May 11 2018 3:20 PM

KEVIN STOCK COUNTY CLERK NO: 18-2-08055-5

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON IN AND FOR PIERCE COUNTY

M.N, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

No.

Plaintiff,

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

v.

MULTICARE HEALTH SYSTEM, INC., a Washington corporation,

Defendant.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff M.N. ("Plaintiff") hereby files this class action complaint on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, by and through the undersigned attorneys, against Defendant MultiCare Health System, Inc. ("Defendant" or "MultiCare") and alleges as follows based upon personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and experiences and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief based upon, *inter alia*, investigation conducted by their attorneys.

II. NATURE OF THE CASE

1. This is a class action lawsuit brought by Plaintiff on behalf of a class of all similarly situated individuals ("Class Members") who were subject to both actual and potential Hepatitis C exposure at Defendant MultiCare's Good Samaritan Hospital located in Puyallup,

COMPLAINT- 1

KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200 Seattle, WA 98101-3052 TELEPHONE: (206) 623-1900 FACSIMILE: (206) 623-3384 Washington ("the Hospital"), between approximately August 4, 2017 and March 23, 2018 (the "Hepatitis C Exposure Incidents").

- 2. The Defendant has stated that the Hepatitis C Exposure Incidents were the result of injections of narcotics performed by a nurse employed by Defendant, Cora Weberg (hereinafter, "Nurse Weberg"), who had "remov[ed] higher-than-normal amounts of narcotics" and "diverted medications intended for patients" for her own use and administered the remainder to her patients using shared needles.¹
- 3. As a result of Plaintiff's and the Class Members' receiving injections of narcotics at the Hospital, and as is set forth below with greater particularity, they were exposed to bloodborne pathogens and placed at an increased risk of contracting Hepatitis C. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class Members have been and will continue to be tested for this potentially deadly virus.
- 4. Plaintiff and Class Members must now undergo medical treatment for their injuries which would not have been necessary in the absence of Defendant's violations alleged herein, and have to live with severe emotional and mental anguish due to the negligence of Good Samaritan Hospital.
- 5. This class action seeks damages, injunctive relief, declaratory judgments, costs, attorneys' fees, and other relief as a result of Defendant's conduct described herein.

III. PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff M.N. ("Plaintiff") is a resident and citizen of the state of Washington.
- 7. Defendant MultiCare Health System, Inc. is a Washington nonprofit corporation whose principal place of business is in Washington and has offices located in Pierce County, Washington, and includes Good Samaritan Hospital in Puyallup, Washington.

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the Constitution of the State of Washington, Art. 4, § 6.

¹ https://www.multicare.org/news/multicare-good-samaritan-hospital-notifying/ (last visited May 11, 2018).

distraction from everyday activities due to the worry and stress of her possible infection with

Hepatitis C. Those damages and similar damages that other Class Members have suffered and will reasonably suffer in the future, in addition to the Class-wide damages of the emotional disruption of their life, the physical invasion and other effects of the testing process, and the months of dread suffered by every class member.

19. The fact that Plaintiff M.N. has been subject to the Hepatitis C Exposure Incider

19. The fact that Plaintiff M.N. has been subject to the Hepatitis C Exposure Incident has caused her lost wages, pain, suffering, humiliation, loss of enjoyment of life, and other general and special damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

B. Defendant's knowledge of the Hepatitis C Exposure Incidents

- 20. Defendant is undeniably aware of the both potential and actual Hepatitis C Exposure Incidents endured by its patients, including Plaintiff and Class Members, because it informed them directly of the Hepatitis C Exposure Incidents.
- 21. Nurse Weberg worked in the Emergency Department at the Hospital from August 2017 through March 2018.
- 22. On information and belief, in August 2017, at least one complaint was lodged with the Hospital indicating that Nurse Weberg had forced injectable pain medications on a female patient in the emergency department who refused pain medications. Despite this, Good Samaritan did nothing to investigate a potential issue of drug misuse on the part of Nurse Weberg.
- 23. On or about April 30, 2018, Defendant notified approximately 2,600 Hospital patients of the Hepatitis C Exposure Incident by letter and also issued a press release with the same information.
 - 24. The letter stated in part:

We are contacting you to share some very concerning information. According to our records, your received care in the Emergency Department at MultiCare Good Samaritan Hospital in Puyallup, Washington between August 4, 2017 and March 23, 2018. Recently we discovered that during this eight-month period, an employee in the Emergency Department may have exposed at least two patients to Hepatitis C virus, causing them to become infected.

We sincerely apologize for the anxiety that this situation may cause you. This is something that should never happen in any health facility and we are committed to providing you with support.

