

Problems at Planned Parenthood

Information for Protecting Our Health

Report of the Problems at Planned Parenthood Committee
PDF book version of the California pages of the constantly-updated website:

Problems at Planned Parenthood -
www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org



See next page for all the pages devoted to California health centers.

This report organizes problems with a chapter for each kind of problem. The website instead reports problems by individual centers or groups of centers.

Not copyrighted. Sharing of information and documentation is encouraged.

PDF version dated 09.09.25

Problems at Planned Parenthood

California Overview Page



CA - Los Angeles



CA cities & towns: A-F



CA - Sacramento



CA: G-R



CA - San Diego



CA: S-Z



CA - San Jose



California Overview:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california

California cities and towns, A-F:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

California cities and towns, G-R:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

California cities and towns, S-Z:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-s-to-z

Los Angeles:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Sacramento:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-sacramento

San Diego:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

San Jose:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-jose

Part 1

Medical Problems



Chapter 1



These include health department inspection reports, media coverage and other documents.

California investigates individual complaints but does not do full health inspections. Therefore, many of the health department documents contain nothing other than privacy complaints, which you can find on the website, listed under each center.



Incidents in health inspection reports that involved an ambulance to the hospital have the highlight explaining it marked with this graphic.

Multi-State



[Botched Care and Tired Staff: Planned Parenthood in Crisis](#)
by Katie Benner, *The New York Times*, February 15, 2025

Excerpt:

in many clinics, they also draw blood and take vital signs. Medical assistants in Ohio, Minnesota, Arizona, California, **New York**, Texas, Indiana and Illinois said they practiced blood draws and I.V. placements for an hour or so on a fake arm and then on a colleague before performing the procedures in clinics. But they said they sometimes ran into problems, and some said they did not know what to do when they arose.

Antioch

The health department document from 2016 can be found under Antioch at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

Highlights:

Staff

- Unlicensed and untrained staff were seeing patients and giving medical care.
- Employees were counseling patients, giving medical advice, examining patients, and obtaining informed consent even though they weren't qualified to do so.
- The staff member who performed vaginal ultrasounds was untrained and unqualified, with only a high school diploma with one medical assistant class. A transvaginal ultrasound is an invasive procedure.
- The medical director stated the only requirement in hiring an ultrasound technician was a high school diploma.
- The head of ultrasound training wasn't a certified ultrasound technician.
- According to the medical director, all 20 clinics she supervised employed untrained ultrasound technicians who were merely certified as medical assistants. The director stated she felt medical assistants were qualified to do ultrasounds but was unable to give an example of a health care facility, other than her clinics, where they were doing so.

Incident



A woman suffered a severe complication, and the clinic failed to cooperate with investigators as to the incident. Surveyors were turned away twice and not permitted to inspect the facility. Clinic staff refused to allow inspectors access to the patient records, refused to allow inspectors entry into the facility, and when they did allow investigators access to electronic records, refused to let them make copies or take notes.

The patient later began bleeding heavily and passed large clots, one of which was the size of a baseball. She passed out and went to the hospital. The patient later said, "I could have died." She needed surgery and a blood transfusion.

The nurse who gave the patient medications wasn't licensed to do so and failed to follow clinic protocol. She gave the patient three extra medications.

Burbank

The 2019 Court Complaint can be found under Burbank at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

7. . . . on October 9, 2018, Plaintiff's insured witnessed water flowing onto the premises from a toilet that had overflowed that was owned and controlled by Defendants, Planned Parenthood . . .

13. As a result of the negligence of Defendants and each of them, Plaintiff's insured sustained at least \$296,158.54 in damages.

Orange

The health department document from 2014 can be found under Orange at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

Highlights:



One patient suffered copious bleeding after surgery and was sent to the hospital to be treated for complications and blood loss. Staff failed to properly document the incident in their records.

- A second patient also bled heavily after surgery. She was sent home with active bleeding after passing a large blood clot. It was estimated from her hemoglobin level that she lost 720 ml of blood. The clinic failed to document the amount of blood loss in their records.

San Jose

Doctor's License Revoked – Joplin

Dr. Joplin served at Planned Parenthood, primarily at the San Jose Center, for many years and was working there at the time of his license revocation in 2011. The full license orders from 2011 and a previous one from 1997 can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-jose

Excerpt from the 2011 license document:

8. . . . it was alleged that Respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct in that he consumed alcohol to excess and to an extent he endangered himself and others, and that he had been criminally convicted on two separate occasions of offenses related to the use and consumption of alcohol . . . Respondent's license was revoked,

stayed, with seven years probation. The terms and conditions of probation . . . required him to abstain completely from the use of products or beverages containing alcohol, submit to biological fluid testing, undergo a psychiatric evaluation, participate in psychotherapy, have a practice monitor, and not engage in the sole practice of medicine . . .

9.A. . . . Respondent failed to comply with this term of his probation in that multiple bodily fluid tests resulted in a positive test result for the presence of alcohol.

Excerpt from the 1997 license document:

First Cause for Disciplinary Action

E. Y.G. had a normal prenatal course until on or about March 28, 1990 . . .

11.G. Despite elevated blood pressure, proteinuria and other findings on examination, respondent did not consider and/or did not chart the possibility of preeclampsia, did not consider and/or did not chart the potential for early induction of labor in Y.G. and did not conduct appropriate patient surveillance. . .

11.I. Four days later, on April 9, 1990, Y.G. presented to the Emergency Room at South Valley Hospital with complaints of severe acute low back pain. . . . Y.G. was diagnosed with toxemia. Emergent medical measures were taken. After delivering a viable male infant, Y.G. died on April 10, 1990.

12 . . . he is guilty of gross negligence and/or incompetence in the practice of his profession . . .

Second Cause for Disciplinary Action

13.B. On July 17, 1993, patient M.M. presented to respondent for examination at the Planned Parenthood Clinic in Seaside, California . . . Respondent recorded in the chart that the patient was 9 and ½ weeks pregnant. Respondent performed a pelvic examination at that time and recorded that the uterus was soft and felt approximately 11-12 weeks size . . .

13.C. On July 17, 1993, respondent undertook to perform an abortion . . .

13.D. Respondent ordered M.M. transferred to Natividad Medical Center, Where ultrasound demonstrated the fetus to be 27 weeks. Labor was induced and the female stillborn was taken for evaluation by the County Coroner.

13.E. At all relevant times, respondent knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that M.M.'s fetus was 27 weeks and viable.

14. . . . he is guilty of gross negligence and/or incompetence .

Thousand Oaks

The health department documents from 2014 and 2018 can be found under Thousand Oaks at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-s-to-z



An employee who was unfamiliar with the ultrasound machine mistakenly dated a patient's pregnancy. It was measured at 13 weeks when it was actually over 21 weeks. Prior to the procedure, the employee asked a nurse practitioner and the doctor to review the picture. Neither recognized it was incompatible with a pregnancy of 13 weeks. The doctor began surgery, but couldn't complete it, due to the advanced pregnancy. The woman was transferred to a hospital.

Ventura

The health department document from 2013 can be found under Ventura at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-s-to-z



A 23-year-old woman, after surgery, began to bleed heavily. The staff unsuccessfully administered medicine to stop the bleeding, then called 911. According to paramedics, the woman was "confused with slurred speech." Her blood pressure was dangerously low.

At the hospital, the woman was said to be in "severe distress" and "hemorrhagic shock." The woman was given a "massive transfusion" and taken into surgery. Surgeons found that the doctor had perforated her uterus. A hysterectomy was done, and the patient permanently lost her ability to have children at 23.

Though legally required to, the clinic failed to report the complication to the California Department of Health; it only came to light with an anonymous tip. Clinic staff claimed they were "unaware" complications needed to be reported, implying they never reported complications to the Department of Health

Chapter 2



This chapter does not include deaths, which are listed separately. We include only cases since 2000, and only those where details of the allegations are known.

We use the plaintiff's last name to distinguish the cases, but the plaintiff's full name and the name of individual defendants are redacted in the excerpts on our pages. They are of course available in the official court documents on the Problems at Planned Parenthood website (problemsatplannedparenthood.org).

Anaheim

Bible

The 2020 Malpractice Complaint be found under Anaheim at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

Excerpt:

14. On or about July 24, 2019, Plaintiff went to get a test done at Defendant Planned Parenthood for a possible sexually transmitted disease believing it was going to only be a blood or urine test.

15. However, the provider employed by Defendant . . . insisted that Plaintiff had to be given a manual pelvic exam.

16. Plaintiff's sister was prevented from going into the examination room with Plaintiff, though Plaintiff desired her presence.

17. Plaintiff told the provider that she did not want to have a manual pelvic exam, but Defendant . . . performed the exam anyway.

