

1 SHAFEEQ SADIQ, ESQ., SBN 233049
2 ROGER KOSLA, ESQ., SBN. 285266

3 SEVEN HUNDRED "E" STREET
4 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

5 PH. 916.446.2800
6 FX. 916.446.2828

E-FILED
1/8/2016 1:28:52 PM
FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
By: M. Meza, Deputy

7 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF FRESNO
8 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

9 Alan MARCUM,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 St. Agnes Medical Center, Dr. Chinnapa
13 Nareddy, Herbert Lee Thomas, Sharon
14 Wimberley, Wayne Thomas, Leisure Care
15 LLC, Does 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No. 15CECG01327

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
DAMAGES

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

16 **GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS RELEVANT TO ALL DEFENDANTS**

17 1. Plaintiff Alan Marcum brings his complaint for damages as against defendants St.
18 Agnes Medical Center, Dr. Chinnapa Nareddy, M.D., Herbert Lee Thomas ("Lee"), Sharon
19 Wimberley, Wayne Thomas, and Leisure Care LLC. Plaintiff has complied with all
20 statutory prerequisites regarding a professional negligence action as he caused to be served a
21 pre-claim notice on the medical professional entities on April 9, 2015.

22 2. Plaintiff is a resident of Sacramento County. The defendants except Wayne
23 Thomas are residents of Fresno County. Wayne resides in Alameda County. All acts
24 alleged herein occurred within Fresno County within the jurisdiction of the Fresno
25 County Superior Court. Therefore, Fresno County is the appropriate venue for this action
26 and the Fresno County Superior Court has jurisdiction over all defendants in this action in
27 light of their substantial contact with the jurisdiction and that all acts alleged herein occurred
28 within the boundary of the county.

1 3. Following the death of her first husband, Dorothy Marcum married her second
2 husband Herbert Lee Thomas. Following a divorce from his first wife, Herbert Lee
3 Thomas married his second wife Dorothy Marcum. Dorothy's first marriage produced
4 two children: Alan Marcum and Dan Marcum. Lee's first marriage produced three
5 children: Wayne Thomas, Sharon Wimberley (Sharon Thomas) and Suzanne Thomas
6 (Deceased). Lee and Dorothy had no children together. On October 25, 1990, Lee and
7 Dorothy created the Herbert L Thomas and Dorothy A Thomas trust. The beneficiaries of
8 that trust were the children of both Lee and Dorothy. The trust was restated June 21, 2007.
9 At that time, Wayne Thomas and Dan Marcum were added as co-successor trustees, with
10 Alan Marcum named as Dan's available replacement, and Wayne Thomas and Dan Marcum
11 as "co-disability panelists," again with Alan Marcum as Dan Marcum's available
12 replacement. Dan Marcum and Wayne Thomas are also co-personal representatives in
13 Dorothy Thomas' pour-over will (executed as part of the trust). Dorothy Thomas died on
14 April 30, 2013. Immediately after her death, Lee amended the trust. In his amendment, he
15 made sweeping changes, including the removal of Dan and Alan from *all* positions of
16 responsibility as successor trustees, and removing Dan and Alan from the disability panel.
17 Dan Marcum's removal required court approval, as per the terms of the trust, and service of
18 process on him. That did not occur. Notably, the original trust permitted removal of a
19 trustee only for cause and required court approval. Furthermore, Lee also altered the trust to
20 remove the requirement that capacity determinations be made based on the opinion of an
attending physician.

21 4. Lee and Dorothy Thomas resided in a single family residence at 532 W. Rialto,
22 Fresno CA 93705 until they moved to Fairwinds-Woodward, a residential care facility
23 pursuant to 22 CCR §87101(5), owned and operated by Leisure Care LLC. It is
24 regulated by the California Department of Social Services as facility number 107201156.
25 Lee was physically abusive toward Dorothy. Instances of abuse are documented throughout
26 Dorothy's medical records. They include Lee offering conflicting versions of events to
27 medical personnel regarding the circumstances surrounding Dorothy's injuries. Elsewhere
28 in the records medical personnel, including nurses, specifically indicate that abuse of

1 Dorothy is occurring in the home she shared with Lee. Indeed referral to local authorities
2 was even noted and recommended. For his part, Plaintiff also had personally witnessed
3 physical indicia of abuse to his mother. Indeed, Dan and Alan confronted Lee in 2012 at the
4 Rialto residence regarding physical abuse of their mother. In that meeting, they demanding
5 notification of *all* future ambulance incidents, hospitalizations, and emergency room visits.
6 In response, Lee capitulated, stating: " You have a right to know."

