1 2 3 4 5 6	THOMAS M. FREEMAN, Cal. Bar No. 109309 SARAH EDWARDS, Cal. Bar No. 268679 MARION'S INN LLP 1611 Telegraph Ave., Suite 707 Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 451-6770 Facsimile: (510) 451-1711 Email: tmf@marionsinn.com Email: se@marionsinn.com	FILED SUPERIOR COURT OF CALLFORNIA COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE OCT 12 2017				
7 8	KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC. a KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS	nd B. Shelton				
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA					
10	COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE - INDIO BRANCH					
11						
12	WAISED FOUNDATION HEAT THEN AND DIG) No. INC 1207224				
13	KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC. and KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS) "				
14	Plaintiffs,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION AND DAMAGES				
15	STEPHAN CHRISTOPHER DEAN, LIZA DEAN,	1. BREACH OF CONTRACT				
16	DBA SUREFILE FILING SYSTEMS, and DOES 1-10, inclusive	2. CLAIM AND DELIVERY				
17	Defendants.	3. CONVERSION/TRESPASS TO CHATTEL				
18 19) 4. UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES				
20		(Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.)				
21						
22		FILEAV				
23		BY FAX				
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	COMPLA	INT				

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 1. Plaintiff Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. ("KFHP") is a non-profit California corporation and health maintenance organization ("HMO") regulated as a health care service plan under the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act, Health & Safety Code § 1340 et seq. Its principal place of business is in Oakland, Alameda County, California. KFHP contracts with employer groups, individuals, and others to arrange for health care to its members through the Kaiser Permanente network of health-care providers, including Kaiser Foundation Hospitals ("KFH") for facilities and Southern California Permanente Medical Group ("SCPMG") for professional services in Southern California.
- 2. Plaintiff Kaiser Foundation Hospitals ("KFH") is a California non-profit corporation that is licensed to own and operate hospitals and other medical centers in California. Its principal place of business is in Oakland, Alameda County, California. Plaintiffs KFH and KFHP will be referred to here collectively as "KAISER" or "Plaintiffs".
- 3. KAISER is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that defendants Stephan Christopher Dean and Liza Dean ("the Deans") are residents of Indio, Riverside County, and that the Deans have in the past and continue to do business as Surefile Filing Systems ("Surefile"), a sole proprietorship. The Deans and Surefire are referred to here collectively as "DEAN" or "defendants."
- 4. KAISER is not presently aware of the true names and capacities of the defendants named in this complaint by the fictitious names of Does 1-10. KAISER will seek leave to amend this complaint upon ascertaining the true names and capacities of those defendants.
- 5. Plaintiffs allege on information and belief that each defendant is jointly liable for each of the wrongful acts and omissions alleged herein because each defendant acted as the principal, agent, joint venturer, co-conspirator, or alter ego of each of the other defendants.
- 6. Defendants and KFH entered into an agreement in 2008 under which Defendants agreed, among other things, to remove, prepare, organize, index, deactivate, transport, store, and

4

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

22

- 7. Patient medical records, and communications about such records that include confidential "protected health information" ("Protected Information"), as that term is defined under the Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, codified at 45 Code of Federal Regulations ("CFR") parts 160 and 164, Subparts A and E, are afforded substantial protections under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, P.L. 104-191 ("HIPAA") and state law, including the Confidentiality of Medical Records Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 56 et seq. KAISER seeks to respect and maintain these protections for its members and patients through its contracts and BAA with vendors, including defendants.
- Effective as of June 15, 2009, DEAN and KFHP entered into a written Business Associate Agreement ("BAA"), in which defendants agreed to allow KFHP access to any of plaintiffs' records they maintained for KAISER and to otherwise comply with the obligations of HIPAA. Under the terms of the BAA defendants specifically agreed that "[u]pon termination of the business relationship between the parties and/or BAA for any reason, [defendants] shall, at [KFHP's] direction, return or destroy all Protected Information that [defendants] or its agents or subcontractors still maintain in any form, and shall retain no copies of such Protected Information. Upon [KFHP's] request, [defendants] shall certify in writing that such return or destruction has occurred."
- 9. Defendants and KFH entered into a written confidential Scanning Service Agreement effective as of November 17, 2009 ("Moreno Valley Agreement"). Defendants agreed, among other things, to remove, prepare, deactivate, transport, store, and retrieve upon request medical records for the Kaiser Permanente Moreno Valley medical center. Defendants further agreed to comply with the existing BAA with KFHP.
- 25 10. Defendants and KFH entered into a confidential Service Agreement - Medical Record Storage and Deactivation effective as of March 12, 2010 ("West Los Angeles Agreement"). Defendants agreed, among other things, to remove, prepare, deactivate, transport, store, and retrieve 27 upon request medical charts for the Kaiser Permanente West Los Angeles medical center.