18. Plaintiff became very anxious and screamed telling Defendant . . ., "No!"

19. As a result of the forced manual pelvic exam, Plaintiff suffered emotional distress, anxiety and depression.

Costa Mesa

Fagan

The 2018 Malpractice can be found under Costa Mesa at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

Excerpt:

5. On March 30, 2015, Plaintiff presented for family planning services with Planned Parenthood at their office in Costa Mesa.

6. Planned Parenthood's doctor . . . implanted a Nexplanon birth control device in Plaintiff's left arm.

7. On February 15, 2017, Plaintiff presented for removal of the birth control device . . . Planned Parenthood's employee . . . was unable to remove the implant. Plaintiff decided to leave the implant in for the time being because it was effective at controlling her ability to get pregnant despite confronting her with numerous unpleasant side effects . . .

9. On August 14, 2017, Plaintiff against presented . . . for removal of the Nexplanon implant. [Defendant] was unable to remove it, however, because the implant rod palpated deep near Plaintiff's bicep muscle. Dr. [Defendant] indicated Plaintiff would need to present again for surgical removal.

10. On October 3, 2017, Plaintiff again presented with [Defendant] for removal of the implant.

11. While [Defendant] was able to successfully remove the device, it was clear that the implant was improperly inserted by Planned Parenthood in 2015. It was too close to her bicep muscle and not placed in an area of benign skin tissue; instead, it was placed in an area that caused severe nerve and muscle damage . . .

12. Because of the improper implantation of the Nexplanon device, Plaintiff suffers from permanent nerve damage and pain. Plaintiff is a yoga instructor and is unable to practice or teach yoga anymore because of the damage caused by the implant.

13. Plaintiff has lost mobility and will suffer the effects of the improper implantation for the rest of her life

El Cerrito

Trujillo

The 2018 Malpractice Complaint can be found under El Cerrito at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

Excerpt:

Plaintiff's complaint is based upon medical treatment that she received from defendants on January 26, 2017 . . . During that visit, plaintiff underwent an ultrasound and was told that she had an intrauterine pregnancy . . . As it turned out, however, plaintiff had an ectopic pregnancy, which required emergency surgery and hospitalization from January 30 to February 3, 2017 . . . She was then hospitalized again from February 4 to either the 8th or 11th.

Fresno

Crowder

The 2017 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Fresno – First Avenue at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

Excerpt:

6. On or about January 29, 2016, Plaintiff underwent a skin biopsy of her right ankle at Defendant Family First Health Center, a subsidiary of Defendant Planned Parenthood Mar Monte . . .

9. Shortly thereafter, Defendants provided Plaintiff with follow up treatment and antibiotics. Defendants told her any discomfort would resolve within a month or two.
10. By May 16, 2016, Plaintiff had developed a severe infection in the area of the biopsy and went to the emergency room at St. Agnes hospital.
11. At that time Plaintiff discovered she had developed a severe infection due to the negligent skin biopsy . . .
14. As a direct and proximate result of the professional negligence of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered severe pain and suffering, severe emotional distress, loss of physical and mental stamina and acuity, and employability.

Lupercio

The 2015 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Fresno at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

Excerpt - Description of Reason for Liability:

An intravaginal ultrasound was performed by defendant on plaintiff on 3/5/15. She was then informed that a viable pregnancy could be terminated by means of a chemical abortion on 3/6/15. However, the defendant failed to detect plaintiff's ectopic or tubal pregnancy which was or should have been apparent on the ultrasound and for which a chemical abortion was unsafe and contraindicated. This conduct fell below the standard of care for the community and constitutes negligence and medical malpractice directly causing plaintiff's serious personal injuries, including permanent removal of her left fallopian tube.

Glendora

Lewis

The 2018 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Glendora at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

Excerpt:

12. On . . . April 10, 2017, Plaintiff presented to Defendants . . . for consultation regarding a birth control device. During this consultation, Defendants recommended-implantation of the Nexplanon Birth Control Device but failed to fully disclose to Plaintiff all risks that were known, or should have been known, and which were associated with said device and procedure . . .

15. As a result of the implantation . . . Plaintiff 'suffered and will continue to suffer serious bodily injuries, including pain, discomfort, humiliation, scarring and disfigurement.

Long Beach

Castillo

The 2025 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Long Beach at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

Excerpt:

7. From at least May 2023, Plaintiff . . . sought a consultation for vasectomy from Planned Parenthood Los Angeles and its agents and employees.

8. On May 20, 2023, Plaintiff . . . underwent a vasectomy . . .

9. On March 25, 2024, Plaintiff . . . was diagnosed with epididymo-orchitis.

10. On July 22, 2024, Plaintiff . . . was required to undergo a Left Epididymectomy & Right Orchiectomy as a result of his diagnosis of epididymo-orchitis.

11. Defendant . . . so negligently failed to exercise the proper degree of knowledge and skill in examining, diagnosing, treating and caring for, Plaintiff . . . that he sustained severe and excruciating bilateral testicular pain, persistent and terrible physical pain, emotional pain and suffering, trauma, sickness, dread, fright, and shock. Additionally, he has incurred economic damages including, but not limited to medical expenses, loss of income, loss of future income, out of pocket expenses and non-economic damages, including excruciating physical and emotional pain, suffering, agony, stress, torment, fear, sleeplessness and devastation.

Los Angeles

Bennett

The 2022 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

6. Plaintiff had an intrauterine device (“IUD”) placed by Planned Parenthood Los Angeles as a form of temporary birth control in 2015 . . .

8. On January 26, 2021, Plaintiff went to Planned Parenthood Los Angeles to have the IUD removed so that she could become pregnant. Planned Parenthood Los Angeles was unable to remove the IUD from Plaintiff.

9. On January 28, 2021, Plaintiff again went to Planned Parenthood Los Angeles to have the IUD removed. Planned Parenthood Los Angeles was unable to remove the IUD from Plaintiff.

10. On February 15, 2021, Plaintiff underwent surgery under general anesthesia to remove the IUD at Cedars-Sinai Hospital. The surgery was unsuccessful. The IUD could not be removed. The IUD remains lodged inside Plaintiff against her will . . .

13. The irremovable, defective IUD has caused damage to Plaintiff in the form of bodily injury, infertility, and related emotional distress. Plaintiff has been forced to undergo costly and risky medical treatment as a result of the irremovable, defective IUD and will need to undergo further costly, risky medical treatment in the future.

Contreras

The 2005 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

9. On or about September 23, 2004 and thereafter, Plaintiff sought medical care for, including, but not limited to, terminating a pregnancy . . . and treatment for subsequent excessive bleeding, at Planned Parenthood.

10. Defendants punctured the Plaintiff's uterus and failed to remove the entire fetus; a blood clot the size of a baseball formed and Plaintiff experienced excessive bleeding . . .

11. As an actual and proximate result of the actions of Defendants . . . Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that she can no longer have children, among other damages.

Hernandez

The 2020 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

6. On March 19, 2019, Defendants, and each of them, negligently failed to exercise the degree of knowledge and skill proper in their service and/or profession, and so negligently and unskillfully performed and/or assisted during the care and treatment of Plaintiff while applying a subdermal implant inserted in Plaintiff's right arm for birth control . . .

8. As a direct and legal result of said Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff was hurt and injured in her health, strength and activities thereby sustaining injury to her body and shock and injury to her nervous system and person, thereby causing and continuing to cause her mental and physical pain and suffering and economic damage.

9. Plaintiff . . . alleges that her injuries have and will result in permanent injury and disability including, but not limited to, loss of function . . .

10. As a further legal result of Defendants' aforementioned wrongful acts, Plaintiff did and will continue to employ health care professionals to examine, treat, and care for her injuries as a result of this incident, thereby incurring medical and incidental expenses according to proof at the time of trial.

Landeros

The 2012 Malpractice Complaint can be found under the Bixby Center at

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

7. On February 9, 2011, Defendants administered anesthetics to Plaintiff during and abortion procedure, which was the direct cause of Plaintiff suffering brain damage due to the extended period of time in which the Plaintiff was deprived of oxygen.

Montenegro

The 2020 Malpractice Complaint can be found under the Hollywood Center at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

13. On or about August of 20, 18, [Plaintiff] went to PPC to receive medical care and treatment. Defendants and each of them through their employees and agents implanted in Plaintiff's body an intrauterine device ("IUD") device for purposes of birth control. The IUD device was improperly selected, chosen and/or placed in Plaintiff's body during said procedure. Defendants and each of them were negligent and careless in the selection, placement, management, control, and monitoring of said IUD in Plaintiff's body. Said IUD caused serious injuries and damages to Plaintiff's body and became difficult and dangerous to extract. Because of said Defendants negligent and wrongful actions, the Plaintiff unnecessarily suffered intense pain, discomfort, and other temporary and permanent damage to her body . . .