7 5. Primary care physician Dr. Garry Steven Sevel even noted in his August 6, 2012,
8 report that Lee was incapable of continuing as Dorothy's primary health caregiver.
9 Specifically, he wrote: "Pt's husband is very confused as to meds pt should be taking, and in
10 my opinion is not giving her needed meds or in my opinion able to be primary care giver."
11 A second letter of similar substance from Dorothy's new primary care physician Dr.
12 Kirandeep Kaur Batth, M.D., was written on 12/4/2012. However, Lee concealed this report
13 from plaintiff. Moreover, Dorothy's medical records from 2012 reveal a woman who was
14 consistently malnourished and dehydrated, with bed sores and other injuries consistent with
15 domestic abuse including a broken rib and black eyes. Lee consistently delayed Dorothy's
16 medical treatment for days or weeks at a time. He deliberately withheld Dorothy's son
17 Dan's contact information from Leisure Care LLC to prevent the facility from contacting
18 him about her care. He resisted and refused efforts to provide in-home caregivers for
19 Dorothy. He failed to take adequate action to ensure that Dorothy's walker could fit through
20 the bathroom door of the home. He rendered himself incommunicado from health caregivers
21 during times when Dorothy was in their care and communication needed to occur with her
22 personal representative/contact. He withheld information from Dan and Alan Marcum,
23 including when she was admitted to the St. Agnes Emergency Room on 4/14/2013 and again
24 on 4/29/2013. He failed to provide nutrition and feeding for Dorothy, often forcing her to go
25 nine to twelve hours at a time without food. He failed to pick up her necessary prescription
26 medication or would cancel them altogether. He repeatedly and consistently allowed her to
27 develop debilitating bedsores. Lee isolated Dorothy from her sons, relatives, and
28 friends she had prior to the marriage. Lee controlled every aspect of Dorothy's life.
When Dan and Alan called Dorothy, Lee listened in on all phone calls. When Dan

1 and Alan visited Dorothy, Lee listened to all conversations. Lee and Dorothy rarely
2 visited Dan and Alan. The hospital records revealed this abuse.

3 6. At one juncture in 2012, plaintiff and Dan and Alan hired an in-home caregiver to
4 assist with his mother's care. A-Plus was the in-home care service business. Alan and
5 Dan employed A-Plus in 2012 to provide care to Lee and Dorothy Thomas in their
6 home. However, Lee refused to allow the caregiver to perform its duties, instead relegating
7 them to light housework. At another point in time, Dorothy was enrolled in Horizon Health
8 Care center. Her condition improved. A 1/4/2013 email from Ginger McMurchie stated that
9 Lee had declined training for the family on caring for Dorothy. This was prior to the move to
10 Fairwinds. Next, Wayne was complicit with the Horizon assessment and ratified it without
11 notifying co-trustee Dan Marcum on 1/27/2013. Wayne signed a service contract with a
12 level of care which was insufficient for the level of care Dorothy required. Wayne Thomas
13 purchased virtually the most inexpensive care Fairwinds provided. At the time Dorothy's
14 net worth exceeded two million dollars.

15 7. Dr. A.P.S. Sidhu M .D., completed Form LIC 602A, a separate interdisciplinary
16 discharge summary that Lee signed on January 30, 2013, the day Dorothy was
17 transferred from Horizon to Fairwinds. Dorothy moved into Fairwinds on January 30,
18 2013, at 11:30am. Yet Lee did not sign off on her intake form until much later that same
19 day, therefore the form could not possibly have been utilized/considered in the
20 admission appraisal process by the caregiver.

21 8. Further records demonstrate that Lee was "tired" of his responsibility as caregiver to
22 Dorothy. Thus, it was unsurprising that Dorothy was taken to the Emergency Room at St.
23 Agnes Medical Center on April 14, 2013, after having suffered a fall on 4/13/2013 while
24 getting out of bed. Unfortunately, the fall caused her to break her back. Lee did not
25 accompany her to the hospital, nor could he be reached by telephone at any time during
26 Dorothy's stay there. Indeed even after she had received medical treatment and was ready
27 for discharge, Lee refused the calls of hospital staff and allowed Dorothy to languish at the
28 hospital.

9. On several occasions Dorothy has signed advance healthcare directives (AHCD) and

1 physician's order for life sustaining treatment (POLST). On each and every occasion, she
2 stated her desire that everything be done to save her in the event medical intervention
3 became necessary. Lee failed to notify Dan of this AHCD and also failed to provide the
4 AHCD to St. Agnes. The Fairwinds AHCD named two specific health care agents, Lee
5 Thomas and Dan Marcum, and it included detailed contact information for both.

6 10. On April 29, 2013, Dorothy was admitted to the Emergency Room at St. Agnes
7 Medical Center. Upon arrival she is in possession of her POLST and the records so indicate
8 that a Dr. Vallapu confirmed having received and reviewed same. Again, Lee did not
9 accompany her to the hospital. Nor did he respond to numerous calls from hospital staff and
10 was never mentioned as being reasonably available by phone or at St. Agnes. For his part,
11 plaintiff was never informed that Dorothy had been hospitalized or had visited the
12 Emergency Room in 2013.