- 11. KAISER patients and members have medical needs to access their medical records, and KAISER needs the medical records from time to time for purposes of litigation or administrative proceedings. Patients have a legal right under HIPAA to access their protected health information. (45 C.F.R. § 164.524.) KAISER also needs to assure that the medical records with Protected Information and confidential communications with Protected Information, including email exchanged between defendants and plaintiffs, are properly maintained, including by requiring defendants by contract to safeguard the records from unauthorized disclosure pursuant to the terms of a BAA and other agreements, verify their financial ability to protect the records and to maintain insurance, and return or destroy all Protected Information at the request of KAISER.
- 12. All medical records provided to defendants and confidential communications with Protected Information exchanged between representatives of KAISER and defendants, including email about the records, are the sole property of KAISER and held for the benefit of KAISER members and patients under the terms of the Moreno Valley Agreement, the West Los Angeles Agreement and the BAA signed by defendants. Defendants have no interest in those medical records or the confidential communications with KAISER about the records, and under the terms of the BAA signed by defendants, defendants have no right to refuse access to those records and any confidential communications with Protected Information or to refuse requests from KAISER to return or destroy those records and confidential communications with Protected Information, including email, or to refuse to certify to KAISER that all Protected Information has been returned or destroyed.
- 13. In or around 2010, a dispute arose between KAISER and DEAN regarding DEAN'S performance of the Moreno Valley Agreement and West Los Angeles Agreement. Beginning in the spring of 2010, defendants interfered with plaintiffs' access to its patients' medical records and failed to verify that they had insurance or the financial ability to protect the records. Defendants refused to allow plaintiffs access to its medical records, interfered with or refused to comply with patients' medical records requests, interfered with or refused to comply with subpoenas for medical records, refused to verify insurance coverage, and refused to verify its financial ability to perform

 its contractual obligations. Defendants also refused to turn over the medical records to KAISER upon its requests.

- 14. As a result of defendants' wrongful conduct, on or about July 6, 2010, plaintiffs notified defendants that: defendants were in breach of their agreements; that defendants should (i) comply with patient requests for medical records, (ii) permit KAISER access to their warehouse to inspect the records, (iii) verify their insurance and financial ability to perform, and (iv) arrange for transfer of the records, premises; and (v) that plaintiffs elected to terminate the West Los Angeles Agreement for convenience.
- agreement ("Sure File Transfer Agreement") to effect the transfer of possession from defendants to KFH of all of the medical records and confidential Protected Information of KAISER patients and members. The Sure File Transfer Agreement was signed by Stephan Dean on or about July 23, 2010, and terminated the on-going business relationship between defendants and KAISER. Pursuant to the terms of the Sure File Transfer Agreement, DEAN specifically agreed to take appropriate steps to preserve all confidential information maintained in those records as required by the Confidentiality of Medical Records Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 56 et seq., the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act ("HIPAA") and the parties' BAA.
- 16. Following the execution of the Sure File Transfer Agreement, in March 2011 the defendants and plaintiffs negotiated a confidential settlement agreement to resolve all the outstanding issues between them. Plaintiffs will make the confidential settlement agreement available to the Court, if necessary, under seal.
- 17. Pursuant to the agreements between plaintiffs and defendants described above, defendants were obligated to maintain the confidential Protected Information of KAISER members and patients in confidence; defendants were obligated not to transmit or communicate to any other party the confidential Protected Information of KAISER members and patients; defendants were obligated to return to plaintiffs or destroy all the confidential Protected Information of KAISER members and patients; and defendants were obligated upon request to certify to plaintiffs the return or destroy all confidential Protected Information in any form of KAISER members and patients.