Thomas

The 2001 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

1. On or about August 18, 2000 . . . plaintiff . . . employed defendants . . . to perform a Dilation & Extraction procedure for Intrauterine Fetal Demise (IUFD) . . . At the time of the procedure, plaintiff sustained extensive blood loss as a result of a laceration of the cervix, a posterior tear of the uterus and a rectal-sigmoid tear. As a result of the injuries sustained, plaintiff required emergency transfer to Los Angeles County Hospital for removal of her uterus, blood transfusions and a colostomy. She will no longer be able to bear children.

Zepeda

The 2018 Malpractice Complaint can be found under the Taper Foundation Center at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

15. . . . As a direct and proximate consequence of the operation, Plaintiff began developing a series of debilitating and near fatal injuries — about 48 hours following the operation.

16. She was taken to the ICU of Holy Cross Medical Center where a successful attempt was made to resuscitate her. Her injuries were severe. She developed complications to her heart, kidneys, as well being diagnosed with septic shock, secondary to Strep group A (pyogenes) bacteremia, likely secondary with improper sterilization of surgical instruments used by Planned Parenthood, during the performance of the late term abortion. Said negligence caused a bacterial infection, which lead to multiple organ failure. Plaintiff was diagnosed with, but not limited to, pulmonary edema, acute kidney failure, acute hypoxic respiratory failure.

17. Despite Defendant's aforementioned knowledge and understanding of the variable and foreseeable risks for proceeding with such operation, Defendant disregarded Plaintiff's safety and proceeded to perform the surgical procedure, therefore causing the aforementioned sustained damages.

Oakland

Moreno

The 2005 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Oakland at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

Excerpt:

7. Prior to March 19, 2004, plaintiff employed defendants, and each of them, to give medical treatment and care to plaintiff and to decedent. Pursuant to this employment, defendants rendered professional services in the diagnosis, treatment and care of plaintiff, for her pregnancy, and decedent.
8. From and after the time of the employment, defendants, and each of them, so negligently failed to exercise the proper degree of knowledge and skill in examining, diagnosing, treating, and caring for plaintiff, that plaintiff was caused to suffer the unbearable pain of losing a child. The death of plaintiff's unborn child resulted in the injuries and damages to plaintiff herein alleged.

Orange

Johnson

The 2012 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Orange at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

Excerpt:

7. Plaintiff . . . engaged the services of defendants to . . . provide the removal of an old intrauterine device (“IUD”) and insertion of a new IUD to prevent pregnancy . . .
9. . . . Defendant . . . used . . . a device he represented he designed and caused to be built and used for removing the IUD . . . Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the device was defective and unsafe for its use and that it was not approved for use by any regulatory entity but employed without informed consent . . .
10. As a direct and proximate result . . . plaintiff . . . suffered a perforation and internal bleeding that was negligently not discovered by the defendants before authorizing her discharge . . .
23. At all times herein mentioned, defendants represented . . . that the instrument was safely designed, tested, approved for use by some regulatory authority including the Federal Food and Drug Administration . . .
24. Defendants knew . . . it did not meet US FDA requirements . . . Neither did the defendants inform plaintiff that a safer alternative was available to preserve her health and tissues.

Kim

The 2012 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Orange at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

8. That in the aforesaid examination and diagnosis of Plaintiff, the prescription of medicines and drugs, the providing of information relative to the medical abortion ultimately performed, the handling and control of the care and treatment of the Plaintiff, and the performance of a medical abortion procedure on or about March 24, 2011, and thereafter, and each of them, negligently failed to possess and to exercise that degree of knowledge and skill ordinarily possessed . . .

9. As a direct and proximate result . . . Plaintiff sustained severe and serious injury to her person . . .

10. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff has been required to employ the services of hospitals, physicians, surgeons, nurses and other professional services, Plaintiff has been compelled to incur expenses for ambulance service, medicines, x-rays, and other medical supplies and services . . .

Martinez

The 2019 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Orange at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

Excerpt:

15. Plaintiff was suffering from long, terrible periods and was told it could be cancer. A cervical biopsy was recommended.
16. A nurse practitioner . . . performed the cervical biopsy.
17. Plaintiff was told she would suffer discomfort for a few days, but that this was normal and would abate in a few days.
18. Plaintiff was told to take ibuprofen for pain, if necessary and was discharged.
19. That night, Plaintiff began to suffer severe pain in the left side of her groin.
20. Plaintiff went to the Emergency Department of St. Joseph's Hospital in Orange, California, where she was diagnosed with a perforated intestine and diverticulitis, likely requiring surgery.

Velasquez

Excerpt: Trellis Case Complaint Summary

Filing Date June 23, 2023 / Case Number CIVSB2313079

The plaintiffs allege that [redacted] were physicians and surgeons licensed to practice medicine in Orange and Los Angeles counties . . . The plaintiffs claim that on March 31, 2022, they employed the defendants to provide an abortion of their impaired fetus and to treat and care for them in regard to the procedure. They allege that the defendants negligently performed the medical services, resulting in injuries to [Plaintiff-], including incisions and lacerations to her vagina and uterus, excessive bleeding, and dismemberment of the fetus.

Pasadena

Chidinma

The 2023 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Pasadena at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r



Planned Parenthood Pasadena Sued Over Allegedly Wrong
'Common Constipation' Diagnosis
City News Service, *Pasadena Now*, August 22, 2023

Excerpt:

A former Planned Parenthood patient Monday sued the organization for medical malpractice, alleging she was incorrectly diagnosed with “common constipation” when she actually had serious issues that put her reproductive capability at risk . . . Chidinma went to Planned Parenthood in March 2022 for a wellness exam and told her provider that she was having abnormally heavy vaginal bleeding, headaches, hormonal imbalance and other related discomforts and abnormalities, according to her suit . . .

Chidinma additionally told informed the provider that she had bloating and a possible mass in her abdomen, but was denied an ultrasound and told she had “common constipation,” the suit states.

Chidinma argued that her condition was more serious and again requested the ultrasound and equivalent testing, but she was again turned down . . .

Chidinma’s symptoms persisted for several months and worsened, so she returned to Planned Parenthood in January and asked again for an ultrasound, finding out for the first time that the facility did not have ultrasound equipment, the suit alleges.

Chidinma was granted a request to be examined by someone else and it took less than a minute for the new provider to diagnose that the plaintiff’s uterus was sharply expanded and that masses were present that could have been found during the March 2022 Planned Parenthood office visit, the suit states.

Chidinma cried and contacted her insurance carrier from her car to obtain coverage from a different provider organization and she learned during her visit to the new facility that she had fibroids so large and advanced that her reproductive health was at risk and that non-surgical options she had in March 2022 were no longer available, the suit states.

Moulton

The 2017 Malpractice Complaint can be found under Pasadena at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

9. . . . on or about January 19, 2015, Plaintiff . . . underwent a procedure for the insertion of a Paragard T 380 Intrauterine device for birth control. Said medical procedure was performed in such a manner that fell below the applicable standard of care.

10. Such negligence has caused Plaintiff . . . to sustain what appears to be a life-long injury, thereby requiring medical intervention and the expenditure of monies in an attempt to somehow remedy the pain and suffering . . .

Sacramento

Vega

The 2018 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-sacramento

Excerpt:

15. On or about November 23,2017, Plaintiff went to the Defendant Planned Parenthood's facility in North Highland for a pelvic exam . . .
17. Defendant Doe No. 1 told Plaintiff that she had moved her IUD string and that her husband would be happy about it.
18. Plaintiff did not consent . . . to move the IUD . . .
19. In mid-March 2018, Plaintiff was informed that she was pregnant.
20. Plaintiff was informed that due to her recent bariatric surgery she would need an abortion.
21. On or about April 18,2018, Plaintiff underwent an abortion procedure.
22. At that time, Plaintiff was informed that her IUD was no longer in her cervix.
23. Plaintiff contends that when Defendant Doe No. 1 moved her IUD without her consent in November 2017, it rendered the IUD ineffective, causing her pregnancy and eventual abortion.
24. As a result of the negligence of Defendants, Plaintiff suffered injury, damage and loss.

San Bernardino

Gonzalez

The 2021 Malpractice Complaint can be found under San Bernardino at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-s-to-z

Excerpt:

11. Prior to the procedure she was asked if she wanted a contraceptive implant placed in her arm during the scheduled procedure, she specifically refused the offer of the contraceptive implant. However, when the plaintiff awoke, following the procedure, she became aware that the implant was placed in her arm, and when she requested that it be removed she was told that they could not remove it.
12. Subsequently, on or about April 20th, 2020, the Plaintiff was taken to St. Mary's Hospital by ambulance; her initial complaints were fever, abdominal pain, vomiting. And severe cramping. The Plaintiff was admitted into the hospital and required surgery in order to address a lacerated cervix, an infection, and to remove large amounts of fetal material.

13. Following the surgery the plaintiff was informed that the damage caused to her reproductive organs would most likely prevent her from having another child and that a hysterectomy may be necessary in the future.