13 11. Regardless, even after being admitted to St. Agnes Medical Center, Dorothy again
14 was presented with forms regarding her wishes in the event life-saving medical care and
15 treatment became necessary. She consistently indicated that everything should be done to
16 save her life, including full resuscitation.

17 12. Inexplicably, defendant Sharon Wimberley, a healthcare professional herself with
18 twenty years of experience in the industry, approached Dr. Nareddy and informed him that
19 Dorothy should not receive any lifesaving treatment whatsoever. Sharon had never had any
20 authorization to act on Dorothy's behalf or even Lee's behalf. Instead she appears to have
21 simply materialized as the angel of death at Dorothy's side. Sharon knew that Dorothy
22 wanted her AHCD mandating full resuscitation to be followed, yet she disregarded
23 Dorothy's wishes.

24 13. For his part, Dr. Nareddy did nothing to confirm whether Sharon had any such
25 authorization to change Dorothy's AHCD or POLST. Instead, he simply alters the
26 records/chart and physician's orders requiring full resuscitation to indicate that Dorothy
27 should not be resuscitated or receive any therapies in the event she needed such medical
28 intervention to stay alive and never mentioned that Dorothy had lost capacity. Thus at
4:47:50 all 7-9 medical procedures were halted along with medications "allowing a natural

1 death" as stated in Dr. Nareddy's notes. All therapies were specifically removed, and no
2 further efforts were made to help her stay alive. A subsequent expert witness review of the
3 records concluded that it was reasonably probable that Dorothy would have continued living
4 had she been taken to intensive care. Thus, in a very real sense Sharon, Lee, Wayne, and Dr.
5 Nareddy killed her.

6 14. Sharon had departed the hospital and Dorothy died alone of acute respiratory failure
7 at 5:45 p.m. on April 30, 2013, with no family at her bedside. Also, Lee is inexplicably
8 never mentioned as being in the hospital or being in contact with any of the staff in 2013.

9 15. Less than an hour after Dorothy expired, Wayne resurfaced at 6:40 authorizing release
10 of Dorothy's health information and ordered no autopsy to be performed on Dorothy's
11 corpse. Wayne lacked the authority to make such a decision on her behalf. Indeed, on
12 information and belief it is alleged that Wayne also engaged in a pattern of making financial
13 decisions which were not in Dorothy's best interest and which were not ratified by co-trustee
14 Dan Marcum. These decisions were intended not to benefit Dorothy, but rather to save as
15 much of his potential inheritance for himself and for his sister Sharon. They include
16 consistently denying or cancelling necessary healthcare for Dorothy because he deemed it
17 too expensive for her.

18 16. Finally, two days after her death, Dr. Nareddy made retroactive alterations to
19 Dorothy's medical records to indicate that the patient's wish was for DNAR (Do Not
20 Attempt Resuscitation) and DNR/DNI (Do Not Resuscitate/Do Not Intubate). All of these
21 actions either violated St. Agnes Medical Center proper best practices and procedures
22 regarding the verification of authority to alter health care directives or the medical center
23 simply failed to have such necessary and appropriate best practices and procedural
24 safeguards in place. On information and belief, St. Agnes Medical Center failed to follow its
25 protocols by allowing Dr. Nareddy to disregard the physician's order for life sustaining
26 treatment thereby ignoring the POLST and AHCD. The nursing staff who are hospital
27 employees found Dorothy not breathing and were unable to even check patient's status
28 because of Dr. Nareddy's instructions (DNAR). The nurses are mandated reporters who
failed to report the crime. According to a subsequent expert analysis, had Dorothy simply

1 been intubated she would have lived. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Dr. Nareddy is
2 an employee of St. Agnes Medical Center and thus is an agent under the legal doctrine of
3 *respondeat superior*.

4 17. Plaintiff is also informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the hospital must
5 have had some written policy or procedure or protocol in place to ensure that complete
6 strangers were not making changes to patient's wishes as regards the scope of their
7 lifesaving medical treatment. However neither the hospital nor any of its agents took any
8 appropriate action to follow their own procedures in this case. The result was the death of
9 Dorothy Thomas.

10 18. Lee was the primary caregiver of Dorothy and had authority to make medical
11 decisions on her behalf. However he secreted himself and otherwise rendered himself in
12 absentia during those crucial times that she needed his advocacy. The co-successors trustees
13 and co-personal representatives of the family trust after Lee were Wayne Thomas and Dan
14 Marcum, plaintiff's brother. However Wayne ignored his co-trustee status and engaged in a
15 pattern of decision-making on Dorothy's behalf without first consulting with co-trustee Dan.
16 For a further example, it is alleged on information and belief that Wayne wrote unauthorized
17 checks to third parties from Dorothy's funds without first consulting either Lee or co-trustee
18 Dan.

