

ORIGINAL



20903989

FILED

Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

FILED

ALAMEDA COUNTY

NOV 01 2018

MAR 13 2019

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk

By Richard Juarez Deputy

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

By ERICA BAKER Deputy

TORIN A. DORROS, SBN 191228

tdorros@dorroslaw.com

DORROS LAW

8730 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 350,

Beverly Hills, California 90211

Telephone: (310) 997-2050

Facsimile: (310) 496-1320

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,

J.H.; R.N.; B.H.; and M.H.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

J.H.; R.N.; B.H.; and M.H.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN,
INC.; KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS;
THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP,
INC.; and DOES 1 THROUGH 10,

Defendants.

Case No.: 18STCV03612

Judge: Hon. RG19010973

COMPLAINT

(Unlimited Jurisdiction)

1. Violation of California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act – Cal. Civil Code §§ 56 et seq. (CMIA)
2. Violation of Privacy/Data Breach Notice Statute Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.82 et seq.
3. Common Law Invasion of Privacy
4. Violation of California Constitution Art 1 § 1 Right to Privacy
5. Negligence and Negligence Per Se
6. Negligent Hiring, Retention, and Supervision
7. Breach of Fiduciary Duty
8. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress and Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress
9. Violation of Evidence Code § 1158 and Demand for Records
10. Employer/Healthcare Provider Retaliation and Wrongful Termination or Wrongful Constructive Termination – Violations of California Government Code §§ 12940 et seq.; California Labor Code § 132a; California Health & Safety Code § 1278.5, and Public Policy

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT

BY FAX

114052648

1 Plaintiffs, J.H.; R.N.; B.H.; and M.H. (individually, "J.H.", "R.N.", "B.H.", and "M.H.,
2 respectively, and collectively "Plaintiffs")¹ hereby alleges against Defendants KAISER
3 FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.; KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS; THE
4 PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC. (collectively "Kaiser") and DOES 1 through 10
5 (individually "Defendant" and collectively "Defendants") as follows:

6 **I.**

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. This action arises out of Kaiser's utter failure to protect and safeguard Plaintiffs'
9 confidential and protected personal, sensitive, medical, healthcare identifying, and/or financial
10 information ("PHI") ultimately resulting in the unlawful access to such PHI by unauthorized persons
11 and disclosure of such PHI to unauthorized recipients, as well as substantial damages, emotional
12 distress, and irreparable harm. For purposes of this Complaint although the acronym PHI is most
13 typically associated only with health information, in this Complaint and lawsuit the use of PHI is
14 meant to be given its broadest meaning and encompass not merely medical or healthcare information,
15 but all information of a person that may be confidential, private, or otherwise protected under the
16 statutes relevant to this action.

17 2. Plaintiffs each are and were patients of Kaiser. Plaintiff J.H. also is and was an
18 employee of Kaiser.

19 3. Kaiser and/or its nurse employee, over the course of a year or more, without legal
20 authorization or consent accessed, viewed and/or disclosed confidential medical information and PHI
21 contained in each of the Plaintiffs' electronic medical record files on multiple occasions, so much so
22 that Kaiser went so far as to recommend that Plaintiffs obtain a temporary restraining order against
23 the Kaiser nurse employee. However, even with Kaiser's stated grave concerns for Plaintiffs' safety
24 and wellbeing, upon initial request, Kaiser refused to provide assistance to Plaintiffs in obtaining such
25

26
27 ¹ To preserve necessary confidentiality and protect the privacy interests of Plaintiffs, the Complaint and action are filed
28 under Plaintiffs' initials. Plaintiffs' counsel and Defendants/Defendants' counsel have previously been in contact
regarding this matter, including without limitation Plaintiffs' counsel's correspondence(s) notifying Defendants of the
facts alleged herein and attempting to resolve the matter without litigation, and thus Defendants are fully familiar with
the identity of Plaintiffs and the circumstances giving rise to Plaintiffs' Complaint, claims, and action.

11/05/2018
11/05/2018

1 Kaiser recommended temporary restraining order.

2 4. Kaiser and its employee's conduct was a gross violation of Plaintiffs' privacy and
3 other rights regarding their PHI and has caused substantial damages, severe emotional distress, and
4 continuing and irreparable harm to Plaintiffs.

5 **II.**

6 **PARTIES**

7 5. Plaintiff, J.H. is an individual currently residing in Minnesota.

8 6. Plaintiff, R.N. is an individual residing in the County of Butte, California.

9 7. Plaintiff, B.H. is an individual residing in the County of Butte, California.

10 8. Plaintiff, M.H. is an individual currently residing in Minnesota.

11 9. Upon information and belief, Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN,
12 INC. is a California licensed health care provider or health care service provider, form unknown, with
13 offices throughout California and conducts business in and throughout California and specifically in
14 the district and/or County in which this Court is located or over which this Court has jurisdiction.

15 10. Upon information and belief, Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS, is a
16 California licensed health care provider or health care service provider, form unknown and conducts
17 business in and throughout California and specifically in the district and/or County in which this Court
18 is located or over which this Court has jurisdiction.

19 11. Upon information and belief, Defendant THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP,
20 INC. is a California licensed health care provider or health care service provider, form unknown and
21 conducts business in and throughout, and/or provides health care and/or health care services to
22 patients residing in and throughout, California and specifically in the district and/or County in which
23 this Court is located or over which this Court has jurisdiction.

24 12. The true names and capacities of the defendants named herein as Does 1 through 10,
25 whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, are currently unknown to Plaintiffs, and
26 therefore Plaintiffs alleges that each of these fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some
27 manner for the events sued upon. Plaintiffs will seek leave of this Court to amend the Complaint to
28 assert the true identities and capacities of the defendants named herein as Does 1 through 10 when

11/05/2018
11/05/2018

1 such identities and capacities have been ascertained.