Quinones

Excerpt:

11. On or about March 6, 2020, Plaintiff . . . consulted With and employed Defendants . . . to examine, diagnose, treat, and perform medical care, namely the insertion of a Nexplanon birth control implant . . .

13. Defendants . . . breached their respective duties to [Plaintiff] in improperly performing the insertion of a Nexplanon birth control implant within her left arm . . . by improperly inserting the device so that it injured [Plaintiff's] arm including but not limited to the nerve . . .

15. Plaintiff . . . felt immediate numbness, pain and discomfort, and was informed by [Defendant's] hotline on multiple occasions that the discomfort was normal and would subside. She was informed and believes and herein alleges she was advised her discomfort was normal. On April 5, 2020, and it would subside. [Defendants] . . . negligently failed to inform her the symptoms and pain were not normal and that she should seek medical care . . .

19. Defendants . . . breached their respective duties to [Plaintiff] in improperly performing the removal of a Nexplanon birth control implant from her left arm . . . The Plaintiff . . . alleges an x-ray was not used to locate the device prior to removal nor was she referred to a surgeon for the removal despite the continued complaints of pain and numbness since the Nexplanon insertion . . .

20. Specifically, in conjunction with and/or immediately after the Nexplanon removal [Plaintiff] felt an immediate electric type shock through her left extremity. Defendant . . . advised [Plaintiff] this sensation would diminish and heal on its own, and no referrals were made to a neurologist on her behalf . . .

29. Despite the representations and assurances from Defendants that the condition was normal and would heal on its own, sometime on or after August 11, 2021, Plaintiff . . . realized the condition of her left arm is chronic, potentially permanent . . .

San Diego

Alirezapoor

The 2023 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

Excerpt:

15. In May 2022, the lives of Alirezapoor and Bakhshi, husband and wife, took an unexpected turn when they discovered they were expecting a child. Eager to ensure the well-being of the pregnancy, they scheduled with an obstetric nurse . . .

17. On June 21, 2022, concerns arose following a Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing ("NIPT"), which indicated an 83% possibility of Down Syndrome. This prompted a referral to a genetic center for further assessment . . .

18. On July 12, 2022, the couple received a call . . . recommending to the couple an abortion before the 15th week and referring them to Planned Parenthood ("PP") . . .

22. Post-abortion complications arose, leading to persistent bleeding and an emergency room visit on August 13, 2022. An ultrasound revealed remaining tissues . . .

23. The couple faced challenges, including long waits in the ER and communication gaps. Ebrahimi performed a subsequent surgery on August 18, 2022, placing a balloon to control bleeding and administering blood transfusions.

24. Despite these efforts, bleeding persisted, leading to ongoing concerns about Alirezapoor's health. Follow-up visits with Ebrahimi, including an ultrasound on August 26, 2022, revealed the severity of the situation . . .

37. Defendants committed medical battery by damaging Plaintiff's internal organs, reproductive parts, without her authorization or informed consent.

38. Plaintiff did not consent to Defendants damaging her reproductive organs that caused her to be unable to carry a baby to term, which was done by Defendants without Plaintiff's necessary and legal consent.

Andersson

The 2013 court document can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

Description of Reason for Liability:

Plaintiff was a patient of both defendant's on March 21, 2012 when she presented for an abortion. Defendants failed to properly treat Plaintiff for her abortion at defendant's facility and failed to provide proper follow up care. Plaintiff had an ectopic pregnancy which defendant failed to diagnose and treat. As a result, plaintiff's left fallopian tube ruptured 10 days after having been seen and treated by defendants at defendants facility. Plaintiff had to undergo an emergency surgery to remove her ruptured tube and had to have a blood transfusion due to the blood loss she suffered. Plaintiff alleges that defendant's actions fell below the standard of care and resulted in her injuries.

Fakhoury

The 2007 court document can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

Excerpt:

7. At the date and time aforesaid, Defendants . . . failed to adequately and properly perform a surgical procedure on plaintiff by among other things, leaving foreign objects inside plaintiff's body.

Glover

The 2007 court document can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

Excerpt:

PPSDRC = Planned Parenthood of San Diego and Riverside Counties

10. Among other things, PPSDRC promises on its website, "We will tell you exactly what you need to do next about an abnormal Pap smear. "

11. Upon information and belief and thereupon alleged, PPSDRC has been cited by the State of California Department of Health for one or more deficiencies in its care and record-keeping within the last four years . . .

43. Defendants . . . informed Plaintiff that she had an abnormal Pap test and that additional medical procedures were needed to further diagnose . . . She was not told that she had cancer and/or that she ran the risk that her

condition could turn into cancer should she forgo or delay any recommended treatment. She also was not referred to any . . . medical professional for a second opinion and/or who was more qualified to diagnose and treat cervical cancer.

44. . . . Defendants . . . misdiagnosed Plaintiff as having "Mild Dysplasia" and/or HPV . . .

46. A notation in Plaintiff's medical records . . . state "cancer vs. HPV" and "growth on entire cervix extreme abnormal presentation." . . . [The doctor] herself noted, "sounds suspicious for higher grade lesion-entire (cervix) involved. " . . . it is noted in Plaintiff's medical chart., "CIN I in all 4 quads." . . .

50. Defendants have and continue to withhold all of Plaintiff's records from her and thereby there may be additional parties and/or dates of treatment or phone calls by which Plaintiff is unaware at this time due to Defendants' refusal to turn over all medical records to Plaintiff.

51. . . . Defendants assured Plaintiff again and again that she did not have cervical cancer.

65. . . . if Plaintiff died prior to realizing the negligence of Plaintiff, then she could not pursue any legal remedies against the Defendants and/or their negligence would never be discovered . . .

69. Among other things, by the time Plaintiff discovered the negligence and fraud of Defendants, it was determined that she had cervical cancer which, upon information and belief, could have been treated at its early stages, by less invasive procedures but, had progressed so far that certain medical treatment options were no longer available. Further, by the time Plaintiff discovered the negligence and/or fraud of the Defendants, and each of them, her cervical cancer had progressed all the way to Stage IIIB cervical cancer.

Piromari

The 2018 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

Excerpt:

11. On or around February 17, 2017, Defendants . . . negligently treated Plaintiff in the course of terminating her pregnancy causing injury which led to severe complications including hospitalization and ongoing care.

12. As a result of Defendants' professional negligence Plaintiff was admitted to the Emergency Department at UCSD Hospital on or around February 17, 2017.

Reyes

The 2012 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

Excerpt:

10. As a legal result of the conduct of the defendants . . . Plaintiff . . . has suffered ongoing and disabling injuries, requiring hospitalization, additional surgical procedures, and ongoing evaluation and treatment . . .

12. As a further legal result of the conduct of the defendants . . . Plaintiff . . . has incurred and will continue to incur medical, hospital, healthcare, and related expenses. . .

13. As a further legal result of the conduct of the defendants . . . Plaintiff . . . was injured in her health and physical ability permanently, thereby causing diminishment of her earning capacity . . .

Richter

The 2022 Malpractice Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

Excerpt:

11. On or about May 14, 2021, Defendant . . . negligently treated [Plaintiff] in the course of terminating her pregnancy, causing injury which led to severe complications including hospitalization and subsequent (and ongoing) medical care.

12. As a result of Defendants' professional negligence, Plaintiff was required to undergo emergency surgery . . . on or about August 11, 2021.

San Ramon

Liang

The 2012 Malpractice Complaint can be found under San Ramon at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-s-to-z

Excerpt:

13. In or around late 2011, Plaintiff experienced bleeding during her early pregnancy. On or around December 9, 2011, Plaintiff was seen by doctors at Defendant Planned Parenthood, Shasta Diablo, in the City of San Ramon. Upon consent of the Plaintiff, Plaintiff was given abortion pill to terminate her pregnancy of around eight (8) weeks. Plaintiff made follow-up office visits at Defendant Planned Parenthood on December 12, 2011 and had ultrasound and other medical examinations taken to confirm termination of her pregnancy. She was then requested to make another office visit on the date of December

15, 2011 when she was again examined to confirm termination of her pregnancy. During the office visit of December 15, 2011, she was given additional abortion pills to take to terminate her pregnancy. Shortly after . . . Plaintiff started to experience excessive bleeding.

16. To stop the excessive bleeding, she was transferred by ambulance to another medical facility . . . emergency room for treatment . . .

21. . . . Plaintiff experienced more and more bleeding, pain and even stronger odor which was intense and noticeable by anyone around her. She was terrified and went to Asian Health Services Medical Clinic . . .

22. Upon examination, Dr. Yang removed around three to four gauges or cotton balls left unremoved in her vaginal area and already turned hard and inseparable . . .

Chapter 3



We only report what can be documented by sources who are not Planned Parenthood opponents. Dispatch audio recordings and paper documents were received through official agencies and are available on the Problems at Planned Parenthood website.

