David M. Lilienstein, SBN 218923 1 david@dllawgroup.com Katie J. Spielman, SBN 252209 2 katie@dllawgroup.com **DL LAW GROUP** 3 345 Franklin St. San Francisco, CA 94102 4 Telephone: (415) 678-5050 Facsimile: (415) 358-8484 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff. 6 STEVEN P. 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 STEVEN P. Case No. 11 Plaintiff, PLAINTIFF STEVEN P.'S COMPLAINT 12 FOR BREACH OF THE EMPLOYEE 13 v. RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974 (ERISA); BREACH OF 14 ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND FIDUCIARY DUTY; ENFORCEMENT HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY; 15 AND CLARIFICATION OF RIGHTS: AMN HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC., and DOES 1 through 10, PREJUDGMENT AND POSTJUDGMENT 16 **INTEREST; AND ATTORNEYS' FEES** Defendants. 17 AND COSTS 18 19 Plaintiff, STEVEN P. herein sets forth the allegations of this Complaint against 20 Defendants ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY 21 ("ANTHEM"); AMN HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC.; and DOES 1 through 10. 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 27



## **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

## **JURISDICTION**

- 1. Plaintiff brings this action for relief pursuant to Section 502 (a) (1) (B) and Section 502 (a) (3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. Section 1132 (a) (1) (B). This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claim pursuant to ERISA Section 502 (e) and (f), 29 U.S.C. Section 1132 (e), (f), and (g) and 28 U.S.C. Section 1331 as it involves a claim made by Plaintiff for employee benefits under an employee benefit plan regulated and governed under ERISA. Jurisdiction is predicated under these code sections as well as 28 U.S.C. Section 1331 as this action involves a federal question.
- 2. This action is brought for the purpose of recovering benefits under the terms of an employee benefit plan and enforcing Plaintiff's rights under the terms of an employee benefit plan.
- 3. Plaintiff seeks relief, including but not limited to: past mental health benefits in the correct amount related to Defendant's improper denial of Plaintiff's claim; prejudgment and post judgment interest; general and special damages; and attorneys' fees and costs.

### **PARTIES**

- 4. At all relevant times, Plaintiff STEVEN P. participated in the AMN HEALTHCARE SERVICES CORPORATE HSA ("the Plan"), an employee welfare benefit plan within the meaning of ERISA section 3(1), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(1), sponsored by his employer, Defendant AMN HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC. ("AMN").
- 5. The designated "Claims Administrator" under the Plan for mental health benefits was at all relevant times Defendant ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY ("Anthem").
- 6. Anthem is a health insurance provider authorized to transact and currently transacting the business of insurance in the State of California.
  - 7. AMN was the Plan Administrator.



5

67

8

1011

12

13 14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

2627

\_ .

8. At all relevant times, the Plan was an insurance plan that offered, *inter alia*, mental health benefits to employees and their beneficiaries, including Plaintiff. This action involves mental health claims denied by the Plan's claims administrator.

## **FACTS**

- 9. The Plan guarantees, warrants, and promises "Mental Health Services" for members and their beneficiaries, including but not limited to: health care services, mental health care, and treatment at issue herein.
  - 10. S.P. is STEVEN P.'s daughter, and was, at all relevant times, a beneficiary of the Plan.
  - 11. At all relevant times, the Plan was in full force and effect.
- 12. The Plan guarantees, promises, and warrants benefits for medically necessary covered health care services.
  - 13. The Plan defines "Medically Necessary" health care services as those that a Physician, exercising professional clinical judgment, would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease or its symptoms, and that are:
    - In accordance with generally accepted standards of medical practice,
    - Clinically appropriate, in terms of type, frequency, extent, site and duration, and considered effective for the patient's illness, injury or disease,
    - Not primarily for the convenience of the patient, Physician or other health care Provider, and
    - Not more costly than an alternative services, including no service or the same service in an alternative setting or sequence of services that is medically appropriate and is likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of that patient's injury, disease, illness or condition. For example, the Plan will not provide coverage for an inpatient admission for surgery if the surgery could have been performed on an outpatient basis or an infusion or injection of a specialty drug provided in the outpatient department of a hospital if the drug could be provided in a Physician's office of the home setting.
- 14. The Plan guarantees coverage for inpatient and outpatient treatment of mental health conditions.
- 15. California's Mental Health Parity Act, Health & Safety Code §1374.72 and Insurance Code § 10144.5, as well as the Federal Mental Health Parity and Addictions Equity Act of 2008



11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

24

23

25

26 27

("MHPAEA") specifically require that health care plans provide medically necessary diagnosis, care and treatment for the treatment of specified mental health illnesses at a level equal to the provision of benefits for physical illnesses.