2 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all relevant times, each
3 Defendant was the agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendant and, in doing each of the
4 things herein alleged, was acting within the scope of such agency and/or employment.

5 III.

6 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7 14. This case arises out of Defendants' illegal and wrongful disclosure and failure to
8 protect Plaintiffs' PHI resulting in substantial statutory and other damages to Plaintiffs.

9 15. This Court properly has jurisdiction as certain events giving rise to the causes of action
10 alleged herein occurred in the County of Los Angeles, State of California within this judicial district;
11 Plaintiffs was harmed in this judicial district; that Defendants conduct business in this judicial district;
12 and that the damages arising out of the alleged causes of action exceed the jurisdictional limits of any
13 court such that this action is brought before this Court in the proper forum and venue.

14 16. Venue is proper in the district on either of the following grounds: (a) Defendants
15 operate and provide services in this district in California, Defendants wrongfully failed to protect/keep
16 confidential and illegally disclosed Plaintiffs' PHI in this district in California, Defendants failed to
17 adhere to California Evidence Code § 1158 and produce requested documents in this district in
18 California, and that Defendants' conduct caused significant harm to Plaintiffs in this district in
19 California; and (b) Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.

20 IV.

21 STATEMENT OF FACTS

22 1. Plaintiffs all were patients of Kaiser.

23 2. Plaintiffs J.H. also was an employee of Kaiser.

24 3. Kaiser is a licensed healthcare provider or health care service provider in the State of
25 California and provides healthcare services throughout California.

26 4. As such, Kaiser is obligated to comply with and adhere to various Federal and State
27 PHI privacy, confidentiality, and security laws, regulations, and rules, including without limitation
28 HIPAA, HITECH, and CMIA.

11/05/2018
11/05/2018

1 5. Kaiser was privy to, came into possession of, and maintained Plaintiffs' PHI, of which
2 Kaiser has and had a legal duty to ensure the confidentiality and security.

3 6. Kaiser failed to protect the confidentiality of Plaintiffs' PHI and unlawfully disclosed
4 Plaintiffs' PHI and/or allowed Plaintiffs' PHI to be disclosed to, or accessed by, persons without
5 Plaintiffs' consent and/or who did not have authority to receive or access Plaintiffs' PHI.

6 7. To be clear, to the extent an employee or independent contractor of Kaiser was
7 responsible for the unlawful access into or disclosure of Plaintiffs' PHI, or other violation of
8 Plaintiffs' PHI privacy rights, Kaiser, as well as the individual employee or independent contractor,
9 is, and would be, legally responsible and liable for such wrongful conduct. Indeed, Kaiser is legally
10 responsible for the acts of its employees and contractors with respect to the protection of (or violations
11 of) PHI privacy and further has a separate and distinct legal obligation to ensure not only that its
12 patients' PHI is properly and adequately protected and secured, but too that its employees and
13 contractors adhere to the relevant PHI privacy laws, that they are properly trained related to PHI
14 privacy laws, and that proper mechanisms or procedures are in place and enforced to ensure that
15 patients' PHI privacy is properly maintained and protected.

16 8. Again, Plaintiffs were patients of Kaiser. Indeed, Plaintiffs, each, had been a patient
17 of Kaiser for many years.

18 9. Further, again, J.H. also was an employee of Kaiser.

19 10. In or about early April 2018 J.H. was advised that she was required to appear at Kaiser
20 for a meeting ("Privacy Violation Meeting"), however no information as to the reasons for the
21 required meeting were provided.

22 11. It turned out that Kaiser had discovered some time before this Privacy Violation
23 Meeting that another Kaiser employee, a nurse, J.H.'s roommate whom J.H. at one point believed to
24 be a friend, for a period of at least a year or more had been intentionally and without authorization
25 accessing and viewing J.H.'s private and confidential patient medical records, J.H.'s PHI.

26 12. In fact, however, it became clear that Kaiser's employee had not merely accessed
27 J.H.'s PHI, but she had also over the course of the year intentionally on multiple occasions without
28 authorization accessed and viewed the PHI, the confidential medical records, of J.H.'s three sons

11/05/2018
11/05/2018

1 (Plaintiffs R.N., B.H., and M.H.)

2 13. This all was traceable and identifiable through the audit logs that Kaiser is/was
3 required to maintain relative to its patients' PHI, including that of Plaintiffs. In fact, on information
4 and belief, the audit trails/logs had access to these audit trails/logs and relevant PHI privacy tracking
5 information at the time of each individual breach and well before the Privacy Violation Meeting.

6 14. Critically, Kaiser did not simply indicate that Kaiser had identified some unauthorized
7 accesses into or viewing of Plaintiffs' PHI. Rather during the Privacy Violation Meeting Kaiser
8 specifically stated to J.H. that it was Kaiser's belief or impression that J.H. had a "Single White
9 Female" situation on J.H.'s hands and thus recommended that J.H. immediately obtain a temporary
10 restraining order ("TRO") against Kaiser's nurse employee.

11 15. The reference to "Single White Female" is critical in this case especially related to the
12 severe negative impact and substantial emotional distress Kaiser's conduct inflicted upon J.H. The
13 movie Single White Female essentially revolves around the story of a woman who befriends her
14 roommate and ultimately murders her roommate's fiancé, beats and attempts to murder her roommate,
15 and kills her roommate's puppy in an attempt to become or steal her roommate's identity.