19 19. Dan Marcum refuses to commence or maintain an elder abuse action at this time
20 because of the cost of an attorney. Dan agrees with Alan that Herbert Lee Thomas, Sharon
21 Wimberley, Wayne Thomas, Leisure Care LLC, Dr. Chinnapa Nareddy, and St. Agnes
22 Medical Center all committed elder abuse to Dorothy. Alan does not accuse Dan of elder
23 abuse. Dan has authorized Alan to commence and maintain this action on behalf of their
24 mother.

25 **ALLEGATIONS SPECIFIC TO FAIRWINDS/LEISURE CARE LLC**

26 20. 22 CCR 87455(c)(2) states that residents who require 24 hour skilled nursing cannot
27 be admitted into residential care facilities like Fairwinds. Notably, Fairwinds is a non-
28 medical facility (and therefore not subject to MICRA). Yet, Dorothy required such care *and*
was still admitted there.

1 21. Dorothy was in fact "bedridden" under Title 2287606 and *Health & Safety Code*
2 §1569.72(e)&(f) of California law. Specifically regulation 87582(d)(2) provides that a
3 resident is "bedridden" who cannot independently transfer to and from bed and is unable to
4 leave the building unassisted for emergency purposes. According to the Physician's Report
5 for Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly, Dorothy was non-ambulatory and not
6 independently able to transfer from her bed. Under the law, Dorothy was in fact bedridden.
7 Thus, despite the report not specifically indicating she was bedridden, a clear profit motive
8 was at play for both the Thomas family to enroll Lee and Dorothy in less expensive care and
9 for Fairwinds to receive another patient despite not being equipped or able to handle her.
10 Fairwinds/Leisure Care LLC violated California regulations in accepting Dorothy. Pursuant
11 to California law under 22 CCR 87637, a resident cannot be cared for if the care exceeds the
12 limits of the provider's license, department of health relocation order 87637(2).

13 22. Fairwinds/Leisure Care LLC is required to perform reappraisals in writing pursuant to
14 87463 whenever there is a change in the medical condition and said reassessment/reappraisal
15 must be delivered to the State of California licensing agency within seven calendar days
16 pursuant to regulation 80061 and 87561. Here, Dorothy experienced a material change in
17 her circumstances when she broke her back on April 13, 2013. Yet no reassessment or
18 reporting was done. She was dead fifteen days later.

19 23. Under California 22 CCR 87455, a resident must be removed from the facility if she
20 requires twenty-four skilled nursing care or intermediate care as specified in the regulations.
21 According to a registered nurse, on January 1, 2013, the facility was incapable of providing
22 care to Dorothy due to her care needs. Still, after admission Fairwinds/Leisure Care LLC
23 did nothing to move Dorothy to a facility that court provide a higher level of care.

24 24. Under California regulation 87202, a special fire clearance must be issued to the
25 facility when someone like Dorothy resides there. But Fairwinds/Leisure Care LLC had no
26 such clearance. Fairwinds/Leisure Care LLC also did not maintain a copy of the admission
27 agreement with the client and the client's authorized representative in the file for Dorothy as
28 required by 22 CCR 80068. No such agreement was maintained and/or it was willfully
concealed from Alan Marcum when he requested the file after presenting HIPPA papers to

1 Fairwinds.

2 25. Dorothy moved into Fairwinds on January 30, 2013 at 11:30am. Lee did not sign off
3 on her intake form until the same day; therefore the form was not used in the admission
4 appraisal process by Fairwinds.

5 26. California law (22 CCR 87303) requires a comfortable temperature must be
6 maintained for residents at all times. Yet on the afternoon of April 29, 2013, the day
7 Dorothy had to go to the hospital, the air conditioning was not functioning and the room was
8 ninety five degrees, causing increased edema for Dorothy and an inability to elevate her legs.

9 27. By February 14, 2013, it was clear to the physical therapists of Dorothy that she
10 needed more assistance and care. Both Wayne and Lee chose a level of care well below
11 what Dorothy required.

12 28. On or about February 4, 2013, a medical note indicates that Lee is not giving Dorothy
13 her required medication. Fairwinds did nothing to ensure that she received her medication.

14 29. On January 31, 2013, a registered nurse found Dorothy suffering in Fairwinds
15 because she was not receiving the level of care she required. This is documented in the
16 nurse's medical note that Fairwinds is incapable of offering the required level of care.
17 Dorothy was calling for help ten or more times a day and not receiving adequate assistance.

18 30. As demonstrated by a series of electronic mail correspondences between Alan
19 Marcum and the director of health and wellness, Dorothy's falls were concealed from Alan
20 by Fairwinds/Leisure Care LLC despite her having confirmed that he is authorized to receive
21 medical information. This director cannot dispute or claim that she was unaware of the falls
22 because she received the prescription for medication for Dorothy arising directly from the
23 falls.

24 31. Fairwinds utilized witnesses for Dorothy's AHCD that worked for and at Fairwinds.
25 This is in violation of California law. *Probate Code §4674.*

26 32. Fairwinds should have enacted the processes/procedures for removing Dorothy from
27 the facility pursuant to 22 CCR 87224. However no action was taken.

