1/189 Yuma Street       County of Riverside         3       Victorville, California 92395         4       Fax: (760)780-1683         5       L. Melendrez         6       Attorney for Plaintiff, Elizabeth Becker         7       Electronically Filed         8       SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA         9       FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE         10       ELIZABETH BECKER,         11       CASE NO. RIC1905540         12       Vs.         13       RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, an         14       entity unknown; FAST STAFF, an entity         14       Defendants.         15       3. WRONGFUL TERMINATION         16       Defendants.         17       J. INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF			
8       SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE         9       ELIZABETH BECKER,         10       CASE NO. RIC1905540         11       COMPLAINT FOR:         12       Vs.         13       RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, an entity unknown, US NURSING CORPORATION, an unknown entity; and DOES 1-10,       1. VIOLATION OF LABOR COD SECTION 6310;         14       Defendants.       2. VIOLATION OF LABOR COD SECTION 6310;         16       Defendants.       3. WRONGFUL TERMINATION EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;         18	2 3 4 5 6	REKTE   BRADSHAW 17189 Yuma Street Victorville, California 92395 Telephone: (760)955-3800 Fax: (760)780-1683	Superior Court of California County of Riverside 11/5/2019 L. Melendrez
11       CASE NO. RIC 1905540         11       COMPLAINT FOR:         12       vs.         13       RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, an         14       entity unknown; FAST STAFF, an entity         14       unknown, US NURSING CORPORATION,         15       an unknown entity; and DOES 1-10,         16       Defendants.         17       3. WRONGFUL TERMINATION         18       Defendants.         19       5. NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;         10       Defendants.         11       6. NEGLIGENCE;         12       Plaintiff, ELIZABETH BECKER, as and for her complaint, alleges as follows:         12       PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS         12       1. Plaintiff, ELIZABETH BECKER (hereinafter referred to as "Plaint         13       now and at all material times herein mentioned has been an individual working in the Course	8		
<ul> <li>Plaintiff, ELIZABETH BECKER, as and for her complaint, alleges as follows:</li> <li>PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS</li> <li>Plaintiff, ELIZABETH BECKER (hereinafter referred to as "Plaint now and at all material times herein mentioned has been an individual working in the Courter of the cour</li></ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	vs. RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, an entity unknown; FAST STAFF, an entity unknown, US NURSING CORPORATION, an unknown entity; and DOES 1-10,	<ul> <li>COMPLAINT FOR:</li> <li>1. VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE SECTION 1102.5;</li> <li>2. VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE SECTION 6310;</li> <li>3. WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY</li> <li>4. INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;</li> <li>5. NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Plaintiff, ELIZABETH BECKER (hereinafter referred to as "Plaint</li> <li>now and at all material times herein mentioned has been an individual working in the Court</li> </ul>	21 22 23	Plaintiff, ELIZABETH BECKER, as and for he	)
	26 27	1. Plaintiff, ELIZABETH B	ECKER (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), is

County of Riverside, State of California.

2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant, RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, an unknown entity (hereinafter referred to as "RCH"), is now and at all material times herein mentioned, is a corporation of unknown structure with its principal place of business located at 4445 Magnolia Avenue, Riverside, California and is authorized to do business and doing business in the County of Riverside, State of California. Plaintiff worked at the Defendant's facility from May 2019 until she was terminated July 2019.

3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant, FASTAFF, an unknown entity (hereinafter referred to as "FASTAFF"). Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that and is authorized to do business and doing business in the County of Riverside, State of California. Plaintiff has worked and continued to work for FASTAFF at health care facilities around the country. Plaintiff was placed on assignment to RCH by FASTAFF at the RCH's facility from May 2019 until she was terminated July 2019.

Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon that Defendant, US
 Nursing Corporation is an unknown corporate entity (hereinafter referred to as "US
 NURSING"). Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that US NURSING is
 authorized to do business and is doing business in the County of Riverside, State of California.

5. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of said defendants when same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously-named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that Plaintiff's damages, as herein alleged, were proximately caused by their conduct.

1

6.

Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the Defendants,

and each of them, are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the agents, servants, and/or representatives of each of their remaining co-defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and purpose of said agency, service, and/or representation and with the permission, consent, and/or ratification of each of their remaining co-defendants.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the Defendants, and each of them, are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the agents, servants, and/or representatives of each of their remaining co-defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and purpose of said agency, service, and/or representation and with the permission, consent, and/or ratification of each of their remaining codefendants.

8. In perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein, Defendants, and each of them, acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy and practice of retaliating against Plaintiff for her complaining about the health and safety violations at the hospital, the failure to follow the proper timing of lab draws for patients and complained about missing compute equipment which prevented her from performing her duties in an efficient manner.

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each and every one of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, and/or attributable to, all Defendants, each acting as agents and/or employees, and/or under the direction and control of each of the other Defendants, and that said acts and failures to act were within the course and scope of said agency, employment and/or direction and control.

10. Plaintiff is informed and thereon alleges that RCH, FASTAFF and US NURSING, and DOES 1 through 10, and each of them, were Plaintiff's joint employers as set forth herein as Plaintiff performed services for the mutual benefit of each corporate defendant, defendants shared control of Plaintiff as an employee, either directly or indirectly, and defendants conducted the business in a manner consistent with finding RCH and anyone of the DOES as a joint enterprise, including the termination decision. There exists at all times herein mentioned a unity of interest between the defendants that such individuality and separateness between the defendants have ceased as related to the Plaintiff=s employment. Adherence to the existence of a separate existence of the corporate defendants would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and sanction fraud and promote injustice.

11. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful actions of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered damages, in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court.

12. Whenever in this Complaint reference is made to any of the Defendants, and each of them, unless otherwise stated, such allegations shall be deemed to mean the act of Defendant, acting individually, jointly and/or severally.

13. The acts complained of herein occurred in, and were performed in, the County of Riverside, State of California.

14. In May 2019, Plaintiff was given an assignment as a traveling nurse to work for RCH at its Magnolia facility by FASTAFF. FASTAFF is an organization which provides traveling Registered Nurses to hospitals nationwide which are in urgent and crucial situations necessitating the hospitals employing additional nurses. FASTAFF claims to be the pioneer and industry leader in Rapid Response supplemental nurse staffing, providing experienced nursing talent in ten days or less.

15. Pursuant to FASTAFF policies, a nurse's orientation is unique to each client facility, provided by the facility, in this instance, RCH. After you receive an assignment date, you will receive orientation information from the facility. Additional when on assignment at RCH, Plaintiff was to follow the schedule set by RCH, float to units/assignments as needed by RCH, even if they were different from what she was initially hired for, and required to follow RCH's including policies, procedures, or patient-care related items, include following the appropriate chain of command. Report any incident or concern to RCH's managers or supervisors, including workplace violence, concerns about patient safety, or violations administering medical treatment to patients.

16. Plaintiff was assigned to RCH and began working under its control and

direction, including the ability to control the Plaintiff as to the work done and the manner and means in which she performed her services. Generally, Plaintiff worked 12 hour shifts 4 days per week; however, there were instances wherein she worked in excess of 16 hours.

17. During her time at RCH, Plaintiff noticed and reported violation of medical orders and the lack of equipment to perform her duties. There was missing computer equipment which prevented Plaintiff from scanning equipment and inventory in conformity with policy and practices and orders for lab draws were not being followed. For one patient, blood was to be drawn every 6 hours; however, RCH was only drawing the blood every 12 hours. Plaintiff reported these problems directly to the unit director, Carol as well as to the assistant director of nursing.