16 16. Kaiser directly likened the Kaiser nurse, who violated Plaintiffs' PHI privacy rights
17 and trolled through Plaintiffs' medical records, to the serial killer woman in the Single White Female
18 movie. In fact Kaiser made these representations and associations when Kaiser specifically knew or
19 should have known that Plaintiff J.H. and the Kaiser employee nurse were roommates.

20 17. Indeed, Kaiser's position has been that their system failed to timely and appropriately
21 flag the Kaiser nurse employee's illegal entry into Plaintiffs' medical records because Plaintiff J.H.
22 and the nurse employee only relatively recently became roommates and thus had the same address.

23 18. Leaving aside the fact that in fact J.H. and the Kaiser nurse had had the same address
24 for months prior to Kaiser's initiating its investigation into the privacy breaches and the Privacy
25 Violation Meeting, at bare minimum Kaiser had been investigating the breaches at issue in this action
26 for a month prior to the Privacy Violation Meeting giving Kaiser plenty of time to conduct an
27 investigation into the Kaiser nurse employee, her relationship if any to J.H., and the violations
28 themselves.

11/05/2018

1 19. After such investigation, and at the time of/during the Privacy Violation Meeting,
2 Kaiser was very much aware that J.H. and the Kaiser nurse were roommates, yet Kaiser went so far
3 as to take the position that Kaiser did not merely have concerns about the privacy violations, but
4 rather that J.H. and her family, the other Plaintiffs, were in significant danger, including potentially
5 danger of severe physical harm or death, i.e. a "Single White Female situation".

6 20. Upon information and belief that was a significant basis for Kaiser specifically
7 recommending that J.H. immediately seek a TRO.

8 21. However, when J.H. initially requested Kaiser's assistance to obtain the TRO, Kaiser
9 refused to provide any assistance to J.H. or J.H.'s other affected/violated family members.

10 22. Thus J.H. was forced to engage counsel to pursue the TRO and ultimately now to
11 protect Plaintiff's privacy rights and seek redress for the severe violation of those rights by Kaiser.

12 23. Only well subsequent to Plaintiffs' counsel being engaged did Kaiser provide any
13 assistance and in fact Kaiser maintained that it could provide no actual assistance in protecting its
14 employee, J.H. or J.H.'s family.

15 24. Kaiser however ultimately provided a signed sworn declaration attesting to the fact
16 that Kaiser and/or its nurse employee violated Plaintiffs' PHI privacy rights on numerous occasions.
17 Attached as **Exhibit "1"** is a true and correct copy of the signed declaration of Kaiser's compliance
18 investigation employee, Jasmeet Gill.

19 25. Significantly, Jasmeet Gill was the Kaiser employee who conducted the Privacy
20 Violation Meeting and informed J.H. of the privacy violations and made the "Single White Female"
21 comment and recommendation for an immediate TRO. During the Privacy Violation Meeting,
22 Jasmeet Gill further specifically stated to J.H. that she had significant concerns for the safety and/or
23 wellbeing of J.H. and her family, the other Plaintiffs in this case.

24 26. Upon information and belief, based at minimum on the very unambiguous statements
25 of Kaiser's privacy compliance investigator, Kaiser apparently had or has information that led it/her
26 to believe that the Kaiser nurse employee either had severe violent tendencies, a criminal past or
27 predilection, or potentially even was or could be a person who could commit murder or other violent
28 crimes toward other persons, including Plaintiff J.H. and/or the other Plaintiffs, J.H.'s family.

1 27. Kaiser has indicated that between the Plaintiffs, Kaiser identified at least thirteen (13)
2 separate and distinct PHI privacy violations and/or breaches by Kaiser and/or its employee related to
3 Plaintiffs. Upon information and belief there are more than 13 separate violations.

4 28. With respect to such PHI privacy violations/breaches, Kaiser either failed to provide
5 any required notice(s) or written notice(s), or failed to provide such notice(s) within the requisite time
6 frame and/or in compliance with all statutory requirements.

7 29. PHI privacy laws such as CMIA, and others, are per violation statutes. They impose
8 the requisite statutory damages, fines, penalties, fees, and otherwise on a per violation basis.

9 30. For each violation Plaintiffs' PHI was unlawfully accessed, viewed, and/or disclosed
10 without the requisite authorization to do so.

11 31. Such conduct is wrongful and illegal subjecting Kaiser to damages, statutory damages,
12 punitive damages, litigation costs, and attorney's fees.

13 32. Indeed, Plaintiffs suffered substantial damages, emotional distress, and irreparable
14 harm as a result of Kaiser's conduct.

15 33. Understandably, the privacy violations themselves and the knowledge that Kaiser
16 and/or its employee had been trolling through J.H.'s and her family's medical records caused serious
17 emotional trauma to J.H.

18 34. Moreover the fact that Kaiser took no or little to no action to protect J.H. or her family
19 further exacerbated the damage.

20 35. Of course also Kaiser's description of the situation as a single white female scenario
21 had massive detrimental and frightening impact on J.H.

22 36. Kaiser's other conduct related to and stemming from the privacy breaches and
23 Plaintiffs' allegations of privacy breaches also have necessarily caused substantial damages and
24 emotional distress and ongoing irreparable harm to Plaintiffs.

25 37. Indeed subsequent to Plaintiff's engagement of counsel and assertion her privacy
26 rights including asserting Plaintiff's claims against Kaiser for such privacy violations, Kaiser took
27 wrongful and retaliatory actions toward and against J.H.

28 38. Kaiser first initiated an unwarranted human resources investigation of J.H. when the

1 privacy violations were the actions of Kaiser and its nurse employee, not J.H.

2 39. Understandably, the massive emotional trauma and distress and psychological harm
3 Kaiser inflicted upon J.H. based upon the privacy violations and subsequent unwarranted human
4 resources investigation and other wrongful conduct, resulted in J.H. needing to file a workers
5 compensation claims for such harms/injuries.

