

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
ORLANDO DIVISION**

WENDY BRYAN and PATRICIA )	
WHITE, individually and on behalf of all )	
others similarly )	<b>Case No.:</b>
situated, )	)
)	)
Plaintiffs, )	)
)	)
v. )	<b>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</b>
)	)
BioPlus Specialty Pharmacy Services, )	)
LLC, )	)
)	)
Defendant. )	)
)	)

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

Plaintiffs Wendy Bryan and Patricia White (“Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, through the undersigned counsel, hereby allege the following against Defendant BioPlus Specialty Pharmacy Services, LLC (“BioPlus” or “Defendant”).

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is a class action for damages with respect to BioPlus Specialty Pharmacy Services, LLC, for its failure to exercise reasonable care in securing and safeguarding its patients’ sensitive personal data—including names, addresses, email addresses, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, health insurance billing

information, and treating physician information, collectively known as Personally Identifiable Information (“PII” or “Private Information”).

2. This class action is brought on behalf of patients whose sensitive PII was stolen by cybercriminals in a cyber-attack that accessed sensitive patient information through BioPlus’s services on or around October 25, 2021 (the “Data Breach”).

3. The Data Breach affected at least 350,000 individuals from BioPlus’s services.

4. BioPlus reported to Plaintiffs that information compromised in the Data Breach included their PII.

5. Plaintiffs were not notified until December of 2021, nearly three months after their information was first accessed.

6. As a result of the Data Breach, Plaintiffs and other Class Members will experience various types of misuse of their PII in the coming years, including but not limited to unauthorized credit card charges, unauthorized access to email accounts, and other fraudulent use of their financial accounts.

7. Defendant’s security failures enabled the hackers to steal the Private Information of Plaintiffs and other members of the class—defined below. These failures put Plaintiffs’ and other Class Members’ Private Information at a serious, immediate, and ongoing risk. Additionally, Defendant’s failures caused costs and

expenses associated with the time spent and the loss of productivity from taking time to address and attempt to ameliorate the release of personal data, as well as emotional grief associated with constant monitoring of personal banking and credit accounts. Mitigating and dealing with the actual and future consequences of the Data Breach has also created a number of future consequences for Plaintiffs and Class Members—including, as appropriate, reviewing records of fraudulent charges for services billed but not received, purchasing credit monitoring and identity theft protection services, the imposition of withdrawal and purchase limits on compromised accounts, initiating and monitoring credit freezes, the loss of property value of their personal information, and the stress, nuisance, and aggravation of dealing with all issues resulting from the Data Breach.

8. Plaintiffs and Class Members suffered a loss of the property value of their Private Information when it was acquired by cyber thieves in the Data Breach. Numerous courts have recognized the propriety of the loss of the property value of personal information in data breach cases.

9. There has been no assurance offered from BioPlus that all personal data or copies of data have been recovered or destroyed. BioPlus offered one free year of Experian IdentityWorks's Credit 3B monitoring services, which does not guarantee the security of Plaintiffs' information. To mitigate further harm, Plaintiffs

chose not to disclose any more information to receive services connected with BioPlus.

10. Accordingly, Plaintiffs assert claims for negligence, breach of contract, breach of implied contract, and breach of fiduciary duty, as well as a claim for declaratory relief.

### **PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE**

#### **A. Plaintiff Wendy Bryan**

11. Plaintiff Wendy Bryan is a citizen of New Jersey and brings this action in her individual capacity and on behalf of all others similarly situated. Ms. Bryan has resided in the state of New Jersey for nearly fifty years and owns a home within the state. Ms. Bryan intends to remain in New Jersey indefinitely.

12. Ms. Bryan used BioPlus's services in 2021 when she had a specialty prescription filled through her doctor's office. To receive services at BioPlus, Plaintiff Bryan was required to disclose her PII, which was then entered into BioPlus's database and maintained by Defendant. In maintaining her information, Defendant expressly and impliedly promised to safeguard Plaintiff Bryan's PII. Defendant, however, did not take proper care of Ms. Bryan's PII, leading to its exposure as a direct result of Defendant's inadequate security measures. In December of 2021, Plaintiff Bryan received a notification letter from Defendant stating that her sensitive PII was taken.

13. The letter also offered one year of credit monitoring through Experian's IdentityWorks Credit 3B monitoring, which was and continues to be ineffective for Bryan and other Class Members. The Experian credit monitoring would have shared Ms. Bryan's information with third parties and could not guarantee complete privacy of her sensitive PII.

14. In the months and years following the Data Breach, Ms. Bryan and the other Class Members will experience a slew of harms as a result of Defendant's ineffective data security measures. Some of these harms will include fraudulent charges, medical procedures ordered in patients' names without their permission, and targeted advertising without patient consent.

15. Plaintiff Bryan greatly values her privacy, especially in receiving medical services, and would not have paid the amount that she did for pharmacy services if she had known that her information would be maintained using inadequate data security systems.

**B. Plaintiff Patricia White**

16. Plaintiff Patricia White is a citizen of Connecticut and brings this action in her individual capacity and on behalf of all others similarly situated. Ms. White has resided in Connecticut for her entire life, has a registered automobile in the state of Connecticut, and has been a member of local civic groups in the state of

# 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.