- 18. Since the execution of the confidential settlement agreement in March 2011, defendants have notified KAISER that they are in possession of email or other records of KAISER that they allege contain Protected Information. Defendants have also publicized through the press the fact theat they retain possession of Protected Information of KAISER patients and members. Defendants have done so for the sole purpose of trying to extract additional payments from KAISER. Despite requests from KFHP that defendants return or destroy the Protected Information and certify the return and destruction of the Protected Information, or provide access to the Protected Information so that plaintiffs may recover or destroy the Protected Information, defendants have refused to certify to KAISER the return or destruction of the Protected Information. Defendants have refused to provide access to the Protected Information so that plaintiffs may recover or destroy the Protected Information. Defendants have refused to provide access to the Protected Information so that plaintiffs may recover or destroy the Protected Information. Defendants have also refused to follow instructions from KAISER to remove and destroy any Protected Information in an electronic format.
- 19. In breach of their agreements with KAISER, defendants also have engaged in conduct that demonstrates their intention or willingness to risk a security breach and the unauthorized disclosure of the confidential Protected Information if plaintiffs refuse to accede to their unwarranted demands for payment of additional compensation to obtain the return of, destruction of or access to the confidential Protected Information improperly retained by defendants. For example, after representing to plaintiffs that email with confidential Protected Information was stored on the hard drives of computers in the garage of their home Stephan Dean and Liza Dean risked the theft or removal of the computers and the unauthorized disclosure of the confidential Protected Information by leaving the door to their garage open.
- 20. The unauthorized disclosure by defendants of confidential Protected Information of KAISER patients and members remaining in the possession of defendants would result in financial harm to plaintiffs and irreparable harm to their reputation and also result in potential harm to the members and patients of KAISER.

9

8

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

2324

25 26

27 28

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF WRITTEN CONTRACT (Against Each Defendant)

- 21. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 to 20 above.
- 22. The BAA specifies that defendants may only use or disclose confidential Protected Information "to perform functions, activities, or services for, or on behalf of, [Plaintiffs]." Because the contractual relationship between defendants and plaintiffs have been concluded and terminated defendants have no further authorized use of the Protected Information "to perform functions, activities, or services for, or on behalf of, [Plaintiffs]." Furthermore, the BAA specifies that by maintaining or using Protected Information for their own purposes, defendants violated the BAA
- Defendants have breached their contractual obligations under the BAA by, among other things, (i) retaining confidential Protected Information of KAISER patients or members on their computers, hard drives, servers, or in their email accounts, or otherwise; (ii) refusing to return, or destroy or allow plaintiffs access to their computers, hard drives, servers, or email accounts, to remove or destroy all the confidential Protected Information of KAISER patients or members, including but not limited to confidential unencrypted email communications between defendants and Plaintiffs that include confidential Protected Information of KAISER members and patients, or to confirm the removal of all Protected Information of KAISER patients or members, from defendants' computers, hard drives, servers or email accounts; (iii) refusing to certify to KFHP the return or destruction of all the confidential Protected Information of KAISER patients or members; (iv) to risk the unauthorized disclosure of confidential Protected Information of KAISER members and patients in defendants' possession, custody or control by their failure to maintain the confidential Protected Information in a secure place and manner; and (v) threatening to use and transmit confidential Protected Information in the medical records and/or confidential email communications between defendants and Plaintiffs that include confidential Protected Information of KAISER members, to contact KAISER members or patients.
- 24. Defendants have also breached the Moreno Valley Agreement and the West Los Angeles Agreement by recording and retaining confidential Protected Information in violation of

the terms of the BAA which are incorporated into and made a part of the Moreno Valley Agreement and the West Los Angeles Agreement.