6 40. Subsequent to J.H. asserting her and her family's privacy rights, as well as subsequent
7 to J.H. filing her workers compensation claim, Kaiser went so far as to terminate J.H.'s pay/salary,
8 employment benefits, and health insurance, including the health insurance for J.H. and all of her sons,
9 at least two of which had quite severe medical conditions requiring ongoing prescription medications
10 and medical/healthcare services. Kaiser was very much aware of J.H.'s sons' medical needs yet still
11 terminated J.H.'s health insurance subsequent to J.H. asserting her rights because of the clear privacy
12 violations committed by Kaiser and its employee nurse.

13 41. Of note, Kaiser did not technically "terminate" J.H.'s employment. Rather Kaiser
14 intentionally left J.H. hanging in the wind with no pay, no benefits, no insurance, but still technically
15 a Kaiser employee. Regardless, this amounts to, at bare minimum, a constructive termination as
16 Kaiser effectively terminated J.H. other than terming its conduct as a termination.

17 42. Kaiser's illegal conduct violated Plaintiffs' various legal rights related to the right to
18 confidentiality of medical information and PHI, including without limitation, HIPAA, HITECH, the
19 California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 56 et seq. ("CMIA");
20 California's Constitutional right to privacy under Cal. Const. Art 1 § 1, California's common law
21 right to privacy; and other medical privacy laws analogous to CMIA and/or HIPAA/HITECH.

22 **V.**

23 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

24 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

25 **Violation of California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act – Cal. Civil Code §§ 56 et**
26 **seq. (CMIA)**

27 **(As Against All Defendants)**

28 43. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations above as if fully stated herein.

1 44. Plaintiffs specifically incorporate herein this claim the allegations set forth in the
2 Statement of Facts above.

3 45. Defendants are licensed California healthcare providers and/or a "covered entities".

4 46. Defendants are and were not authorized to disclose, transmit, or otherwise allow access
5 to Plaintiffs' PHI to or by unauthorized persons.

6 47. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs' PHI was disclosed to, or allowed to be
7 accessed, obtained, or viewed by, unauthorized persons.

8 48. Defendants had, possessed and/or maintained Plaintiffs' PHI.

9 49. Defendants were obligated to protect and ensure the confidentiality of such PHI.

10 50. Defendants are obligated to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA,
11 analogous State medical information confidentiality and privacy statutes, Cal. Civil Code §§ 1798.82
12 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and Professions Code, and other
13 State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the protection of the confidentiality
14 of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure of such information.

15 51. Defendants had a duty to protect Plaintiffs' PHI and to prevent the unauthorized access
16 and disclosure of Plaintiffs' PHI.

17 52. As a result of Defendants' conduct Plaintiffs' privacy was breached including that
18 Plaintiffs' PHI was disclosed to unauthorized persons, was allowed to be disclosed to unauthorized
19 persons, was made capable of access by unauthorized persons, and/or was accessed by unauthorized
20 persons.

21 53. As a result of Defendants' conduct Plaintiffs' PHI was used and/or disclosed without
22 Plaintiffs' authorization and the PHI was not kept secure, private, and/or confidential.

23 54. Defendants breached their duties owed to Plaintiffs.

24 55. Such breach and conduct proximately caused substantial damages to Plaintiffs.

25 56. Defendants' failure to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA, Cal.
26 Civil Code §§ 1798.82 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and
27 Professions Code, and other State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the
28 protection of the confidentiality of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure

1 of such information constitute a breach of the standard of care and a breach of Defendants' duties
2 owed to Plaintiffs.

3 57. Such breach proximately caused substantial damages to Plaintiffs.

4 58. Defendants' conduct violated CMIA.

5 59. Defendants' conduct was intentional, reckless, and/or negligent.

6 60. Plaintiffs is entitled to recover damages, statutory damages, punitive damages,
7 attorney's fees, and injunctive relief as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct pursuant to Cal.
8 Civil Code §§ 56.35 and 56.36.

9 61. Plaintiffs is also entitled to statutory nominal damages of one thousand dollars per
10 violation pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 56.36.

11 62. Plaintiffs is entitled to litigation costs.

12 63. Plaintiffs is entitled to attorney's fees.

13 64. Plaintiffs is entitled to injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' damages and irreparable harm are
14 substantial and continuing and will continue unless restrained and/or enjoined.

15 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

16 **Violation of California Privacy/Data Breach Notice Statute Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.82 et seq.**

17 **(As Against All Defendants)**

18 65. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations above as if fully stated herein.

19 66. Plaintiffs specifically incorporate herein this claim the allegations set forth in the
20 Statement of Facts above.

21 67. Defendants are licensed California healthcare providers and/or a "covered entities".

22 68. Defendants are and were not authorized to disclose, transmit, or otherwise allow access
23 to Plaintiffs' PHI to or by unauthorized persons.

24 69. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs' PHI was disclosed to, or allowed to be
25 accessed, viewed, obtained, or received by, unauthorized persons.

26 70. Defendants are obligated to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA,
27 Cal. Civil Code §§ 1798.82 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and
28 Professions Code, and other State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the

1 protection of the confidentiality of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure
2 of such information.

3 71. Defendants had a duty to protect Plaintiffs' PHI and to prevent the unauthorized access
4 and/or disclosure of Plaintiffs' PHI.

5 72. As a result of Defendants' conduct Plaintiffs' privacy was breached including that
6 Plaintiffs' PHI was disclosed to unauthorized persons, was allowed to be disclosed to unauthorized
7 persons, was made capable of access by unauthorized persons, and/or was accessed by unauthorized
8 persons.