California

Antioch: An incident involving an ambulance call is listed in a health inspection document under California – Antioch above in Chapter 1.

Orange

Audio of calls to dispatch an ambulance and/or written documents can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-g-to-r

February 22, 2013

May 9, 2013

January 16, 2021

February 13, 2021

April 5, 2024

May 31, 2024

An incident involving an ambulance call is listed in a health inspection document under California – Orange above in Chapter 1.

Thousand Oaks: An incident involving an ambulance call is listed in a health inspection document under California – Thousand Oaks above in Chapter 1.

Ventura: An incident involving an ambulance call is listed in a health inspection document under California – Ventura above in Chapter 1.

Walnut Creek

Audio of calls to dispatch an ambulance and/or written documents can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-s-to-z

May 14, 2019

September 25, 2020

May 14, 2021

May 21, 2021

July 23, 2021

Chapter 4



Contra Costa

Tran



Suit Links Death to ‘Abortion Pill’
By Jennifer Muir, *Orange County Register*, October 7th, 2005.

Excerpt:

The husband of a Fountain Valley woman who died after taking the so-called abortion pill RU-486 has sued the drug’s manufacturers and a local Planned Parenthood, accusing them of not warning her of the drug’s risks . . .

Tran died Dec. 29, 2003 – six days after beginning the drugs’ cycle. She was 22. An autopsy revealed evidence of sepsis, an illness caused by infection in the bloodstream, according to the complaint.

The Federal Drug Administration in July issued a public health advisory warning after four women in California, including Tran, died from sepsis after taking the drugs. The first U.S. death was reported in September 2003; a death in Canada was reported in 2001 . . .

Also named is Planned Parenthood of Orange and San Bernardino Counties . . . Tran, a former education student at Santa Ana College, received the drugs Dec. 23, 2003, at the Planned Parenthood in Costa Mesa . . . Had she known of the risks, she would not have taken the drug or would have gotten the medical attention necessary to save her life, the lawsuit said.

Hayward

Patterson



“Monty Patterson Learns about RU-486 the Hard Way”
By Julian Guthrie, *The San Francisco Chronicle*, December 5th, 2011.

Excerpt:

It was just after 9 a.m. on Sept. 17, 2003, when Monty Patterson got the call from the hospital. His daughter was in intensive care, and Patterson, a construction supervisor working on a home in the Oakland hills, was told to hurry. At ValleyCare Medical Center in Pleasanton, Patterson, a divorced dad, was informed that Holly, who had turned 18 three weeks earlier, had an infection from an “incomplete abortion.” The doctor said Holly had taken the abortion pill Sept. 10, and was in septic shock . . .

Efforts to save the vivacious teenager with the blond hair and bright blue eyes failed. She died shortly before 2 p.m.



“Monty Patterson Critical of Planned Parenthood After Daughter’s Death”
By Carly Schwartz, *Huffpost*, December 6th, 2011.

Excerpt:

On September 17, 2003, Monty Patterson rushed to ValleyCare Medical Center in Pleasanton, Calif., where his 18-year-old daughter, Holly, was suffering from septic shock brought on by a medical abortion. Five hours later, Holly was dead . . .

Holly had visited a Planned Parenthood center a week earlier seeking RU-486 — a medical abortion pill — but the center did not follow FDA guidelines when administering the medication. As a result, Holly died from a severe infection brought on by an incomplete abortion . . .

After extensive research, Patterson claimed that it was not only the medication that killed her, but also what he believes to be its improper application, as directed by the Planned Parenthood center that Holly visited. And according to Patterson, this practice is dangerously common. In his research, he claims to have uncovered other previously unreported deaths linked to the pill.

Los Angeles (Bixby)

Lopez



“Clinic Doctor Faulted in Abortion Death”

By Steve Hymon, Staff Writer, *Los Angeles Times*, June 25th, 2003.

A 25-year-old woman bled to death last year after a Planned Parenthood clinic in East Los Angeles neglected to follow established medical procedures during an abortion, according to a report by the state Department of Health Services. The report also found that the clinic failed to report Diana Lopez’s death within 24 hours, as required, and that a doctor working there did not follow clinic policies that would have excluded the woman as a candidate for the procedure. . .

Among the most serious allegations in the state report is that Maltzer violated clinic procedure because he went forward with the abortion even though Lopez’s hemoglobin levels were below the clinic’s standards. Low hemoglobin levels often lead to increased bleeding. The report also states that Maltzer did not follow the clinic’s standards in waiting until Lopez was sufficiently dilated before the procedure.

The clinic did not report Lopez’s death to the state until a week later, even though such notification is supposed to be done within 24 hours, the report said.

The report also found that Planned Parenthood’s patient records lacked basic information on Lopez’s care and condition . . .

Riverside

Goode

Court Document:

[CA Riverside Meloncon 2007 Complaint for Wrongful Death and Medical Malpractice filed by her mother](#)

Excerpt:

5. Despite the clearly demonstrated bacterial vaginosis infection, [the nurse] proceeded to place five seaweed stick cervical dilators through . . . Goode’s already infected vagina and into her cervix. Thus, the seaweed stick cervical dilators became like wicks that would take the existing local infection through the vagina into the cervix and turn the local vaginal infection into a raging systemic infection rapidly leading to sepsis and toxic shock syndrome of the entire body . . . the Riverside County Coroner determined that the cause of death was “toxic shock syndrome secondary to retained laminaria cervical dilators.”



[Abortion procedure caused death of Riverside woman, lawsuit alleges](#)

by Jonathan Abrams, *The Los Angeles Times*, June 21, 2017

Excerpt:

The mother of a Riverside woman who died of toxic shock syndrome after allegedly undergoing an abortion procedure at Planned Parenthood filed a malpractice suit against the organization and a Riverside County hospital this week. The lawsuit alleges that . . . a nurse inserted cervical dilators, used to gradually expand the cervix in preparation for second-trimester abortions, despite the fact that Goode had a vaginal infection.

The dilators, which are shaped like small sticks and consist primarily of seaweed, became a conduit that spread the infection to the rest of her body, the lawsuit alleges.



[Mother blames Riverside abortion procedure for daughter's death](#)

Orange Register, June 25, 2007

Excerpt:

“My daughter made a choice, but she didn’t choose to die,” Meloncon [her mother] said. “A lost dog gets more attention than my daughter did. This has really torn at my family.”

Planned Parenthood mailed two letters to Goode stating the dilators needed to be taken out, but Meloncon said the family never received the letters. The woman said Planned Parenthood should have been more aggressive in contacting her daughter . . .

With her condition deteriorating, Goode was taken to Riverside County Regional Medical Center in Moreno Valley on Feb. 4. A blood test confirmed Goode was pregnant, and Meloncon said she asked that a pelvic examination be performed. But the hospital said it couldn’t perform one because Goode would not consent, the suit said.

“She was confused and disorientated,” Meloncon said. “It was totally out of character for what her behavior normally is.”

The hospital performed a pelvic examination Feb. 13 and found the dilators. Goode had a miscarriage that day and died the next, the lawsuit said.

Part 2: Non-Medical Problems



Chapter 5



Cases cited here are in two categories:

- Non-reporting of Cases of Abuse of Minors (which allowed the abuse to continue)
- Sexual Harassment (of patients, or of staff by the doctor)

California

Affiliate: Mar Monte



A former employee sues Planned Parenthood, alleging retaliation for speaking up about harassment
by Mary Duan, *Monterey County Weekly*, October 31, 2019

Excerpt:

The woman once responsible for cultivating donors and bringing in major cash contributions to the largest Planned Parenthood affiliate in the country has sued her former employer, alleging the organization mishandled a sexual harassment and assault claim brought by another employee, then fired her when she repeatedly expressed her concerns about it.

Elizabeth Winchester says she was fired in late 2018 from the job she held at Planned Parenthood Mar Monte after she twice complained to her supervisor and CEO Stacy Cross about how they were handling the harassment and assault complaint. In her suit, filed Oct. 10 in Monterey County Superior Court, Winchester says Planned Parenthood issued her a “final written warning for alleged professional misconduct” after her second complaint, which she made on Oct. 24, 2018, and that her subsequent firing was in retaliation.

Fresno



‘Nowhere is safe.’ Women accuse ex-Planned Parenthood official of sexual harassment.
by Mackenzie Mays, *Fresno Bee*, October 12, 2018

Excerpt:

For years, Pedro Elias was the face of Fresno’s branch of Planned Parenthood. At news conferences and events, as the director of public affairs, he stood out in a sea of women advocating for reproductive rights: A muscular man often wearing a bright pink Planned Parenthood T-shirt.

But when his employment ended in September after working for the organization since 2000, his colleagues came forward to surmise why.

“He flaunted his advocacy for women while sexually harassing and assaulting multiple women for years,” said Sarah Hutchinson, policy director for ACT for Women and Girls in Visalia.