28 33. Fairwinds was required to provide the AHCD to the responding emergency personnel.
22 CCR 85075.3. Fairwinds never did this.

1 34. The advanced healthcare directive signed on 2/21/2013 at Fairwinds was concealed
2 and never taken to St. Agnes and is the only directive listing Lee and Dan as the only
3 medical agents. Dorothy signed a statement, "I want this person to help make my medical
4 decisions."

5 35. Fairwinds' facility number is 107201156. The license did not allow any bedridden
6 people on the second floor where Dorothy resided. The license allows only three bedridden
7 people on the first floor and they must be recovering from surgery or near a status above
8 bedridden. From 3/29/2011 to 08/12/2015 Fairwinds received 15 citations from the
9 Department of Social Services.

10 **ALLEGATIONS SPECIFIC TO ST. AGNES MEDICAL CENTER**

11 36. On or about January 21, 2013, Dorothy filled out a Physician's Order for Life Saving
12 Treatment (POLST). It provided for all life-saving treatment. And she arrived at the
13 emergency room on April 29, 2013, with it and provided it to the admitting physician at St.
14 Agnes, one Hemanth K. Vallapu, the authorized agent/representative of St. Agnes, per the
15 hospital's own stamp. This evidence demonstrates the hospital was on full notice of her
16 AHCD at all times upon her admission.

17 37. *Probate Code* §4780 - 4786 requires St. Agnes and its physicians to honor this
18 POLST and to make all healthcare decisions in accord with this document.

19 38. The hospital made her sign another advance AHCD. Again, she indicates that they
20 are to do everything possible to save her. Under California law codified at *Probate Code*
21 §4731, the physicians at the hospital must have obtained a copy of this new document and
22 ensured that it was made part of the patient's medical records. St. Agnes date-stamps
23 indicate the document was prepared and received by the hospital, and the document on its
24 face also indicates it is not in conflict with the POLST. Hospitals are required to follow
25 AHCD orders. *Cardoza v. USC Univ. Hospital*, (2008) B.195092.

26 39. The back of the POLST states modifying "based on known desires of patient."
27 *Probate Code* §4657 provides that Dorothy was/is presumed to have capacity. Indeed there
28 is nothing in the records to indicate that Dorothy lacked capacity to execute these documents
until after she is deceased, at which time Dr. Naredy enters a cryptic / incomplete /

1 unintelligible note which may have been his effort to falsify records on the issue of capacity.
2 However, per *Probate Code* §4732, any indication / representation regarding capacity or lack
3 thereof must be immediately entered into the patient's records and communicated to the
4 patient. This was simply not done such that no legitimate factual dispute can be raised as to
5 the issue of capacity. Nor were any of the measures required by *Probate Code* §4736 taken
6 by the physicians at St. Agnes. These facts should foreclose in advance any bogus
7 contention that Dorothy lacked capacity.

8 40. By 4:47 p.m. on April 30, 2013, Dr. Nareddy knew that his withholding of seven to
9 nine medical treatments to Dorothy, would result in her death, as he writes in his note:
10 "allow a natural death." As Dorothy expires, and according to Nareddy's narrative, he
11 discussed "in detail" with Sharon Wemberly at Dorothy's bedside the likely result of failing
12 to administer medical treatment (likely death) and that he "would be" signing the death
13 certificate. This demonstrates the requisite intent and awareness of likelihood of harm as
14 well as the egregious nature of their failure to administer treatment and the clear result being
15 that Dorothy would die without treatment. Before a hospital or physician can make a
16 decision about the patient and her care, California law requires a consult with the patient.
17 *Probate Code* §4730. The hospital and physician are furthermore required to comply with
18 her AHCD and individual care instructions as much as possible. *Probate Code* §4733. In
19 the medical records, at 4:47:50, Dr. Nareddy's Physician's Orders changes from " Full
20 Resuscitation" to " DNAR Limited Measures." The "A" indicates not to even attempt
21 resuscitation. Thus, medical procedures were halted with orders for "allowing a natural
22 death." No further efforts were made to help her stay alive. Indeed, *a subsequent expert*
23 *witness review of the records concluded that it was reasonably probable that Dorothy would*
24 *have continued living had she been taken to intensive care.* Thus, in a very real sense
25 Sharon, Lee, Wayne, and Dr. Nareddy killed her.

26 41. *Probate Code* §4733 requires hospitals to comply with an individual's health care
27 instructions. *Probate Code* §4736 provides that where a hospital declines to comply with
28 health care instructions, it must inform the patient and immediately make efforts to transfer
the patient to another institution that is willing to comply, *and* provide continuing care to the

1 patient until the patient's transfer is complete. If it appears the transfer cannot be
2 accomplished in all cases appropriate pain relief and other palliative care shall be continued.
3 Probate Code §4742 contains penalties for intentionally concealing not following the health
4 care directive. Here, Dr. Nareddy dictated on 4/30/2013 at 16:46:27: "I discussed with the
5 patient's daughter as mentioned, Sharon (355-7070), and she mentions very clearly that
6 patient never wanted any intubation or chest compression so has been made DNR." The
7 time of this dictation demonstrates that Sharon communicated with the physician *prior to*
8 Dorothy's expiration, thereby demonstrating gross negligence/intentional conduct that would
9 certainly result in substantial harm.