9 73. Moreover under Cal. Civil Code § 1798.82 et seq. Defendants are obligated to provide
10 statutorily required notices and take other actions upon privacy violations and privacy or data
11 breaches such as the violations and breaches alleged herein.

12 74. However Defendants failed to adhere to and comply with their statutory and other legal
13 obligations provided under the relevant statutes including Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1798.82 et seq.

14 75. Such breach proximately caused substantial damages to Plaintiffs.

15 76. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, reckless, and/or negligent.

16 77. As a result, Plaintiffs is entitled to damages, statutory damages, punitive damages, and
17 attorney's fees.

18 78. Plaintiffs is also entitled to injunctive relief enjoining Defendants from further such
19 wrongful conduct.

20 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

21 **Negligence and Negligence Per Se**

22 **(As Against All Defendants)**

23 79. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations above as if fully stated herein.

24 80. Plaintiffs specifically incorporate herein this claim the allegations set forth in the
25 Statement of Facts above.

26 81. Defendants are licensed California healthcare providers and/or a "covered entities".

27 82. Defendants are and were not authorized to disclose, transmit, or otherwise allow access
28 to Plaintiffs' PHI to or by unauthorized persons.

11/05/2018
11/05/2018

1 83. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs' PHI was disclosed to, or allowed to be
2 accessed, viewed, obtained, or received by, unauthorized persons.

3 84. Defendants are obligated to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA,
4 Cal. Civil Code §§ 1798.82 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and
5 Professions Code, and other State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the
6 protection of the confidentiality of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure
7 of such information.

8 85. While HIPAA may not provide for a private right of action, case law has held that the
9 strict requirements of HIPAA placed upon healthcare professionals and healthcare facilities and their
10 staff regarding the protection of PHI to prevent unauthorized access and disclosure of such
11 information may be used as a standard of care for claims of negligence. In fact, case law has also
12 indicated that breaches of HIPAA may justify imposition of liability for negligence per se not merely
13 just negligence.

14 86. Defendants had a duty to protect Plaintiffs' PHI and to prevent the unauthorized access
15 and disclosure of Plaintiffs' PHI.

16 87. As a result of Defendants' conduct Plaintiffs' privacy was breached including that
17 their PHI was disclosed to unauthorized persons, allowed to be disclosed to unauthorized persons,
18 made capable of access by unauthorized persons and/or accessed by unauthorized persons.

19 88. Defendants breached their duties owed to Plaintiffs.

20 89. Such breach and conduct proximately caused substantial damages to Plaintiffs.

21 90. Defendants' failure to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA, Cal.
22 Civil Code §§ 1798.82 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and
23 Professions Code, and other State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the
24 protection of the confidentiality of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure
25 of such information constitute a breach of the standard of care and a breach of Defendants' duties
26 owed to Plaintiffs.

27 91. Defendants' conduct constitutes negligence and negligence per se.

28 92. Plaintiffs is entitled to recover damages as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

1 93. Plaintiffs is entitled to attorney's fees.

2 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

3 **Negligent Hiring, Retention, and Supervision**

4 **(As Against All Defendants)**

5 94. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations above as if fully stated herein.

6 95. Plaintiffs specifically incorporate herein this claim the allegations set forth in the
7 Statement of Facts above.

8 96. Defendants are licensed California healthcare providers and/or a "covered entities".

9 97. Defendants are and were not authorized to disclose, transmit, or otherwise allow access
10 to Plaintiffs' PHI to or by unauthorized persons.

11 98. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs' PHI was disclosed to, or allowed to be
12 accessed, viewed, obtained, or received by, unauthorized persons.

13 99. Defendants are obligated to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA,
14 Cal. Civil Code §§ 1798.82 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and
15 Professions Code, and other State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the
16 protection of the confidentiality of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure
17 of such information.

18 100. While HIPAA may not provide for a private right of action, case law has held that the
19 strict requirements of HIPAA placed upon healthcare professionals and healthcare facilities and their
20 staff regarding the protection of PHI to prevent unauthorized access and disclosure of such
21 information may be used as a standard of care for claims of negligence. In fact, case law has also
22 indicated that breaches of HIPAA may justify imposition of liability for negligence per se not merely
23 just negligence.

24 101. Defendants breached their duties owed to Plaintiffs.

25 102. Such breach proximately caused substantial damages to Plaintiffs.

26 103. Defendants' failure to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA, Cal.
27 Civil Code §§ 1798.82 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and
28 Professions Code, and other State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the

11/05/2018
11/05/2018

1 protection of the confidentiality of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure
2 of such information constitute a breach of the standard of care and a breach of Defendants' duties
3 owed to Plaintiffs.

4 104. Further, Defendant negligently hired, kept or retained, and/or supervised its employees
5 and staff regarding the privacy violations and failure to maintain HIPAA, CMIA, and other statutory
6 compliance.

7 105. As alleged more fully above, Kaiser's nurse employee over the course of at least a year
8 trolled through Plaintiffs' medical records and PHI on numerous occasions—at least 13 separate
9 occasions.

10 106. Kaiser has an entire compliance and/or privacy department and/or persons/employees
11 directly responsible for the oversight of PHI privacy and compliance with PHI privacy related laws.

12 107. Moreover Kaiser, as covered entities and/or healthcare providers are required to have,
13 has various electronic or computer monitoring systems, including a HIPAA audit log or trail system,
14 to ensure that Kaiser and/or its employees adhere to all the relevant PHI privacy laws, including
15 without limitation HIPAA, HITECH, and CMIA. These type of systems should have made it easy
16 for Kaiser to monitor and identify clear privacy violations such as those that occurred to Plaintiffs.
17 Nevertheless Plaintiffs suffered numerous PHI privacy violations and unlawful intrusions into their
18 medical records over the course of at least a full year.

