	<b>~</b> ~				
`	E-FILMUG				
1	Melvyn D. Silver - SBN 48674 Ruth Silver Taube - SBN 169589 LAW OFFICES OF SILVER & TAUBE				
2	LAW OFFICES OF SILVER & TAUBE				
3	Sunnyvale, CA 94087				
4	Sullyvale, CA 94087       RICHARD W. WIEKING         Telephone:       (408) 737-2313         Facsimile:       (408) 737-2937         Richard W. WIEKING         San JOSE				
5	- UN JUSE SALIFORNIA	F			
6		1. ·			
7		1 2.00			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9 10					
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
12					
13	ALEXANDER ELSINGA, $CV13 - 0829$				
14	Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF				
15	v. ) EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLAN ) (29 U.S.C. § 1002 et seq);				
16					
17	METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE ) COMPLAINT FOR BENEFITS COMPANY,KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH ) PLAN, INC. LONG TERM DISABILITY PLAN )				
18	Defendants.				
19 20					
20	$\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{O}}$				
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28	Elsinga vs. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., et. al Complaint				

٠,

2

I.

1

## JURISDICTION

3 1. Alexander Elsinga ("Elsinga") is and at all times mentioned herein was an 4 employee of Kaiser Permanente ("Kaiser"). Kaiser is and at all times mentioned herein was a 5 Health Care provider doing business in Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties, California in the 6 Northern District of California. Kaiser created the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. Long 7 Term Disability Plan ("the LTD Plan") as an employee benefit. The LTD Plan was fully insured 8 with the Metropolitan Insurance Company ("MetLife") effective prior to March 17, 2011 as Group Policy 959110-1-G. MetLife is an insurer doing business in Santa Clara County, California in the Northern District of California. The LTD Plan is in writing. This claim arises under an ERISA registered and controlled employee benefit plan. Jurisdiction of this court is present under 29 U.S.C. § 1002, 29 U.S.C. § 1132.

13

14

15

16

17

21

24

26

27

9

10

11

12

## IL. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Prior to March 17, 2011 Kaiser created the LTD plan in writing for its 2. employees as an employee benefit fully insured with MetLife. Under the terms of the LTD Plan, MetLife promised to pay Long Term Disability benefits to any of such employees as would become totally disabled as defined by the LTD Plan while employed by Kaiser.

18 3. At all times herein mentioned, Elsinga was an employee of Kaiser and is a 19 covered employee under the Plan.

20 4. On or about March 17, 2011, Elsinga became totally disabled in accordance with the definition of total disability under the LTD Plan and timely applied for benefits under 22 the Plan.

23 5. The LTD Plan was to provide long term benefits to Elsinga commencing September 13, 2011 at 60% of Elsinga's salary subject to offset by payments from California SDI 25 and Federal SSDI.

28 Elsinga vs. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. et al. - Complaint

•. ,	<b>~</b> ~			
t				
1	6. Elsinga timely applied for benefits under the Plan. The Plan denied benefits to			
	Elsinga on the basis that he was not disabled under the terms of the Plan.			
3	7. Elsinga properly appealed the denial of benefits to the LTD Plan. On			
4	February 20, 2013 the LTD plan denied Elsinga's appeal in a final and administratively binding			
5	decision. Elsinga has now exhausted his administrative remedies under the LTD Plan.			
6	8. Elsinga is and at all times mentioned herein was totally disabled as that term			
7	is defined in the LTD Plan.			
8	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION			
9	1. The Long Term Disability Plan is an employee benefit plan defined under			
10	29 U.S.C. § 1002.			
11	2. In accordance with 29 U.S.C. § 1132, Plaintiff herein seeks to recover the			
12	benefits due under the Plan including prejudgment interest and attorney's fees expended			
13	herein.			
14	3. In all cases, Plaintiff has performed all conditions required on Plaintiff's part			
15	to be performed and, in accordance with the Plan, gave the Plan due and timely notice of			
16	and proof of loss.			
17	4. The action of the Plan in rejecting claims, terminating benefits, and failing to			
18	provide a full and fair review cannot withstand scrutiny under any standard of review.			
19				
20				
21				
22				
23	/			
24	/			
25	/			
26	/			
27				
28	Elsinga vs. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. et al Complaint			

<b>)</b> •	-	•	$\widehat{}$	
	1	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:		
	2	1. For all benefits due Plaintiff under the LTD Plan together with prejudgment		
	3	interest thereon at the legal rate;		
	4	<ol> <li>For cost of suit incurred herein;</li> <li>For attorney's fees; and</li> </ol>		
	5			
	6			
	7	circumstances.		
	8	Dated: Feld 25,2013	SILVER & TAUBE	
	0		MELVEN D. SILVER	
	1		Attorney for Plaintiff	
	2		1G	
	3		R	
1	4			
1	5			
1	6			
1	7			
1	8			
1	9			
2	0			
2		(G)		
2				
2				
2				
2				
2 2				
2		Elsinga vs. Metropoliton Life Inc. Co. et al. Co.	Apploint	
2		Elsinga vs. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. et al Co	mprannt	