10 42. *Probate Code* §4653 provides that nothing in this division shall be constructed to
11 condone, authorize, or approve mercy killing, assisted suicide, or euthanasia. This division is
12 not intended to permit any affirmative or deliberate act or omission to end life other than
13 withholding or withdrawing health care pursuant to an advance health care directive, by a
14 surrogate, or as otherwise provided, so as to permit the natural process of dying. See also
15 *Probate Code* §§4654, 4657, and 4658.

16 ALLEGATIONS SPECIFIC TO WAYNE THOMAS

17 43. Wayne Thomas signed and negotiated a service contract with Fairwinds on January
18 27, 2013, as the authorized representative for Dorothy. In the document, he negotiates a
19 level of care and/or service plan which was insufficient for the level of care Dorothy
20 required. He went with the most inexpensive plan possible.

21 44. Wayne Thomas concealed and/or deliberately withheld emergency contact
22 information from Fairwinds and omitted Dan and Alan's information.

23 45. Wayne Thomas, on April 30, 2013, at 6:40 p.m., before even notifying Dan and Alan
24 of her demise, decided to dispose of the corpse without an autopsy, effectively destroying
25 evidence of his and his sister's misdeeds.

26 ALLEGATIONS SPECIFIC TO LEE THOMAS

27 46. Lee Thomas was not reasonably available as Dorothy's caretaker as that term is given
28 meaning in the California Probate Code at §4635. Both times Dorothy was placed into an
ambulance on April 14, 2013, and April 29, 2013, and for transport to the hospital, Lee did

1 not provide her with any of her personal effects for the trip. He was not reasonably available
2 for her care. On April 14, 2013, Dorothy wanted to leave hospital and go home. But neither
3 she nor the hospital staff were able to reach the husband telephonically. He was not
4 reasonably available.

5 47. *Probate Code* §4743 provides that anyone who willfully takes those actions which are
6 counter to a lawful AHCD with regard to medical treatment and care which then results in
7 the hastening of death is liable for homicide. The AHCD at Fairwinds was willfully
8 concealed from St. Agnes by Sharon, Lee, and Wayne, and the physician Dr. Nareddy. A
9 healthcare provider or institution who fails to follow the directive or willfully conceals is
10 liable for actual damages and attorneys' fees. *Probate Code* §4742.

11 48. HIPPA papers including the authorizations to release medical records were concealed
12 from Alan and Dan Marcum by Lee, Wayne and Sharon so they had no ability to obtain any
13 health information. They did this deliberately to ensure that Alan or Dan did not have access
14 to information about Dorothy's health care information. Indeed after Dorothy's death, a
15 copy of her trust was provided to Alan and Dan Marcum, but the HIPPA medical record
16 release authorizations were deliberately removed from the document. *California Probate*
17 *Code* §4653 provides that a surrogate cannot withhold information so as to permit the natural
18 process of dying. The law says you cannot make a deliberate act/omission. It must say so in
19 other than in the AHCD. The AHCD must state her wishes to die. To this end, *Probate Code*
20 §§250-259, the so-called "slayer laws" are at issue here with respect to disinherit Lee and
21 his progeny.

22 49. *Probate Code* §4714 provides that a surrogate shall make healthcare decisions in
23 accordance with the patient's individual health care instructions. Also, *Probate Code* §4743
24 provides that any person who willfully conceals an AHCD with the intent of withholding or
25 withdrawing of health care necessary to keep the patient alive and hastened death is subject
26 to prosecution for unlawful homicide.

27 50. On 9/4/2013 Lee amended the trust removing Dan and Alan as successor trustees
28 removing Dan and Alan from the disability panel. And he also changed the determination of
incapacity of a trustmaker, removing the opinion of the attending physician. Dan and Wayne

1 are listed in the will of Dorothy Thomas as being co-personal representatives.

2 **First Cause of Action: Negligence Resulting in**
3 **Wrongful Death as Against Sharon Wimberley**

4 51. Plaintiff incorporates factual averments one through nineteen herein by reference.

5 52. The elements of a cause of action for wrongful death are a tort, such as negligence,
6 and resulting death. *Boeken v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.*, 48 Cal.4th 788, 806 (2010). The
7 elements of negligence are the existence of a legal duty of care, breach of that duty, and
8 proximate cause resulting in injury. *McIntyre v. Colonies-Pacific, LLC* 228 Cal.App.4th
9 664, 671 (2014).