19 108. Defendant had a duty to Plaintiffs to act responsibly relative to the security and
20 confidentiality of PHI and to act timely and appropriately when notified of problems, violations, or
21 breaches. Defendant further had a duty to ensure that its staff protected the security and
22 confidentiality of PHI and that the staff took the appropriate steps to remedy the situations of privacy
23 breaches or violations when notified or when they should have been aware of them.

24 109. However Defendant and its staff failed take such actions and in so failing breached the
25 obligations and duties owed to Plaintiffs. Defendant failed to hire the correct persons, failed to train
26 them appropriately, failed to fire them upon their failure to maintain or protect the confidentiality of
27 PHI or to take the necessary and requisite steps to remedy or provide notice of the violations and
28 breaches, and failed to properly or adequately supervise its staff relative to PHI privacy, HIPAA

1 compliance and otherwise.

2 110. Such failures and breaches of duties directly led to damages to Plaintiffs.

3 111. Defendants' conduct constitutes negligence and negligence per se.

4 112. Plaintiffs is entitled to recover damages as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

5 113. Plaintiffs is entitled to attorney's fees.

6 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

7 **Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress and Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress**

8 **(As Against All Defendants)**

9 114. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations above as if fully stated herein.

10 115. Plaintiffs specifically incorporate herein this claim the allegations set forth in the
11 Statement of Facts above.

12 116. Defendants are licensed California healthcare providers and/or a "covered entities".

13 117. Defendants are and were not authorized to disclose, transmit, or otherwise allow access
14 to Plaintiffs' PHI to or by unauthorized persons.

15 118. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs' PHI was disclosed to, or allowed to be
16 accessed, viewed, obtained, or received by, unauthorized persons.

17 119. Defendants are obligated to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA,
18 Cal. Civil Code §§ 1798.82 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and
19 Professions Code, and other State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the
20 protection of the confidentiality of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure
21 of such information.

22 120. While HIPAA may not provide for a private right of action, case law has held that the
23 strict requirements of HIPAA placed upon healthcare professionals and healthcare facilities and their
24 staff regarding the protection of PHI to prevent unauthorized access and disclosure of such
25 information may be used as a standard of care for claims of negligence. In fact, case law has also
26 indicated that breaches of HIPAA may justify imposition of liability for negligence per se not merely
27 just negligence.

28 121. Defendants had a duty to protect Plaintiffs' PHI and to prevent the unauthorized access

1 and disclosure of Plaintiffs' PHI.

2 122. As a result of Defendants' conduct Plaintiffs' privacy was breached including that
3 Plaintiffs' PHI was disclosed to unauthorized persons, allowed to be disclosed to unauthorized
4 persons, made capable of access by unauthorized persons and/or accessed by unauthorized persons.

5 123. Defendants breached their duties owed to Plaintiffs.

6 124. Such breach and conduct proximately caused substantial damages to Plaintiffs.

7 125. Defendants' failure to adhere to the requirements of HIPAA, HITECH, CMIA, Cal.
8 Civil Code §§ 1798.82 et seq., Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1280.15, California Business and
9 Professions Code, and other State and Federal statutes and regulations requiring and regarding the
10 protection of the confidentiality of PHI and patient medical information and the access and disclosure
11 of such information constitute a breach of the standard of care and a breach of Defendants' duties
12 owed to Plaintiffs.

13 126. Defendants further took significant wrongful steps or engaged in significant wrongful
14 conduct which also and/or further led to severe emotional distress and trauma for Plaintiffs, and
15 especially for Plaintiff J.H. Defendants intentionally and/or negligently described the privacy
16 violations as a situation similar to that of the serial killer in Single White Female and recommended
17 that J.H. obtain a temporary restraining order against Defendants' nurse employee. However,
18 Defendants refused to assist in obtaining the temporary restraining order. Defendants initiated an
19 unwarranted and intentional human resources investigation against J.H. after Defendants admitted to
20 the multiple privacy violations and after J.H. engaged counsel and began the process of asserting and
21 protecting her rights relative to her PHI privacy and the PHI privacy breaches. Defendants further
22 cut off J.H.'s pay, benefits, health insurance, and other employment benefits for J.H. In particular
23 J.H.'s health insurance benefits covered J.H.'s sons, whom Defendants were very much aware
24 required prescription medications and other healthcare services covered under J.H.'s health insurance.
25 Nevertheless Defendants, subsequent to J.H. asserting her PHI privacy rights and/or subsequent to
26 filing her workers compensation claim, terminated her health insurance, pay and other benefits.

27 127. These wrongful acts and conduct by Defendants were extreme, outrageous and
28 Defendants knew or should have known when they engaged in such conduct that the conduct was

11/05/2018
11/05/2018

likely to result in significant mental anguish and/or other physical manifestations for Plaintiffs.

128. Indeed Defendants' wrongful conduct did result in damages to Plaintiffs including without limitation severe and significant emotional distress, mental anguish, and otherwise.

129. In committing the extreme and outrageous acts as described herein, Defendants acted with the intent to inflict injury or severe mental anguish on Plaintiffs or with the understanding that injury or severe mental anguish to Plaintiffs was substantially certain to result.

130. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' outrageous conduct as described herein, Plaintiffs endured great mental anguish, constant worry, shock, humiliation, anxiety, and/or other severe emotional distress. Defendants' conduct resulted in Plaintiffs suffering damages and emotional distress in an amount to proven at trial.

131. Defendants acted intentionally, willfully, knowingly, recklessly and/or negligently in engaging in the wrongful conduct alleged herein. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression, and in reckless disregard of Plaintiffs' rights.