- 25. According to the Hospital, at least two patients who were treated by Defendant during approximately December 2017 likely contracted Hepatitis C while in the Hospital Emergency Department.
- 26. On May 8, 2018 the Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department reported that there were twelve positive Hepatitis C cases under investigation, seven probable cases of positive Hepatitis C cases awaiting Center for Disease Control ("CDC") lab testing, and two Hepatitis C cases confirmed by the CDC.
- 27. The Washington State Department of Health determined through genetic tests that the two patients who contracted Hepatitis C derived the disease from a common source, which it identified was Nurse Weberg as the "common denominator."
- 28. Defendant has admitted publicly that the cause of the Hepatitis C Exposure Incident was the result of theft by Nurse Weberg of excessive levels of pain medication (including narcotics, antihistamines, and sedatives) from the Hospital dispensary.
 - 29. Defendant Safety Alert posted on its website states in part:

MultiCare Good Samaritan Hospital in Puyallup is notifying certain patients who were treated in the Emergency Department during a nearly eight-month period in 2017 and 2018 that they should be tested for Hepatitis C. The alert follows the confirmation that two patients who were treated in December likely contracted the disease while in the Emergency Department.

Good Samaritan and local and state health department officials have conducted a thorough investigation and determined that one of our nurses was removing higher-than-normal amounts of narcotics from our dispensing system and admitted to diverting medications intended for patients. She tested positive for Hepatitis C and had treated both of the patients we know are infected. Hepatitis C is most commonly transmitted by exposure to an

infected person's blood through shared needles. The nurse no longer works for MultiCare.²

- 30. Nurse Weberg administered the medication to patients using needles that she shared among them and herself.
 - 31. The narcotics diverted by Nurse Weberg included fentanyl and hydromorphone.
- 32. According to information published by Defendant, Nurse Weberg has tested positive for Hepatitis C.
- 33. Nurse Weberg was arrested by the Puyallup Police Department on two counts of second-degree assault due to the Hepatitis C Exposure Incidents.
- 34. On or about May 7, 2018, the Washington Nursing Care Quality Assurance Commission announced the suspension of Nurse Weberg's nursing license, citing "unprofessional conduct."
- 35. Defendant has publicized the work schedule of Nurse Weberg between August 4, 2017 and March 23, 2018 so that patients can determine whether they are potentially affected.³
- 36. Defendant has admitted publicly that it has experienced issues "around reporting of narcotic use."⁴
- 37. Hepatitis C is a blood-borne viral infection of the liver that is usually spread when blood from a person infected with the Hepatitis C virus enters the body of someone who is not infected. Hepatitis C is most commonly transmitted by exposure to an infected person's blood through shared needles.
- 38. If left untreated, Hepatitis C can cause serious long-term health problems. Symptoms of Hepatitis C may include stomach pain, vomiting or yellow eyes or skin.

KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.

² https://www.multicare.org/safety-alert/ (last visited May 11, 2018).

³ https://www.multicare.org/file_viewer.php?id=17395&title=Emergency+Department+Shifts (last visited May 10, 2018).

⁴ https://www.multicare.org/news/multicare-good-samaritan-hospital-notifying/ (last visited May 10, 2018).

- 39. Plaintiff and Class Members received injections of narcotics, antihistamines or sedatives between August 4, 2017 and March 23, 2018 during stays at the Hospital that subjected them to the Hepatitis C Exposure Incidents.
- 40. News reports have informed Plaintiff and Class Members that the threat posed to them is not just theoretical; there have been close to ten confirmed Hepatitis C cases in patients that were treated by Defendant in the class time period.
- 41. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's negligence and the notice it was required to send as a result, Plaintiff and Class Members were informed that they had been put in a zone of danger of contracting Hepatitis C. The only way to determine if they had been infected so that they could take steps to mitigate the disease and begin treatment was to subject themselves to the expense, inconvenience, distraction from everyday activities, pain, and physical invasion of a blood draw for Hepatitis C, Hepatitis B and HIV testing.
- 42. Because of the limitations of Hepatitis C, Hepatitis B and HIV testing, a recent infection may not be detectable for months, so Plaintiff and Class Members cannot yet know whether they are out of the zone of danger into which Defendant's conduct placed them. From the date of the Notice and extending over the months until the second test is completed, Plaintiff and Class Members will live with the anxiety, stress, and emotional distress that they may be infected with Hepatitis C, Hepatitis B and/or HIV. That distress is the natural, expected product of the zone of danger into which the Defendant's negligence placed Plaintiff and Class Members.