18. On July 6, 2019, Plaintiff reported for work at approximately 5:00 pm. She reported to the charge nurse for her assignment for that night. Plaintiff was assigned a pod assignment wherein she was responsible for the four patients in room 52 a b and 53 a b. Upon entering room 52, daughter of the patient in bed 52a ask Plaintiff if her father has a sitter. Plaintiff explained there was no sitter assigned. When told there was supposed to be a sitter with her father, Plaintiff told her she would check with the charging nurse.

19. Plaintiff then inquired of the charge nurse, Marilou, about a sitter for bed 52a. The charging nurse replied with "your on a pod assignment, do you know what that means?" Plaintiff explained no. It was explained to Plaintiff that while there was a sitter in 53 a b, Plaintiff was required to sit with 52 a and b and could not leave the room. She would have to coordinate with the sitter in 53ab when she needed a break. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that all four patients were confused, non-compliant, and combative at times. All four had orders requiring for 1:1 observation, not the two patients for one nurse as had been scheduled for the night.

20. After returning from lunch, the patient in bed 52b had become restless and difficult. Plaintiff was informed that the 52b patient had been disconnected from his IV and began throwing things.

21. Later that night, the patient tried getting out of bed several times. When assisting this patient with urinal he became agitated throwing the urinal at Plaintiff. During the process of cleaning the patient, the patient became highly combative grabbing Plaintiff's right wrist and twisting it with both hands. She called for assistance however, no one showed.

22. The patient continued to be difficult, so difficult that Plaintiff called for a code gray-combative patient. The charge nurse cancelled the code gray. Again, the same patient continues to be difficult, but the charge nurse again cancels the code gray. During this period Plaintiff paged the responsible numerous times.

23. The same patient continues to be agitated. He throws his pillow on the face of his roommate. He, among other things, takes his heart monitor box apart and threw the box on floor. Plaintiff again calls for assistance. However, no one shows. The patient throws his heart monitor cables at the Plaintiff striking her in the face. Plaintiff was able to exit room and, in tears, told charge nurse to call a code gray. At that point in time, Plaintiff informed the charge nurse that she would not return to that room as the inadequate staffing violated the orders and was not safe for either the patients or the staff to be in that room alone. Security finally showed up and restrained the patient. The doctor, Dr. Patel, finally called back and was provided an update by Plaintiff.

24. At the time of the assault by the patient, Plaintiff's wrist was aching and her face stung. Instead of sending Plaintiff to the Emergency Room for treatment and care as a result of the assault, the charge nurse merely told Plaintiff to change assignments. Plaintiff opposed this order and requested to speak to the nursing supervisor. Plaintiff subsequently, went to emergency department to be checked and was subsequently sent home.

25. Prior to leaving for the night, Plaintiff filed all incident reports and charted everything that had happened. Plaintiff left the hospital at approximately 4:00 a.m. on Sunday, July 7<sup>th</sup>.

26. Plaintiff was scheduled to have Sunday, July 7<sup>th</sup> and Monday July 8<sup>th</sup> off from work. However, no one contacted Plaintiff about the incident. Plaintiff became concerned

and on July 8<sup>th</sup>, went in to discuss the situation with the director of nursing, Carol.

27. During the meeting, Plaintiff reported her safety concerns, as well as the violation of orders and inoperable equipment to the director of the unit. The Director of Nursing informed Plaintiff that she had done everything properly.

28. However, on July 9<sup>th</sup>, the day after Plaintiff's meeting with the Director of Nursing, instead of investigating Plaintiff's complaints and address the short-falls and violations illustrated by the Plaintiff, the very next day, Plaintiff was notified that she was suspended. On Thursday, July 11<sup>th</sup>, Plaintiff was terminated. No reason for the termination was provided. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that she was terminated in retaliation for reporting the issues she encountered while working at RCH as well as in order to prevent her from reporting the RCH's violations to the state regulators. In fact, Plaintiff is informed and believes thereon that RCH has threatened to file a complaint about her with the California Board of Nursing in order maintain leverage over her to prevent her from complaining to state regulators or undermining the effectiveness of any evidence she might give.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### **RETALIATION -LABOR CODE SECTION 1102.5**

(Against all Corporate Defendants)

29. Plaintiff, realleges, reasserts and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through28 set forth above as if fully set forth hereat.