10 53. Probate Code 4714 states Sharon Wimberley owed Dorothy Thomas a legal duty to
11 follow her POLST and Advanced Healthcare Directive that mandated full resuscitation, and
12 decisions in accordance with Dorothy's written care instructions. In other words, Sharon's
13 obligations encompassed a duty to follow the AHCD mandating full resuscitation. The
14 POLST mandated CPR, full treatment, trial period of artificial nutrition including feeding
15 tubes. She further owed a duty of due care to refrain from making unauthorized oral changes
16 to that directive or to take any action which could or would reasonably and proximately
17 result in the expiration of Dorothy. However, Sharon Wimberley breached this duty by
18 approaching Dr. Nareddy and informing him that Dorothy should not receive any lifesaving
19 treatment whatsoever. Sharon had never had any authorization to act on Dorothy's behalf.
20 Dr. Nareddy at Sharon's direction fails to provide life-saving treatment, which directly
21 caused in Dorothy's death.

22 **Second Cause of Action: Elder Abuse as Against Herbert Lee Thomas, Wayne Thomas,**
23 **St. Agnes Medical Center, Dr. Nareddy, Sharon Wimberley and Leisure Care LLC**

24 54. Plaintiff incorporates factual averments one through twenty-two herein by reference.

25 55. Dorothy Thomas was at all times an elder as that term is defined by California
26 *Welfare and Institutions Code* section 15610 *et seq.*

27 56. The defendants conduct alleged herein constitute abuse of an elder or a dependent
28 adult" as defined in *Welfare and Institutions Code* section 15610.07, which is defined as
physical abuse, neglect, fiduciary abuse, abandonment, isolation, abduction, or other
treatment with resulting physical harm or pain or mental suffering, or the deprivation by a

1 care custodian of goods or services necessary to avoid physical harm or mental suffering.
2 The Act defines neglect as “the negligent failure of any person having the care or custody of
3 an elder or a dependent adult to exercise that degree of care that a reasonable person in a like
4 position would exercise. *Carter v. Prime Healthcare Paradise Valley LLC*, (2011) 198 Cal.
5 App. 4th 396, 902. Neglect includes, but is not limited to, the failure to assist in personal
6 hygiene, or in the provision of food, clothing, or shelter, failure to provide medical care for
7 physical or mental health needs, failure to protect from safety and health hazards, and the
8 failure to prevent malnutrition and dehydration. Id.

9 57. With respect to defendant Lee, he had a consistent pattern of delaying and denying
10 treatment for Dorothy, as well as other factual averments previously alleged, which if true
11 would give rise to liability under the Elder Abuse Act.

12 58. With respect to defendant Wimberley, she changed Dorothy’s AHCD from full
13 resuscitation to do not resuscitate despite not having the authorization to do so, which lead to
14 Dorothy’s death. Dr. Nareddy is complicit in this change which resulted in the withholding
15 of necessary and appropriate medical treatment for Dorothy. St. Agnes Medical Center was
16 further complicit and participated in this tort by and through its failure or inability to require
17 its agents to follow protocol, or to even have the appropriate protocols or safeguards to guard
18 against this course of action which resulted in Dorothy’s death.

19 59. With respect to defendant Leisure Care LLC, it failed to report incidents of abuse. It
20 failed to provide Dorothy’s AHCD to caregivers. It allowed Wayne Thomas to select the
21 level of care for Dorothy despite the fact that Wayne was not a personal representative and
22 co-trustee/co-personal representative Dan Marcum was not appropriately consulted. Leisure
23 Care LLC failed to inform the correct personal representatives of Dorothy’s various health
24 issues. Leisure Care LLP took in a bed-ridden patient that it was not authorized to accept.
25 On information and belief, managing agents of Leisure Care LLC were aware of these
26 misdeeds. As a consequence, the Marcums were never informed of the improper and
27 lackluster care and treatment of their mother at the hands of the Thomases, and it was that
28 lackluster care and treatment which ultimately resulted in Dorothy’s demise. This is contra
to 22 CCR §87468(8)&(9), which provides that communications from family and

1 responsible persons should receive a prompt and appropriate response.

2 60. These defendants were guilty of recklessness, oppression, fraud and malice in the
3 commission of the abuse described above. Recklessness involves “deliberate disregard” of
4 the “high degree of probability that an injury will occur” and “rises to the level of a
5 conscious choice of a course of action...with knowledge of the serious danger to others
6 involved in it. *Carter v. Prime Healthcare*, (2011) 198 Cal. App. 4th 396, 405.

7 61. Under *Welfare and Institutions Code* section 15657(a), defendants are liable to
8 plaintiff for reasonable attorney fees and costs.

9 62. Under *Civil Code* section 3294, defendants are liable for punitive damages.

10 **Third Cause of Action: Financial Elder Abuse as Against Herbert Lee Thomas, Wayne**
11 **Thomas and Sharon Wimberley**

12 63. Plaintiff incorporates factual averments one through thirty-one herein by reference.