VI. CLASS ALLEGATIONS

43. The proposed class (the "Class") is defined as follows:

All persons who were treated at the MultiCare Good Samaritan Hospital in Puyallup, Washington between August 4, 2017 and March 23, 2018 and were notified by the Hospital that they should be tested for Hepatitis B, Hepatitis C and HIV.

- 44. Excluded from the Class are Defendant and its employees, officers and directors, and the Judge(s) assigned to this case. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify, change or expand the Class definition after conducting discovery.
- 45. The requirements of Washington's class action rule, CR 23, are met in this case. Class treatment is appropriate if the four threshold requirements of CR 23(a), and one of the three requirements of CR 23(b), are met.
- 46. There are four CR 23(a) requirements for class actions: numerosity; commonality; typicality; and adequacy. All are met in this case.
- 47. <u>Numerosity</u>. The exact number of Class Members is unknown to Plaintiff, but can be readily determined from records maintained by Defendants. According to Defendant, it notified at least 2,600 individuals that they were possibly exposed to a bloodborne pathogen during their treatment and should immediately have their blood tested for HIV and Hepatitis B and C. Thus, the number of persons who are members of the proposed Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.
- 48. <u>Commonality</u>. There are numerous questions of fact and/or law that are common to Plaintiff and all members of the Class, with answers that are common to all members of the Class, including, but not limited to:
 - a. Whether Defendant failed to conduct a proper employment background check of Nurse Weberg or otherwise negligently hired her;
 - b. Whether Plaintiff's and Class Members' increased risk of exposure to a bloodborne pathogens was caused by Defendant's negligence;
 - c. Whether reasonable pre-employment review of Nurse Weberg's available background made her an unsuitable candidate for direct patient care at Defendant's Hospital;
 - d. Whether Defendant used appropriate and standard-of-care practices to screen persons hired at the Hospital and intended to have direct patient contact;

- e. Whether Defendant used appropriate and standard-of-care practices to monitor the distribution of prescription drugs within the Hospital;
- f. Whether Defendant used appropriate and standard-of-care practices to monitor the use of needles, and to prevent the dangerous sharing of needles, by Hospital staff;
- g. Whether Defendant timely detected the misconduct of Nurse Weberg and the obvious danger she posed to persons at Defendant's Hospital;
- h. The adequacy and appropriateness of Defendant's post-exposure testing administered to Plaintiff and Class Members.
- The nature and extent of the legal claims available to Plaintiff and Class Members as a result of zone of danger into which Defendant's conduct has placed them;
- j. The recoverable damages of the Plaintiff and Class Members associated with the necessary testing, re-testing, and inconvenience, disruption, and fear naturally appertaining thereto.
- 49. Typicality. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of the absent Class Members because their claims arise from the same event, practice and/or policies, namely Defendant's hiring of Nurse Weberg and neglect to adequately monitor the danger she posed to Class Members. Defendant defined the Class members by their own determination that they had been put at risk. The typicality of the financial and emotional impact of being told that one is at risk for serious diseases and must be tested is self-evident. The impact may vary slightly in degree from person to person, but Plaintiff remain typical of the Class because each member of the Class members were similarly affected by Defendant's negligence.
- 50. <u>Adequacy</u>. Adequate representation has two components: (1) the representative's interests must not be antagonistic to those of other class members; and (2) class counsel must be qualified, experienced, and generally able to conduct the litigation. Both requirements are plainly met here.
 - 51. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of all

members of the Class.

- 52. Plaintiff does not have any interests antagonistic to or in conflict with the interests of the Class; she shared in what each of them went through.
- 53. Defendant has no unique defenses against Plaintiff that would interfere with Plaintiff's representation of the Class. Defendant conducted an internal analysis regarding who was exposed and sent them the letters informing them of the Hepatitis C Exposure Incidents. Defendant's defenses against Plaintiff are no different than those against any of the Class members.
- 54. With respect to counsel, Plaintiff has engaged Keller Rohrback L.L.P. and Sauder Scheklopf LLC to represent Plaintiff and the Class. Keller Rohrback and Sauder Schelkopf have extensive experience in class action litigation.
- 55. In addition to meeting the four requirements of CR 23(a), the Class must meet at least one of the three requirements of CR 23(b):
 - (1) the prosecution of separate actions by or against individual members of the class would create a risk of (A) inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the party opposing the class, or (B) adjudications with respect to individual members of the class which would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudications or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests; or
 - (2) the party opposing the class has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole; or
 - (3) the court finds that the questions of law or fact common to the members of the class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and that a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. The matters pertinent to the findings include: (A) the interest of members of the class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions; (B) the extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the class; (C) the desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; (D) the difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