30. Labor Code section 1102.5 prohibits employers from retaliating against employees who the employer believes may disclose information to a governmental entity which would disclose a violation of the law or retaliating against an employee for refusing to participate in any illegal activities.

31. Plaintiff is informed and believes that she was terminated because Defendants were concerned about the disclosures of all of their violations of law and/or for her complaining

about their failure to follow the prescribed staffing requirements and reporting the unsafe conditions for employees and patients.

32. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer humiliation, emotional distress, and mental and physical pain and anguish, loss of wages, retirement benefits and loss of medical benefits all to her damage both economic and non-economic, in a sum according to proof at trial.

33. Defendants conduct as described above was willful, despicable, knowing, and intentional. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Labor Code section 6310)

(Against all Corporate Defendants)

34. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates as if fully set forth herein each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs 1 through 33, as if fully set forth hereat.

35. The California legislature passed California Labor Code section 6310. This statute was enacted to protect employees from wrongful termination in retaliation for employee complaints about health and safety in the workplace.

36. Similar to Labor Code section 1102.5, an employee making a claim under this section must be able to establish that he engaged in a protected activity and faced adverse employment action, while also being able to show a causal link between the activity and adverse action.

37. The statute states, in part, "No person shall discharge or in any manner discriminate against any employee because the employee has done any of the following: (1) Made any oral or written complaint to the division, other governmental agencies having statutory responsibility for or assisting the division with reference to employee safety or health, his or her employer, or his or her representative."

38. Moreover, the statute provides, "(b) Any employee who is discharged, threatened with discharge, demoted, suspended, or in any other manner discriminated against in the terms and conditions of employment by his or her employer because the employee has made a bona fide oral or written complaint to the division, other governmental agencies having statutory responsibility for or assisting the division with reference to employee safety or health, his or her employer, or his or her representative, of unsafe working conditions, or work practices, in his or her employment or place of employment, or has participated in an employer-employee occupational health and safety committee, shall be entitled to reinstatement and reimbursement for lost wages and work benefits caused by the acts of the employer".

39. Plaintiff is informed and believes that she was terminated because Defendants were concerned about the disclosures of all of their violations of law and/or for her complaining about their failure to follow the prescribed staffing requirements and reporting the unsafe conditions for employees and patients.

40. As a proximate result of Defendants conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer humiliation, emotional distress, and mental and physical pain and anguish, loss of wages, retirement benefits and loss of medical benefits all to her damage both economic and non-economic, in a sum according to proof at trial.

41. Defendants conduct as described above was willful, despicable, knowing, and intentional. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

## (Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy)

(Against all Corporate Defendants)

42. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates as if fully set forth herein each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs 1 through 41, as if fully set forth hereat.

43. The actions defendant inflicted upon Plaintiff violated California's Constitution

and the Labor Code's prohibition against retaliation. Such actions or inactions ordered by the Defendants.

44. As a proximate result of Defendants conduct, Defendants and each of them acted for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer financial loss, including lost earnings and future earnings and other employment benefits, humiliation, embarrassment and severe emotional distress in an amount to be established at trial.

45. In doing the acts set forth herein, Defendants knew that the conduct they would have required of Plaintiff was unlawful and required Plaintiff to choose between violating the law and losing her job. As such Defendants are guilty of oppression and malice, justifying an award of exemplary and punitive damages.

### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

(Against all Defendants)

46. Plaintiff refers to the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 45 inclusive of this complaint and incorporates the same herein by this reference as though said paragraphs were set forth in full hereat.

47. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants engaged in intentional and/or reckless conduct that was outrageous and unlawful and outside the bounds of all decency by intentionally imposing additional stress on Plaintiff, including the behavior by informing others that she had abandoned her patients despite knowing she had been assaulted by a patient requiring medical treatment.

48. Defendants, intended to cause the Plaintiff emotional distress and acted with a conscious disregard of the probability that Plaintiff would suffer emotional distress by their conduct complained of herein.

49.

As a direct and proximate result of the conduct and actions of Defendants

Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer and will in the future suffer severe emotional distress and mental anguish. 50. Defendants conduct as described above was willful, despicable, knowing

and intentional. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# **NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

(Against all Defendants)

51. Plaintiff refers to the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 50 inclusive of this complaint and incorporates the same herein by this reference as though said paragraphs were set forth in full hereat.

52. Defendants knew or should have known that the actions, including terminating Plaintiff for exercising her lawful rights, and the post termination behavior, would cause Plaintiff severe emotional distress.

53. As a proximate result of Defendant, terminating Plaintiff for exercising her lawful rights to, among other things, report harassment, refusal to participate in illegal activities, and having him arrested, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer and will in the future suffer severe emotional distress and mental anguish.

# SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligence (Against all Corporate Defendants)

54. Plaintiff refers to the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 53 inclusive of this complaint and incorporates the same herein by this reference as though said paragraphs were set forth in full hereat.

55. Plaintiff is informed and thereon alleges, the Defendants owned and/or were in control of the property where she was assaulted and were negligent in the use and/or maintenance as alleges hereinabove.

56. Defendants owned and/or controlled the property and have prior notice about the risks of staff being harmed by patients who require greater supervision that the defendants were willing to staff. Throughout the night she was harmed, Plaintiff reported the aggressive nature of the patient who eventually assaulted her, but those pleas fell on deaf ears. As the owner and occupier of the property, they had a duty to manage and act reasonably and control the property and protect all who enter the property, including protecting individuals from injury.

57. Defendants were aware of the dangerous nature of the patient, but, in an effort to save costs, willfully ignored the order for 1-on-1 supervision of the patient, thereby creating the risk that the patient would injure and harm the Plaintiff.

58. By virtue of the information provided for herein, Defendants knew or should have known about the patient's violent tendencies, Defendants owed a duty to the Plaintiff to prevent the kinds of injuries she sustained.

59. Defendants breached this duty of care by way of their own conduct as alleged herein. Defendants failed to take reasonable steps to protect the Plaintiff and Plaintiff sustaining injuries as a result of this breach.

60. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants illegal conduct, Plaintiff has suffered emotional distress, humiliation and embarrassment and economic harm all in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

1	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
2	WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays for judgment and relief against Defendants and DOES		
3	WHEREFORE, the Flamith plays for judgment and tener against Detendants and DOES		
4	1-10, jointly and severally, as follows:		
5	1. For all applicable statutory penalties;		
6	2. For interest on the amount of any/all economic losses, at the prevailing legal rate;		
7	3. For reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to statute.		
8	4. For costs of suit and any and all such other relief as the Court deems just/ proper.		
9	5. General and special damages in a sum according to proof;		
10	6. Exemplary and punitive damages in a sum sufficient to deter, according to proof;		
11	7. For all back and front pay, including lost earnings and other employee benefits,		
12	past and future;		
13	8. For pre-judgment interest on lost earnings and benefits at the legal rate.		
14	Λι		
15	Dated: November 5, 2019 REKTE/BRADSHAW		
16 17			
18	By: Andre Rekte		
19	Attorney for Plaintiff, ELIZABETH BECKER		
20	<b>REQUEST FOR A JURY TRIAL</b>		
21			
22	Plaintiff requests a jury trial on all matters triable to a jury.		
23			
24	Dated: November 5, 2019 REKTE   BRADSHAW		
25			
26	Ву:		
27	Andre Rekte Attorney for Plaintiff, ELIZABETH BECKER		
28			