Los Angeles

Lenihan

	<p>Diocese Pays \$1.2 Million In Sex Lawsuit by Greg Winter, <i>The New York Times</i>, April 2, 2002</p>
---	---

Excerpt:

A California woman who accused a priest of sexually abusing her and then paying for an abortion when she was a teenager will receive \$1.2 million to settle her suit against the Roman Catholic Church, the two sides said yesterday.

The woman . . . said that in 1978, when she was 14, the priest . . . began a pattern of abuse that lasted throughout much of her adolescence. The contact began with fondling and kissing, she said, culminating in her pregnancy at 16.

"When I told him about the pregnancy, he told me that I had to get an abortion . . . Father John drove me to his bank, withdrew the money and gave it to me to pay for the abortion. Father John did not go with me to Planned Parenthood. I remember how alone and scared I felt."

Note: Though the successful lawsuit was against the church, Planned Parenthood also allowed the abuse to continue since they apparently never reported; if they had, the abuse would have stopped earlier.

Ramirez

The Appeals Court Document. Response of prosecutors when defendant appealed aspects of the verdict, can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

. . . The undisputed evidence in this case established beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant continued to have sexual intercourse with his 13-year-old Daughter . . .

BACKGROUND

. . . In July of 2010, K.R. [the daughter] had an abortion at a Planned Parenthood clinic. She did not tell the clinic staff that defendant had impregnated her, but instead made up a story about having a boyfriend her own age. The doctor told her not to have sex for three weeks after her abortion. Although she relayed this information to defendant, he resumed having sex with her a “couple of days later.”

By December of 2010, defendant had again impregnated K.R. and she returned to Planned Parenthood for another abortion. The physician who performed the second abortion testified that K.R. was approximately six weeks pregnant. After the abortion, he implanted an intrauterine device to prevent additional pregnancies.

K.R. testified that she did not have sex with anyone other than defendant during the time she lived with him.

Defendant was arrested on or before March 16, 2011, after J.R.[K.R.’s older sister] reported his conduct toward her to the police.

Ramos

The 2020 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Sexual Harassment (Government Code § 12955(a), (d)))

43. The hostility and harassment that Plaintiff suffered included the following:

a. On many instances, Defendant . . . would pass by Plaintiff’s workspace and ask her unwanted and inappropriate questions.

b. On several instances, Defendant . . . attempted to and/or did take photographs of Plaintiff as Plaintiff was sitting/working at her desk, without her knowledge and/or consent . . .

46. As a proximate result of Defendants’ willful, knowing, and intentional sexual harassment of Plaintiff, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer humiliation, emotional distress, and mental and physical pain and anguish, all to her damage in a sum according to proof.

47. Defendants’ sexual harassment was done intentionally, in a malicious, oppressive, fraudulent manner, entitling Plaintiff to punitive damages.

Sacramento

Martin-Santana

	<p>Medical assistant at Planned Parenthood faces sex charge by Michelle Schultz, NBC KCRA Channel 3, December 4, 2013</p>
---	---

	<p>Parenthood Employee Accused Of Sexual Battery Against Patient December 4, CBS Sacramento Channel 13, 2013</p>
---	--

San Francisco

Cross

The court document, People of California v. Cross, Appeal Opinion, is no longer online.

Excerpt:

Evidence at Trial

. . . K. testified that when she was 13 years old . . . appellant had her lie on his bed, took off her clothes, and had sexual intercourse with her. Appellant told K. not to tell her mother what had happened or K. would be sent to a foster home.

Over the next several weeks, appellant had sexual intercourse with K. once or twice a week when her mother was away at work. K. testified that occasionally she would pretend she was asleep, but that sometimes appellant would then get angry and punish her by taking away her cell phone or telling her that she could not see her friends. Appellant put his penis in her mouth three or four times. K. said that she did not tell her mother about any of this because she believed she would be taken away from her mother if she did.

K. told appellant that she had missed her menstrual period and he took her to Planned Parenthood where a pregnancy test confirmed that she was pregnant. K. testified that appellant told her that she "had to get an abortion."

On December 17, 2002, appellant drove K. to San Francisco General Hospital for an abortion . . . K. testified that she did not tell her mother about the abortion because she "didn't want her to have the police take me away or want her to hate me." . . .

One night, appellant's wife (Wife) caught appellant naked in bed with K. K.'s mother picked up the phone to call the police but appellant and K. convinced her that they were not having sex. About two weeks later, Wife found some old papers related to the abortion. When she confronted K., K. admitted that she had been pregnant and had had an abortion. Wife testified that K. said that appellant had told her not to tell because she would be taken away from her mother.

Chapter 6



Affiliate: California – Mar Monte

Mendoza

The 2018 Class Action Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-jose

2. This Complaint challenges systemic illegal employment practices resulting in violations of the California Labor Code against employees of Defendants.

3. . . . Defendants . . . have acted intentionally and with deliberate indifference and conscious disregard to the rights of all employees by failing to pay proper minimum, regular and overtime wages, failing to provide rest breaks, failing to provide accurate itemized age statements, and failing to timely pay wages to terminated employees.

San Jose

Noye

The 2019 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-jose

CA Mar Monte Noye 2019 Labor

7. Plaintiff, . . . an African-American female, over age 45, was hired by Defendant . . . in 2008. Plaintiff was a dedicated, hardworking employee that provided over 10 years of service . . .

8. In or about June 2018, Plaintiff began to raise complaints about unethical hiring practices, ageism and discrimination that was taking place . . . Once the complaints were lodged, Plaintiff's work environment became hostile.

9. The hostile work environment included but was not limited to the forgoing: Plaintiff's supervisors began to disproportionately micro-manage her work; Plaintiff was singled out for criticism by her supervisors; Plaintiff was disparately monitored by her supervisors; and Plaintiff's ability to perform her day to day work functions was substantially hindered.

10. On or about September 25, 2018, Plaintiff again reported her concerns about unethical hiring practices, ageism and discrimination, as well as her concerns that she believed that she was being retaliated against at Planned Parenthood Mar Monte, Inc. for Whistleblowing.

11. The very next day after Plaintiff raised her legitimate complaints, she was terminated.

Chula Vista

Murray

The 2014 Complaint can be found under Chula Vista at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-f

Excerpt:

14. In or about the late summer or early fall of 2012, [Plaintiff complained to [Defendant] that the Chula Vista clinic was in violation of the law because Mendoza was directing non-licensed Clinicians to access the locked medication cabinet and dispense medication to patients . . .

15. [Defendant] began to retaliate against Plaintiff . . .

25. Despite Planned Parenthood's mission as alleged, the Chula Vista clinic manager (a non-licensed staff member), authorized the injection of birth control to a minor patient, against the will of the minor and absent an order by a licensed medical provider. This unauthorized administration of medication without a license was, and is, a violation of California law . . .

35. On or about March 30, 2013, [Plaintiff] was terminated. In its termination letter, Planned Parenthood indicated that [Plaintiff] was terminated because her performance was "below expectations."

36. A short time later, Planned Parenthood reported to the California Employment Development Department that Plaintiff was terminated because after she reported the March 8th incident, Plaintiff "refused to move on."

37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that she was terminated because she reported her supervisor's unlawful administration of medication without a license.

Coachella

Barron

The 2012 Complaint can be found under Chula Vista at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-f

Excerpt:

7. Plaintiff began working for defendants in or about 1987 . . .

11. In or about February 2012, plaintiff notified defendants' human resources department that plaintiff's physician, who had been treating plaintiff for a shoulder condition, restricted the distance plaintiff could drive . . . Despite the fact plaintiff had in the past successfully performed her job duties on a remote/telecommuting basis while

working in Riverside County, defendant's human resources department informed plaintiff defendant would not be able to accommodate plaintiff's driving restrictions and would not permit her to work remotely or on a telecommuting basis. Defendant told plaintiff the only accommodation it would provide plaintiff was a leave of absence . . . Plaintiff provided the required medical certification from her physician with defendant's approving the leave of absence on or about March 19, 2012, and designating the leave of absence as a leave taken under the California Family Rights Act (CFRA) set forth in Government Code § 12945.2 . . .

18. On or about March 20, 2012, while plaintiff was still on her CFRA leave which was set to expire on May 15, 2012, defendant terminated plaintiff thus refusing to reinstate her to her previous or comparable position upon expiration of her leave of absence under CFRA . . .

35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, her physical disability was a motivating factor in defendant's decision to terminate her employment . . .

Fresno

Aoki

The 2015 Complaint can be found under Fresno at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-fresno

Note: The complaint details several incidents in detail.

8. In or around August 2012, Ms. Aoki was hired by Planned Parenthood as a Response Center Agent in Clovis, California . . .

9. Throughout Ms. Aoki's employment with Planned Parenthood, [E.R.] was head of the Planned Parenthood Response Center . . . From the beginning of Ms. Aoki's employment with Planned Parenthood, Ms. Aoki regularly hear Planned Parenthood employees complain about [E.R.] because he yelled at employees, retaliated against employees who complained about him, and made disparaging remarks toward female employees . . .

