set forth below
9	
10	Prayer for Relief
11	
12	Wherefore, plaintiff prays for relief as follows:
13	
14	1. For benefits due under the Plan according to proof, and prejudgment interest
15	thereon;
16	
17	2. For attorneys fees of \$150,000 or according to proof; and
18	
19	3. For such other relief as the court deems just and proper.
20	
21	Dated: March 20, 2015 /s/ Laurence F. Padway
22	Laurence F. Padway Attorney for plaintiff
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	