132. Plaintiffs suffered harm and damages as a result of Defendants' conduct and such conduct was the proximate cause of, and/or a substantial factor causing, Plaintiffs' damages and harm and continuing ongoing damages and irreparable harm.

133. Plaintiffs is entitled to damages in an amount to be proven at trial, statutory damages to the extent provided under applicable statute; costs and expenses to the extent permitted; injunctive relief; attorney's fees to the extent permitted; and punitive damages to the extent permitted.

134. Plaintiffs' damages and irreparable harm are substantial and continuing and will continue unless restrained and/or enjoined.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of Evidence Code § 1158 and Demand for Records

(J.H. As Against All Defendants)

135. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations above as if fully stated herein.

136. Plaintiff specifically incorporates herein this claim the allegations set forth in the Statement of Facts above.

137. Defendants are licensed California healthcare providers and/or a "covered entities".

11/05/2018
11/05/2018
11/05/2018

1 138. Pursuant to California Evidence Code § 1158 California healthcare providers are
2 required to produce, or otherwise make available, a copy of all medical records demanded pursuant
3 to a patient or patient executed medical record release authorization. The healthcare providers are
4 obligated under the statute to comply with the request within five days of the request.

5 139. Failure to comply with the request and/or failure to comply with the request within the
6 statutorily required timeframe subjects the healthcare provider to "liability for all reasonable
7 expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred in any proceeding to enforce this section [CCP § 1158]."

8 140. On June 19, 2018 Plaintiff, J.H., by, through, and from her attorney in Los Angeles
9 County, California, requested that Defendants produce Plaintiff's medical records to Plaintiffs'
10 attorney in Los Angeles County, California. Plaintiff's attorney provided Defendants with a medical
11 record release authorization executed by Plaintiff.

12 141. On June 19, 2018 Defendant confirmed to Plaintiff's counsel in Los Angeles County,
13 California receipt of the medical record authorization and request for medical records.

14 142. As of the date of the filing of this action and complaint, well after the statutory time
15 frame to produce the records, Defendants have not produced the requested medical records.

16 143. As such this action/proceeding and specifically this cause of action was necessitated.

17 144. Plaintiff J.H. thus requests that the Court issue an injunction or other relief requiring,
18 or otherwise ordering, Defendants to immediately turn over all medical records, images, scans,
19 results, tests, notes, and other information covered by, and requested pursuant to, the medical record
20 release authorization previously provided to Defendants.

21 145. Plaintiff J.H. is entitled to costs of litigation and attorney's fees as is required under
22 the relevant statute or otherwise.

23 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

24 **Employer/Healthcare Provider Retaliation and Wrongful Termination or Wrongful**

25 **Constructive Termination – Violations of California Government Code §§ 12940 et seq.;**

26 **California Labor Code § 132a; California Health & Safety Code § 1278.5, and Public Policy**

27 **(J.H. As Against All Defendants)**

28 146. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations above as if fully stated herein.

1 147. Plaintiff specifically incorporates herein this claim the allegations set forth in the
2 Statement of Facts above.

3 148. Plaintiff J.H. is and was an employee of Defendants.

4 149. Plaintiff J.H. is and was a patient of Defendants.

5 150. Defendants are California licensed healthcare providers or healthcare service
6 providers.

7 151. Defendants permitted and/or failed to prevent the unauthorized access into Plaintiff's
8 PHI and medical records by Defendants/Defendants employee(s). Indeed Defendants unlawfully
9 accessed, viewed, and disclosed Plaintiff's PHI on numerous occasions.

10 152. Defendants have admitted that Plaintiff J.H.'s PHI was accessed without her legal
11 written authorization. See **Exhibit 1**.

12 153. Plaintiff J.H. filed or submitted a complaint and/or grievance with Defendants relative
13 to Defendants' violation of Plaintiffs' PHI privacy rights. Indeed Plaintiff J.H. went so far as to
14 engage counsel through whom a complaint and/or grievance was submitted to Defendants regarding
15 the PHI privacy violation issues. In fact, Defendants were issued a litigation hold letter specifically
16 informing Defendants of their obligations relative to maintaining relevant documents and information
17 and making it clear that Plaintiffs were submitting or filing a complaint or grievance and asserting
18 their rights regarding the PHI privacy violations.

19 154. PHI privacy violations affect the safety, health, and wellbeing of both patients and
20 employees of healthcare providers and/or healthcare service providers such as Defendants. The PHI
21 privacy violations at issue in this action and about which Plaintiffs, including J.H., complained,
22 grieved, and asserted their rights to protect such privacy and seek relief for such violations, affect or
23 affected, or were regarding, Defendants' patients' and/or employees' health, safety, wellbeing, or
24 other matters/issues requiring protection.

25 155. Subsequent to Plaintiffs engaging counsel and substantial discussions and interactions
26 between counsel and Defendants' counsel regarding the PHI privacy violations, including Plaintiffs
27 specific assertion that Plaintiffs are moving forward against Defendants with formal proceedings such
28 as Court intervention to protect Plaintiffs PHI privacy rights and to seek redress for Defendants'

1 violations of such rights, Defendants actively, intentionally, and/or negligently took steps and actions
2 harmful toward to J.H. in retaliation for J.H.'s assertion of her rights relative to the PHI privacy
3 violations.

4 156. Shortly after J.H. asserted her rights and made it clear, personally or through counsel,
5 that J.H. would be pursuing/filing claims against Defendants regarding the privacy violations,
6 Defendants retaliated and initiated a human resources investigation of J.H.