- 25. Plaintiffs have performed all obligations due to defendants, except such obligations as are excused or waived.
- 26. As a proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiffs have sustained damage or loss in an amount to be proved at trial. Furthermore, unless enjoined defendants' continued possession of the Protected Information threatens further harm to KAISER, as well potentially the privacy interests of KAISER'S members and patients. Plaintiffs lack an adequate remedy at law and will suffer irreparable harm unless defendants are enjoined from their continued use and possession of the Protected Information of KAISER'S members and patients and to engage in the aforesaid trespasses and interference with plaintiffs' property. An action for damages is inadequate because it is extremely difficult to place a monetary value on this continuing invasion of plaintiffs' property rights and the continued possession of the Protected Information by defendants. Even if the harm could be measured in monetary terms, plaintiffs would be required to incur the inconvenience and expense of multiple legal actions to collect damages resulting from defendants' actions as they continue to occur in the future. Plaintiffs are accordingly entitled to both preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining defendants from further possession and use of plaintiffs' property.
- 27. Therefore plaintiffs seek preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining defendants and their employees and anyone acting on their behalf (i) from retaining any "Document," as defined by Californian Evidence Code Section 250, specifically including but not limited to, KAISER medical records and charts and email, with confidential Protected Information relating to any member or patient of KAISER; (ii) from using any confidential Protected Information in any "Document," as defined by Californian Evidence Code Section 250, provided to defendants by KAISER; and (iii) from disclosing to any third-party any Protected Information from any "Document," as defined by Californian Evidence Code Section 250, provided to defendants by KAISER
 - 28. Plaintiffs also seek preliminary and permanent injunctions requiring defendants and

their employees and anyone acting on their behalf (i) to refrain from using any confidential				
Protected Information from any "Document," as defined by Californian Evidence Code Section 250				
provided to defendants and confidential Protected Information in any email exchanged between				
defendants and plaintiffs to contact KAISER members or patients; (ii) to refrain from disclosing to				
any third-party any Protected Information from any "Document," as defined by Californian				
Evidence Code Section 250, provided to defendants and confidential email exchanged between				
defendants and plaintiffs; (iii) to return, delete or destroy any "Document," as defined by				
Californian Evidence Code Section 250, specifically including, but not limited to email with				
confidential Protected Information of KAISER members and patients that defendants maintain or to				
which they have access or care custody or control; (iv) to certify in writing under penalty of perjury				
that defendants have returned, deleted or or destroyed all of the records and email with confidential				
Protected Information of KAISER members and patients that defendants maintain or to which they				
have access or care, custody or control; (v) to provide access to all defendants' computers, servers,				
hard drives and email accounts for inspection by a forensic consultant appointed by the Court at				
plaintiffs' expense to confirm the removal, deletion or destruction of all of the records and				
confidential email with Protected Information of KAISER members and patients; and (vi) to				
promptly notify counsel for plaintiffs of the discovery of any additional Protected Information of				
KAISER members and patients that defendants maintain or to which they have access or care,				
custody or control; following completion of (i) - (v) above, and thereafter to comply with the				
requirements of (i) - (v) above.				

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION CLAIM AND DELIVERY (Against Each Defendant)

- 29. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 to 28 above.
- 30. Despite receipt of a demand for return or destruction of the confidential Protected Information concerning KAISER members and patients, defendants have refused, and continue to refuse to return or destroy the Protected Information to plaintiffs and provide certification of the