- 56. The requirements of CR 23(b)(1)(A) are met here, because the prosecution of separate actions by members of the Class would create a risk of establishing incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant. Additionally, the requirements of CR 23(b)(1)(B) are satisfied because adjudication of these claims by individual members of the Class would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the actions, or substantially impair or impede the ability of other members of the Class to protect their interests.
- 57. In addition, the requirements of CR 23(b)(3) are met here because questions of law or fact common to members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members. Moreover, a class action is superior to the other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

VII. CLAIMS

- 58. Defendant MultiCare had a duty to exercise the degree of care expected from a reasonably prudent hospital and a duty to safeguard Plaintiff and Class Members' well-being. Defendant failed to exercise the degree of care expected of a reasonably prudent hospital acting in similar circumstances. Defendant had a duty to train and supervise its employees to ensure that competent and safe nursing care was provided to Plaintiff and Class Members. Defendant failed in its duty because it knew or should have known that Nurse Weberg was putting the Plaintiff and Class Members at risk, and, that duty was heightened after Defendant received the initial complaint against Nurse Weberg. Defendant acted negligently in supervising its nursing staff.
- 59. Defendant breached its duty when its agents failed to exercise that degree of care, skill, and learning expected of a reasonably prudent health care provider at that time in the profession or class to which he or she belongs, in the state of Washington, acting in the same or similar circumstances, and such failure was the proximate cause of the injuries sustained by Plaintiff and the Class.

COMPLAINT- 12

- 60. Defendant breached its duty when its agents violated the standard of care and acted negligently in properly training, investigating and supervising its nursing staff, including Nurse Weberg.
- 61. Defendant breached its duty when its agents failed to properly screen Nurse Weberg for employment in the emergency department at Good Samaritan Hospital.
- 62. Defendant breached its duty when its agents failed to realize that medication was being misused in the emergency department, in particular, that Nurse Weberg was stealing injectable narcotics and endangering patients, for over a period of six months.
- 63. Defendant breached its duty of care when its employees and agents failed to take appropriate steps to investigate Nurse Weberg until after she had infected patients with Hepatitis C or other bloodborne pathogens, particularly in light of a patient complaint against Nurse Weberg.
- 64. Defendant breached its duty of care when its employees and agents failed to take timely steps to discipline or terminate Nurse Weberg.
- 65. Defendant breached its duty of care when it failed to implement and/or follow existing policies and procedures with regard to proper management of medication, particular injectable narcotic pain medication.
- 66. As a direct and proximate result of the violations of the standard of care and failures by Defendant, Plaintiff and Class Members have: incurred the need for necessary medical care, treatment, and services received as of the filing of this action and with reasonable probability to be required in the future; have incurred inconvenience and loss of time associated with such medical care, treatment, and services; suffered serious emotional distress, including but not limited to living with the knowledge that they could have or potential will contract a bloodborne pathogen disease, such as Hepatitis C. Plaintiff's and Class Members' injuries are unknown and will require and will continue to require expensive medical care and treatment. These and other general and special damages are continuing in nature and will be determined by

1	the jury at the time of trial.	
2	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF	
3	WHE	EREFORE, Plaintiff requests the following relief against the Defendant MultiCare
4	Health Syste	m:
5	(a)	Certification of this action as a class action pursuant to CR 23;
6	(b)	General and special damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
7	(c)	Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and a service award for Plaintiff;
8	(d)	Any and all applicable pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the judgment
9		and
10	(e)	Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper under the
11		circumstances of this case.
12	DATED this 11th day of May, 2018.	
13		
14		KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.
15		
16		By <u>s/ Ian S. Birk</u> Ian S. Birk, WSBA #31431
17		Cari Campen Laufenberg, WSBA # 34354
18		1201 Third Ave., Suite 3200 Seattle, Washington 98101
19		Telephone: (206) 623-1900 Fax: (206) 623-3384
20		Email: ibirk@kellerrohrback.com claufenberg@kellerrohrback.com
21		
22		Mark D. Samson KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.
23		3101 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 1400 Phoenix, Arizona 85012
24		Telephone: (602) 248-0088 Fax: (602) 248-2822
25		Email: msamson@kellerrohrback.com
26		

1	Joseph G. Sauder Matthaw D. Schalkonf
2	Matthew D. Schelkopf Joseph B. Kenney
3	SAUDER SCHELKOPF LLC 555 Lancaster Avenue
4	Berwyn, Pennsylvania 19312
5	Telephone: 888.711.9975 E-Mail: jgs@sstriallawyers.com
6	mds@sstriallawyers.com
	jbk@sstriallawyers.com
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	