7 157. Subsequently Defendants went so far as to terminate J.H.'s employment benefits
8 including without limitation J.H.'s health insurance for J.H. and her sons. Defendants also stopped
9 paying J.H. but technically did not "terminate" J.H. as an "employee". However for all intents and
10 purposes Defendants terminated or constructively terminated J.H. as Defendants terminated all salary,
11 pay, benefits, insurance, and otherwise related to her employment.

12 158. Upon information and belief Defendants took these actions in retaliation for J.H.'s
13 actions including without limitation her asserting her rights and/or filing a complaint or grievance
14 relative to Defendants' PHI privacy violations related to J.H. and her family the other Plaintiffs.

15 159. Moreover, understandably Defendants wrongful conduct including the privacy
16 violations, indicating that J.H. was in a Single White Female situation, and initiating human resource
17 investigations against J.H. in response to Defendants' privacy violations resulted in massive stress,
18 anxiety, and mental distress and trauma inflicted upon J.H.

19 160. Subsequently J.H. filed a workers compensation claim.

20 161. Defendants, alternatively, terminated J.H.'s salary, benefits, health insurance, and other
21 employment related benefits as a result of, or in response to, J.H.'s filing and pursuing her worker's
22 compensation claim.

23 162. Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged herein above was engaged in by Defendants
24 in retaliation against Plaintiff.

25 163. Defendants acted intentionally, willfully, knowingly, and/or negligently in engaging
26 in the wrongful conduct alleged herein. The above-described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified
27 by a managing agent or officer of Defendants. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression,
28 and in reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights.

1 164. Defendants' conduct violated the relevant and applicable laws and statutes relative to
2 employer-employee retaliation in California, including without limitation Cal. Gov. Code §§ 12940
3 et seq.; Cal. Labor Code § 132a; Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1278.5; and California public policy.

4 165. Indeed Defendants' wrongful conduct also made J.H.'s remaining an employee at
5 Defendants so intolerable that J.H. was or would be left with no reasonable option but to no longer
6 remain an employee, i.e. to resign or otherwise separate from Defendants. As such Defendants
7 conduct constitutes a wrongful termination or wrongful constructive termination of Plaintiff J.H.

8 166. Plaintiff suffered harm and damages as a result of Defendants' conduct and such
9 conduct was the proximate cause of, and/or a substantial factor causing, Plaintiff's damages and harm.

10 167. Plaintiff is entitled to damages in an amount to be proven at trial, statutory damages to
11 the extent provided under applicable statute; penalties to the extent provided under applicable statute;
12 costs and expenses to the extent permitted; attorney's fees to the extent permitted; and punitive
13 damages to the extent permitted.

14 **VI.**

15 **PRAYER**

16 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs prays for the following:

- 17 1. Monetary damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
- 18 2. Statutory damages to the maximum extent permitted by law, statute, the Court, or the jury;
- 19 3. Equitable relief/injunctive relief on Plaintiffs' Cal.. Civ. Code § 1798.82 claim enjoining
20 Defendants and its officers, directors, agents, representatives, and employees from further
21 conduct identical or similar in nature to the wrongful acts alleged herein;
- 22 4. Equitable, injunctive or other relief requiring Defendants to immediately turn over a full
23 and complete copy of all PHI and medical records requested;
- 24 5. Treble (or other applicable multiplier of) damages if and where permitted by law, statute,
25 the Court, or jury;
- 26 6. Penalties to the maximum extent permitted by law, statute, the Court, or the jury;
- 27 7. Punitive damages to the maximum extent permitted by law, statute, the Court, or the jury;
- 28 8. Attorney's fees to the maximum extent permitted by law, statute, case law, the Court, or

1
2
3
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

the jury;

9. Costs of suit;

10. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just, fair, and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiffs demands trial by jury on all claims and triable issues.

Dated: October 31, 2018

DORROS LAW

Torin A. Dorros
Torin A. Dorros
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Courthouse News Service

11/05/2018

Courthouse News Service

EXHIBIT "1"

DECLARATION OF JASMEET GILL

I, Jasmeet Gill, state and declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California and these United States the following:

1. I am an employee of Kaiser Foundation Hospitals ("Kaiser") with the title of Compliance Consultant. As part of my duties I am responsible for investigating and advising on various types of privacy concerns at Kaiser, including alleged privacy breaches or violations regarding Kaiser employees' and/or Kaiser patients' protected health information ("PHI"). In this role I have access to PHI Access Audit reports.

2. I submit this declaration in support of J [REDACTED] H [REDACTED]'s request seeking a Restraining Order against Shana Burbank.

3. I am familiar with the allegations asserted by J [REDACTED] H [REDACTED] against Shana Burbank.


4. Ms. H [REDACTED] is both an employee and patient of Kaiser. (Please note that Ms. H [REDACTED] has given me/Kaiser authorization to disclose the fact that she and her two minor sons are Kaiser patients).

5. Based on my investigation, I found that on numerous separate occasions Shana Burbank, while working as a nurse for The Permanente Medical Group, accessed the PHI of J [REDACTED] H [REDACTED] and her family members, including her two minor sons, within Kaiser's electronic medical records systems.

6. Kaiser has no written authorization by Ms. H [REDACTED] authorizing Shana Burbank to access Ms. H [REDACTED]'s or her family's PHI.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of these United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: May 10, 2018


Jasmeet Gill

DECLARATION OF JASMEET GILL

PPL_DOCS:1051047 v1
5/10/2018



64228169

DOCUMENT: Complaint (COM040)

CASE: 18STCV03612

FILED: 11/01/2018

FILED BY: J.H. (Plaintiff)

BARCODE BY: rjuarez1 11/03/2018 7:20 AM

ENTERED BY: rjuarez1 11/03/2018 7:19 AM

Courthouse News Service

11/03/2018