1	return or destruction of the Protected Information to plaintiffs.				
2	31.	Defendants have no right to refuse to return or destroy the confidential Protected			
3	Information concerning KAISER members and patients and provide certification of the return or				
4	destruction of the Protected Information to plaintiffs, the owners of the records with the Protected				
5	Information.				
6	32.	Plaintiffs are entitled to a writ of possession to recover their personal property.			
7					
8 9		THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION CONVERSION/TRESPASS TO CHATTEL (Against Each Defendant)			
10	33.	Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 to 32			
11	above.				
12	34.	Despite receipt of a demand for the return or destruction of the confidential Protected			
13	Information concerning KAISER members and patients, defendants have refused, and continue to				
14	refuse, to return or destroy the records and any email with confidential Protected Information and				
15	certify to plaintiffs the return or destruction of the confidential Protected Information concerning				
16	KAISER members and patients.				
17	35.	By so doing, defendants have converted and trespassed on plaintiffs' rights in the			
18	records and any email with confidential Protected Information derived from the records of and email				
19	of plaintiffs v	vithout legal right or justification.			
20	36.	Plaintiffs are entitled to an injunction as prayed below and to damages in an amount			
21	to be proved at trial.				
22					
23	FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW				
24		(Against Each Defendant)			
25	37.	Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 to 36			
26	above.				
27	38.	California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq. (the "UCL") prohibit unfair			
28	competition. In this context, "unfair competition shall mean and include any unlawful, unfair or				
	9 COMMINIATED				
	COMPLAINT				

- 39. The "unlawful" prong of the UCL permits a plaintiff to obtain relief from anything that can properly be called a business practice and that at the same time is forbidden by law, regardless of whether the underlying law provides for a private right of action.
- 40. Defendants, by their conduct and practices alleged herein, have committed and continue to commit violations of the Health Insurance Portability Act of 1996, P.L. 104-191 ("HIPAA") and the Confidentiality of Medical Records Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 56 et seq. Defendants are therefore in violation of the "unlawful" prong of the UCL.
- 41. The "unfair" prong of the UCL is intentionally broad, thus allowing courts maximum discretion to prohibit new schemes to defraud. Outside of the competitor context, courts have enunciated differing tests for unfairness under the UCL. One test is that the harm to the victim outweighs the justification of the alleged wrongdoer. A different test is that the defendant's acts offend a public policy that is tethered to some statutory provision. Still another test is that the defendant's acts constitute sharp practices.
- 42. Defendants, by their conduct and practices alleged herein, have engaged and continue to engage in conduct and practices that cause considerable harm and injury in fact to plaintiffs, and defendants have no justification whatsoever other than reducing defendants' attempt to extort additional compensation from defendants, which is neither a reasonable nor legitimate justification. Defendants' conduct and practices offend a public policy of providing confidentiality and protection to the confidential personal health information of health plan members and medical patients, which policy is tethered to the Health Insurance Portability Act of 1996, P.L. 104-191 ("HIPAA"), the Confidentiality of Medical Records Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 56 et seq.. and the California Constitution. Defendants' modus operandi constitutes a sharp practice because defendants understand that KAISER desires to protect the confidentiality of Protected Information of KAISER members and medical patients and avoid the unauthorized disclosure of such Protected Information. Defendants are therefore in violation of the "unfair" prong of the UCL.
- 44. Plaintiffs have suffered injury in fact and have incurred unnecessary expenses, including legal fees, as a result of defendants' violations of the UCL.