- 16. S.P. has a long history of mental illness and emotional disturbance, beginning at a young age.
- 17. Around sixth grade, S.P. was diagnosed with severe ADHD for which she was prescribed medication. She began seeing a psychiatrist and a therapist.
- 18. Despite ongoing treatment, S.P.'s condition continued to worsen. In 2017, S.P.'s mom found a note saying that S.P. planned to commit suicide. She was subsequently admitted to the emergency department and then, to Sundance Behavioral Health Hospital, an inpatient treatment center, for seven days.
- 19. When S.P. returned home, she continued outpatient treatment, but her condition continued to worsen. She began cutting herself.
- 20. Eventually, S.P.'s suicidal ideation and threats escalated to the point that she was again admitted to the emergency department, and from there, the children's psychiatric unit at Children's Medical Center in Dallas.
- After her discharge from Children's Medical Center, S.P. participated in an intensive 21. DBT program. She participated in individual and group DBT counseling and received individual therapy several times a week. She continued taking psychiatric medication.
- 22. Despite ongoing treatment, S.P.'s self-harm behavior continued to escalate. She would bang her head against walls and floors and punch herself. S.P.'s destructive behavior escalated to the point that she once again was admitted to the emergency department and then to the children's psychiatric unit at Children's Medical Center.
- 23. Again, after her discharge S.P. resumed outpatient treatments. Again, her condition deteriorated to the point that she was unmanageable at home.



//

## A. Anthem's Wrongful Denials of S.P.'s Treatment at New Vision Wilderness

- 24. As a result of S.P.'s escalating dangerous behavior and the repeated failure of every other treatment modality, S.P. was admitted to New Vision Wilderness ("New Vision"), an outdoor behavioral health program.
- 25. At all times relevant, S.P.'s treatment at New Vision was medically necessary, based upon the reasoned medical opinions of her treaters.
- 26. At all times relevant, S.P.'s treatment at New Vision was a covered benefit under the Plan.
- 27. Plaintiff filed claims for mental health benefits pursuant to the terms of the Plan for S.P.'s treatment at New Vision.
  - 28. Anthem denied Plaintiff's claims for S.P.'s treatment at New Vision.
  - 29. Plaintiff timely appealed Anthem's denials of S.P.'s claims for treatment at New Vision.
  - 30. Anthem denied Plaintiff's appeals.
- 31. As a result, Plaintiff was forced to pay for S.P.'s care and treatment at New Vision from his own personal funds.
- 32. Plaintiff has exhausted all administrative remedies regarding the denial of S.P.'s mental health benefits for her treatment at New Vision.

## B. Anthem's Wrongful Denials of S.P.'s Treatment at ViewPoint Center, LLC

- 33. Following S.P.'s treatment at New Vision, at the recommendation of her treatment providers, she was admitted to Summit Achievement of Stow, a residential treatment center in Maine. From there, S.P. returned home briefly.
- 34. While home, S.P. got into an explosive argument with her family which led to the police being called. Shortly thereafter, S.P. attended a private boarding school.
- 35. While at the boarding school, S.P.'s condition deteriorated. She threatened suicide. The school kept S.P. sequestered and could not provide the level of care S.P. needed.
- 36. At the recommendation of her treatment providers, S.P. was admitted to Sedona Sky Academy ("Sedona Sky"), a residential treatment center.



# DOCKET

# Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

# **Real-Time Litigation Alerts**



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## **Advanced Docket Research**



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

# **Analytics At Your Fingertips**



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

### **LAW FIRMS**

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

### **FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## **E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS**

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