18. Ms. Aoki understood [E.R.]'s regular reference to female employees as his "bitches" as sexual harassment . . .

21. . . When Ms. Aoki encouraged the female coworkers to report [E.R.]'s sexist comments, the female coworkers told Ms. Aoki that [E.R.] had a close relationship with Human Resources and that nothing could be done to stop [E.R.]'s behavior . . .

32. After [E.R.] closed the door to his office, Ms. Aoki saw that he was visibly furious. [E.R.]'s hands were shaking and he was red in the face. Ms. Aoki was scared that [E.R.] was going to react violently to any complaints . . .

4]. Ms. Aoki was terrified and on the verge of tears. Her supervisor had gotten in her face, nearly hit her, and screamed at her and all the other template specialists in an enraged and demeaning tone. After thinking about all of [E.R.]'s sexist comments as

detailed above, Ms. Aoki feared [E.R.]’s repeated harassment and that he might physically assault her . . .

56. Between January 31, 2017 and February 2, 2017, Ms. Aoki heard from at least two co-workers that [E.R.] was showing Ms. Aoki’s resignation letter to other employees. [E.R.] also told employees that [two supervisors] told him that he “did not have anything to worry about.” [E.R.] was bragging about the fact that Planned Parenthood managers had ratified his harassing and retaliatory behavior.

61. To this day, Ms. Aoki has never received any information from Planned Parenthood about the results of this investigation or any investigation that Planned Parenthood made as a result of her Ms. Aoki’s complaints about [E.R.]’s sexual harassment and retaliation.

Los Angeles

Abutaleb

The 2022 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

26. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to clock in at the beginning of their shifts and out at the end of their shifts by calling Defendants on their personal cell phones. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not paid for all hours worked because employees were required to work off the clock and because Defendants unlawfully rounded the hours worked . . .

27. . . . Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock without proper compensation including . . . attending pre-shift and post-shift activities, COVID-19 related screenings, and cellular phone use outside of scheduled shifts. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to attend a firearms training, but were not compensated for the hours spent at said training.

28. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to call Defendants on a day they were scheduled to work or a day before in order to be informed of their exact hours. However, due to the uncertainty of which schedule they would be assigned for the following day, they were forced to remain available the entirety of the following day. Plaintiff and . . . the Aggrieved Employees, were not compensated for on-call or standby time.

29. In addition, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of eight (8) hours in day and/or over forty (40) hours in a workweek. However, they were not properly paid for such time . . .

36. . . . Plaintiff and the Non-Exempt Employees were systematically not authorized and permitted to take one net ten-minute paid, rest period for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof, which is a violation of the Labor Code and IWC wage order . . .

42. Defendants also failed to provide accurate, lawful itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in part because of the above specified violations . . .

Barton

Excerpt, Trellis Case Complaint Summary

Filing Date June 24, 2024 / Case #24STCV15716 / Matter Type Wrongful Termination

This complaint filed by [Plaintiff] against Planned Parenthood Los Angeles and others alleges retaliation in violation of California Labor Code sections 1102.5 and 98.6, as well as wrongful termination in violation of public policy. The complaint outlines that [Plaintiff], a Behavioral Health Therapist, reported violations of laws to Planned Parenthood, including issues with patient privacy, lack of tele-health compliance, and unpaid work hours. In response to her complaints, she was accused of fraudulent timekeeping and subsequently terminated, despite being required to work off the clock to fulfill job responsibilities. The complaint seeks damages for lost earnings, emotional distress, and statutory damages not exceeding \$10,000 per violation of Labor Code § 1102.5.

Additionally, the complaint asserts that the termination and adverse actions taken against [Plaintiff] were in violation of California public policy as outlined in the Labor Code. It details the adverse employment actions, lack of accommodation, and failure to engage in good faith interactions with the plaintiff.

Ceniceros

The 2015 Class Action Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have failed to pay her and all other similarly situated individuals for all vested vacation pay, failed to provide them with meal periods, failed to provide them with rest periods, failed to pay premium wages for unprovided meal and/or rest periods. . . failed to pay overtime wages, failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements, and failed to timely pay them all of their final wages following separation of employment. Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class and representative action to recover unpaid wages, restitution, and related relief on behalf of herself, all others similarly situation, and the general public.

Cristobal

The 2015 Class Action Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

12. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants . . . rather than paying Plaintiff "one additional hour of pay" as required by Section 226.7, Defendants only paid these meal period premium payments in increments of one half of one hour.

13. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants regularly, systematically, and impermissibly rounded the hours worked by their non-exempt employees in Defendants' favor, over a period of time, in the failure to properly compensate them, including Plaintiff, for all hours worked, therefore depriving them of all required minimum and additional overtime wages earned.

14. As a result . . . Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Plaintiff Defendants also issues inaccurate wage statements because they failed to list the name of the legal entity that was the actual employee of Plaintiff and putative class in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(8)

Dawson

The 2017 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

16. Plaintiff Dawson . . . came to PPLA in July 2013 with some 30 years of sophisticated fundraising experience . . . By all legitimate measures he had a good record of success with his work at PPLA . . .

17. Plaintiff was targeted for retaliation in early 2016 by his supervisor, [B.B.], specifically because he had expressed dissatisfaction with the work being performed by a direct-mail vendor to PPLA . . . owned and operated by [B.B.]'s husband . . .

20. At the beginning of 2016, the problems became more serious . . . With his manager also on the phone, Plaintiff attempted to discern what the problems were, but could not seem to get straight answers . . .

21. Retribution began the very next day . . .

26. Plaintiff's employment was terminated on June 20, 2016 . . . after which he packed his personal belongings, overseen by security, then was escorted from the building by security . . .

Gonzalez

The 2023 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

1. This is a wage and hour class action lawsuit on behalf of Plaintiff and other current and former non-exempt employees . . .

- (a) failure to pay wages for all hours worked at minimum wage;
- (b) failure to pay overtime wages for all overtime hours worked;
- (c) failure to pay overtime at the proper overtime rate by failing to include all remuneration in calculating the regular rate of pay for purposes of paying overtime;
- (d) failure to authorize or permit all legally required and compliant meal periods and/or pay meal period premium wages;
- (e) failure to authorize or permit all legally required and compliant rest periods and/or pay rest period premium wages;
- (f) failure to pay accrued and vested vacation/PTO wages;
- (g) failure to pay sick pay at the proper regular rate;
- (h) failure to indemnify all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties;
- (i) statutory penalties for failure to timely pay earned wages during employment;
- (j) statutory waiting time penalties in the form of continuation wages for failure to timely pay employees all wages due upon separation of employment; and
- (k) statutory penalties for failure to provide accurate wage statements.

Pereira

The 2020 Complaint for disability discrimination can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

16. . . .

a) On or about June 29, 2018, while at work, Plaintiff suffered severe injuries to her right knee, including multiple lacerations and a torn meniscus, after a faulty metal file cabinet fell onto her. As witnessed by many of Plaintiff's coworkers . . . Plaintiff bled profusely and was immediately rushed to the hospital where she received stitches and related care.

b) As a result of her condition, Plaintiff notified Human Resources Director . . . of her need to take several days of protected medical leave.

c) Upon Plaintiff's return to work . . . Plaintiff duly communicated her restrictions and/or need for accommodations to Defendant Planned Parenthood, including the need to elevate her leg, among the other accommodations . . .

d) Moreover, Plaintiff contacted Human Resources Manager . . . and requested a parking space closer to her work area due to the severe pain and swelling she was experiencing.

e) Additionally . . . Plaintiff underwent surgery as a result of said injuries, after which time she was placed on a medical leave of absence through approximately July 8, 2019. At all times relevant herein, Defendant Planned Parenthood had notice of Plaintiff's need for protected medical leave.

f) At the completion of her aforesaid medical leave of absence, in hopes of returning to work, Plaintiff submitted medical documentation to Defendant Planned Parenthood identifying her restrictions, including no kneeling, squatting, or lifting over ten pounds . . .

18. However, on a severe and/or pervasive basis continuing at least through the time of Plaintiff's wrongful termination on or about September 19, 2019, and continuing, Defendant . . . harassed Plaintiff and created and maintained a hostile work environment . . .

c) In further harassment, rather than accommodate Plaintiff's request for a closer parking space due to the severe pain and swelling she was experiencing, Defendant Planned Parenthood instead offered the parking spaces to non-disabled employees in upper Management . . .

Ramos

The 2020 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

17. In or about March of 2019, Plaintiff began experiencing back pain from sitting down over long periods of time. Plaintiff spoke to Defendant [D] about her back pain and requested a standing desk to help alleviate her pain. Defendant [D] informed Plaintiff that Plaintiff cannot receive the standing desk accommodation because Defendant PPLA was "on a budget." Following this interaction, Plaintiff reported her worsening back pain to Defendant [D] on multiple occasions.