1	Evidence Code Section 250, provided to detendants and confidential email exchanged between		
2	defendants and plaintiffs; (iii) to return, delete or destroy any "Document," as defined by		
3	Californian Evidence Code Section 250, specifically including, but not limited to email with		
4	confidential Protected Information of KAISER members and patients that defendants maintain or to		
5	which they have access or care custody or control; (iv) to certify in writing under penalty of perjury		
6	that defendants have returned, deleted or or destroyed all of the records and email with confidential		
7	Protected Information of KAISER members and patients that defendants maintain or to which they		
8	have access or care, custody or control; (v) to provide access to all defendants' computers, servers,		
9	hard drives and email accounts for inspection by a forensic consultant appointed by the Court at		
10	plaintiffs' expense to confirm the removal, deletion or destruction of all of the records and		
11	confidential email with Protected Information of KAISER members and patients; and (vi) to		
12	promptly notify counsel for plaintiffs of the discovery of any additional Protected Information of		
13	KAISER members and patients that defendants maintain or to which they have access or care,		
14	custody or control; following completion of (i) - (v) above, and thereafter to comply with the		
15	requirements of (i) - (v) above.		
16	f. For a writ of possession transferring all the Documents with		
17	confidential Protected Information of any KAISER member or patient in the possession, custody or		
18	control of defendants to plaintiffs;		
19	g. For KAISER's cost of suit; and		
20	h. For such other and further relief as the Court should find to be just		
21	and proper.		
22	Respectfully submitted,		
23	Dated: October 11, 2012 MARION'S INN LLP		
24	THOMAS M. FREEMAN SARAH EDWARDS		
25	By Color Color		
26			
27	Sarah Edwards		
28	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.		
- 1			

p		CM-010				
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar in Triogras M. Freeman, No. 109309) Sa	umber, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY				
Marion's lun LLP	ran barraras, No. 20001 1					
1611 Telegraph Ave, Suite 707	robber of CA 941017					
The lead to the last of the	THEN A CH. ITUIZ					
TELEPHONE NO.: 510-451-6770	FAX NO.: 510 - 701-171	rd.				
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): YAISEN FOUNDATION H	MITH HAN, INC. 3 KAISEY HO	<u>sps.</u>				
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF	verside_					
STREET ADDRESS: 46 - 200 ODSIS SH	reet					
MAILING ADDRESS:	_					
CITY AND ZIP GODE: IVINIO, CA 9220	oli National and and	,				
BRANCH NAME: Indio Laver JUK						
CASE NAME: Kaisev Foundation Heal	th Plan, Inc., et 11., V.					
Stephan anistopher Dean, Lizz	I DEAM, DAH SMEHLETIING SUF	Jems .				
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:				
Unlimited Limited	Carreton Constant	INC 1207224				
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	THE STATE OF THE S				
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defen	idant				
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402					
	w must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).				
1. Check one box below for the case type that						
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation				
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)				
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)				
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)				
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)				
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)				
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)				
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the				
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case				
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)				
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment				
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)				
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint				
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	· · ·				
intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	RICO (27)				
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)				
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition				
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)				
Wrongful termination (36)		Other petition (not specified above) (43)				
1	Writ of mandate (02)					
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)					
2. This case is is is not complete factors requiring exceptional judicial manage	ex under rule 3,400 of the California R	ules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the				
	· .					
a. Large number of separately repres		er of witnesses				
b. Extensive motion practice raising d		with related actions pending in one or more courts				
issues that will be time-consuming		ties, states, or countries, or in a federal court				
c. Substantial amount of documentary	vevidence f Substantial p	ostjudgment judicial supervision				
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.	monetary b. nonmonetary:	de de la companya de				
Number of causes of action (specify):	Thonesary D. A. Honmonetary;	declaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive				
	action suit.					
6. If there are any known related cases, file an	d serve a notice of related case. (You	may uş o -{orm CM-015.} ∧				
Date: October 11, 2012						
Salanta Fahral	15	$\sim V \hookrightarrow A \Lambda X$				
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)				
	NOTICE					
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the fir	st paper filed in the action or proceeding	ng (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 the case is separated 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 of 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. 						
		in the second se				

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.

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 Pt/PD/WD (Personal injury) Property Damage/Wrongful Death) 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**

```
Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,
Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)
Professional Negligence (25)
    Other Professional Malpractice
(not medical or legal)
Other Non-Pi/PD/WD Tort (35)
```

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES 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) Centractual 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

```
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
 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 Rellef From Late
            Claim
        Other Civil Petition
```

Employment

Fraud (16)

Practice (07)

false arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Intellectual Property (19)

Legal Malpractice

Wrongful Termination (36)

Other Employment (15)

Review of Health Officer Order Notice of Appeal-Labor

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)