13 64. Dorothy Thomas was at all times an elder as that term is defined by California
14 *Welfare and Institutions Code* section 15610 *et seq.*

15 65. Dorothy Thomas was a beneficiary of the Herbert L. Thomas and Dorothy A. Thomas
16 Family Trust Dated October 25, 1990, which was amended in 2007 to allow for Dan
17 Marcum and Wayne Thomas to be joint personal representatives of Dorothy and Lee
18 Thomas.

19 66. Upon information and belief, Wayne Thomas profited individually in taking and
20 secreting money from the family trust by making unauthorized distributions of trust funds by
21 writing checks from trust monies without the approval of Dan Marcum. Further, he made
22 decisions about Dorothy’s care which were not in her best interest and which were not
23 ratified by co-trustee Dan. Instead those decisions were designed solely to enhance his and
24 Sharon’s inheritance to the detriment of Dorothy’s care and comfort. Lee is equally liable in
25 this regard for his pattern of denying Dorothy care and comfort and medical treatment for the
26 sole purpose of conserving her money in order to give it to his offspring from a prior union
27 an enhanced inheritance. For her part, Sharon secured the delivery of her inheritance at the
28 expense of Dorothy’s comfort and care by taking those actions necessary to end her life and

1 thus cause trust funds to be delivered forthwith to her.

2 67. Their conduct alleged herein constituted financial abuse under *Welfare and*
3 *Institutions Code* section 15657.5 as defined in *Welfare and Institutions Code* section
4 15610.30.

5 68. These defendants are guilty of recklessness, oppression, fraud and malice in the
6 commission of the abuse described above.

7 69. Under *Welfare and Institutions Code* section 15657.5(a), defendants are liable to
8 plaintiff for reasonable attorney fees and costs.

9 70. Under *Civil Code* section 3294, defendants are liable for punitive damages.

10 **Fourth Cause of Action: Civil Conspiracy As Against Herbert Lee Thomas Wayne**
11 **Thomas and Sharon Wimberley**

12 71. Plaintiff incorporates factual averments one through thirty-nine herein by reference.

13 72. The elements of an action for civil conspiracy are the formation and operation of the
14 conspiracy and damage resulting to plaintiff from an act or acts done in furtherance of the
15 common design. *Applied Equipment Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd.*, 7 Cal.4th 503,511
16 (1994).

17 73. Lee Thomas, Wayne Thomas, and Sharon Wimberley conspired together to facilitate
18 the death of Dorothy Thomas. As part of the conspiracy, Lee Thomas made himself
19 unavailable to receive phone calls from St. Agnes Hospital after Dorothy had been taken
20 there on 4/14/2013 and April 29, 2013 for shortness of breath. Sharon Wimberley acting in
21 concert with Wayne Thomas and Lee Thomas failed to follow Dorothy's AHCD and POLST
22 and changed Dorothy's instructions to do not resuscitate and withholding of therapies despite
23 the fact that Sharon is not authorized to do so. Then Wayne Thomas tried to conceal Lee's
24 culpability and any evidence of Sharon's misdeed by telephoning the hospital and attempting
25 to dispose of the evidence by ordering that no autopsy be performed on Dorothy's corpse.

26 74. The above-referenced acts are done in the furtherance of a common design and causes
27 plaintiff damage in the form of the death of his mother, Dorothy Thomas.

28 75. Lee Thomas, Wayne Thomas, and Sharon Wimberley withheld and concealed the

1 Fairwinds advanced care health directive from Dan and St. Agnes.

2 **Fifth Cause of Action: Negligence As against all Defendants Leisure Care LLC, St.**
3 **Agnes Medical Center, and Dr. Nareddy**

4 76. Plaintiff incorporates factual averments one through forty-three herein by reference.

5 77. The elements of negligence are the existence of a legal duty of care, breach of that
6 duty, and proximate cause resulting in injury. *McIntyre v. Colonies-Pacific, LLC* 228
7 Cal.App.4th 664, 671 (2014).

8 78. These defendants, and each of them, owed Dorothy Thomas a duty of care to refrain
9 doing such acts that would cause Dorothy harm. The health care defendants can and should
10 later be added in an amended pleading as to this cause of action if the pre-claim notice period
11 expires without any satisfactory resolution of the claims asserted in the pre-claim notice.

12 79. These defendants, and each of them, breached their duty of care by committing the
13 above-referenced acts that amounted to a failure to provide appropriate level of care to
14 Dorothy Thomas.

15 80. As a result of the defendants' breach, Dorothy Thomas suffered physical harm in
16 form of physical injuries and her eventual death.

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

- 19 1. For general damages according to proof;
- 20 2. For special damages and punitive damages according to proof;
- 21 3. For prejudgment interest as allowed by law;
- 22 4. For attorneys' fees;
- 23 5. For costs of suit;
- 24 6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

25 DATED: January 8, 2016

26 

27 Shafeeq Sadiq
28 Attorneys for Plaintiff Alan Marcum