18. On or around April 2, 2019, Plaintiff exchanged emails with Defendant PPLA's employee . . . regarding Plaintiff's request for a standing desk. [She] told Plaintiff that she was placed on a "queue" for a workstation evaluation. However, Plaintiff's workstation was never evaluated and Plaintiff never received her standing workstation accommodation from Defendants.

19. On or about, April 10, 2019, Plaintiff informed Defendants that she was pregnant. After learning about Plaintiff's pregnancy, both Defendant[s] . . . began treating Plaintiff differently in the workplace . . .

25. On or about January 23, 2020, Plaintiff visited Defendants' office with her newborn baby to show her newborn baby to her friends and co-workers. As soon as she arrived, Defendants escorted Plaintiff and her baby off the premises and instructed her not to return.

26. Based on Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff believes and alleges that she her employment was constructively terminated, if not actually terminated . . .

31. During the course of Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed to prevent their employees from engaging in intentional actions that resulted in Plaintiff's being treated less favorably because of Plaintiff's protected status (*i.e.*, her disability and sex). During the course of Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed to prevent their employees from engaging in unjustified employment practices against employees in such protected classes. During the course of Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed to prevent a pattern and practice by their employees of intentional discrimination, retaliation, and harassment on the basis of disability, sex, and/or protected status or protected activities.

Rivera

The 2020 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

10. Plaintiff was hired by Defendant on or about December 2016 as a Surgical Registered Nurse . . .

12. On or about 10/2018, and continuing, Plaintiff sustained and/or aggravated and/or developed perceived physical disabilities, including but not limited to a wrist injury and associated condition . . .

14. Plaintiff was placed on work restriction from 10/2018 through 04/2019;

15. Plaintiff requested and/or was granted a leave of absence on or about 04/2019 to have a wrist surgery.

16. In and around 07/2019, Plaintiff was released back to work and was placed on work restrictions and/or modified duties.

17. Plaintiff notified Defendant, and each of them, of Plaintiff's work restrictions.

18. On or about 06/2019, Defendant, and each of them, now discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff by refusing to engage in a good faith interactive process, refusing to provide a reasonable accommodation and refusing to allow her to return to work.

19. On or about 07/2019, Plaintiff spoke with Defendant*s Human Resources Department and was informed her employment was terminated.

Sherf

The 2015 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

7. Plaintiff was hired by Defendants in or about April 2013 as a Physician's Assistant. At all times herein mentioned, Sherf was qualified for and was able to perform her essential duties as Physician Assistant.

8. In or about September 2013, Plaintiff was taken off work by her doctor to undergo surgery on her kidney. Plaintiff's doctor took her of work for six to eight weeks. Plaintiff was released to go back to work in November 2013. In response to Plaintiff's

request for time off to undergo kidney surgery, Defendants terminated her employment effective September 12, 2013.

Wallace

The 2013 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

6. Defendant PPLA hired Plaintiff in approximately March 2012 . . . as a Senior Accountant . . .

8. In approximately 2013, Defendant PPLA underwent a change in management whereby it sought to employ employees much younger than Plaintiff in its accounting department . . .

9. On or about March 26, 2013, PPLA falsely accused Plaintiff of defacing the outside of a window of its office building with sexually graphic graffiti the previous day . . . and thereby sexually harassing the employee who used the affected office . . . PPLA produced a security camera video showing Plaintiff walking on the sidewalk outside the building in the general vicinity of said wall, during her daily morning break . . . However, that is all the video showed. Plaintiff was not carrying a spray can nor did her arm gestures at any time suggest that she was engaged in graffiti . . .

10. The security camera footage showed numerous other Planned Parenthood employees, as well as other unknown individuals, walking by the subject window . . .

12. Despite the complete lack of evidence implicating Ms. Wallace, nor any reason at all to suspect her of such conduct, PPLA terminated Plaintiff immediately without any further investigation. This was also despite . . . the utter absurdity of the idea that a 53-year-old female accountant, working for a non-profit organization devoted to women's health care, who had no conflicts whatsoever with PPLA nor any other members of the staff, and who barely even knew the woman who used the affected office . . . would deface the building where she worked with a drawing of a penis, in broad daylight no less . . .

13. Notably, PPLA's abrupt notice of termination was given on Plaintiff's one-year anniversary of employment with PPLA, when she was due to become vested in the organization's 403(b) retirement plan . . .

Wang

The 2016 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-a-to-f

1. In or around January 2015, Planned Parenthood hired Plaintiff as a Clinician. From the beginning . . . [R.M], a Medical Assistant . . . together with [E.H.], manager of the same office, engaged in a discriminatory campaign against Plaintiff solely on the basis of her color, race, ethnicity, and national origin (Asian/Chinese) as well as a known disability. Not only was Plaintiff forced to endure substantially unfavorable

working conditions in comparison to the super-majority of Hispanic, Spanish-speaking employees, Plaintiff was terminated from her employment for complaining of such Labor Code violations . . .

25. . . . Plaintiff . . . complained . . . regarding Planned Parenthood’s failure and refusal to offer her the statutorily required meal periods and rest breaks . . . In so complaining, Plaintiff advised Planned Parenthood of her pre-diabetic condition/disability and her frustration with not being able to monitor and regulate her blood sugar levels . . . that the simple and reasonable accommodations or providing her with timely meal periods and rest periods would permit her to perform the essential functions of her job without materially and/or adversely affecting her health.

Pasadena and San Gabriel Valley Affiliate

Garcia

Excerpt: Trellis Case Complaint Summary

Filing Date May 12, 2025 / Case #25STCV13839 / Matter Type General Employment

This complaint is a PAGA representative action filed by Plaintiff Ana Garcia against Planned Parenthood Pasadena and San Gabriel Valley, Inc., and unnamed defendants. The complaint alleges various violations of the California Labor Code, including failure to pay for all hours worked, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize rest breaks, failure to pay earned wages twice per month, failure to maintain accurate records, and failure to indemnify for necessary expenditures. The complaint seeks civil penalties under PAGA for these violations. Plaintiff seeks penalties on behalf of herself, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California.

Redding

Smith

Excerpt, Trellis Case Complaint Summary

Filing Date March 25, 2024 / Case Number 24CV00944

The complaint alleges three causes of action: discrimination, retaliation under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), and whistleblower retaliation.

According to the complaint, Mariah Smith was an employee of Planned Parenthood and experienced discrimination and hostility due to her heterosexual, white, married, female status with children. She alleges that she faced exclusion and reprimand for not conforming to the company’s cultural beliefs and business model. Smith also claims that she was retaliated against after announcing her pregnancy and requesting maternity leave. She alleges that she was subjected to unwarranted discipline, placed on a performance improvement plan, and denied a pay increase.

Smith further asserts that she made lawful complaints about an employee stealing company time and the company’s money handling decisions, but her concerns were not addressed and she faced further retaliation. She alleges that her whistleblower activities were a substantial motivating reason for the defendant’s conduct.

Payne

Trellis Case Complaint Summary

Filing Date June 29, 2023 / Case #CGC23607359

This complaint alleges various violations of the California Labor Code and unfair business practices by Defendant Planned Parenthood: Shasta-Diablo, Inc. The plaintiff, Jasmine Payne, brings this class action complaint on behalf of herself and other similarly situated individuals. The complaint alleges the following violations:

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197)
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198)
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512)
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7)
5. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203)
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226)
7. Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures (Cal. Lab. Code § 2802)
8. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

The complaint alleges that Defendant failed to comply with these requirements throughout the statutory period. It further alleges that Defendant was aware of these improprieties but intentionally refused to rectify its unlawful policies. The complaint seeks damages and other relief for the plaintiff and the class members.

San Diego

Macias

Trellis Case Complaint Summary

Filing Date May 19, 2025 / Case #TCN-363413 / Matter Type Wage and Hour

Plaintiff Daisy Lizete Macias filed a complaint against Planned Parenthood of the Pacific Southwest and unnamed Doe defendants on behalf of herself, similarly situated non-exempt employees, and the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA). The complaint alleges widespread violations of California labor laws, including failure to pay all wages owed such as unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime and double time calculated at correct regular rates that include shift differentials and other remuneration, and failure to pay accrued vacation wages upon separation. Plaintiff asserts that Defendants engaged in unlawful company-wide practices, such as editing time records to underreport hours worked, denying or undercompensating meal and rest breaks, and failing to reimburse employees for necessary business expenses like personal cell phone use.

Further allegations include inaccurate and incomplete wage statements, failure to maintain accurate payroll and employment records, untimely payment of wages during employment and upon termination, and violations of paid sick leave laws through improper accrual, notice, and payment calculations. Plaintiff provides specific wage statement examples from 2024 illustrating these deficiencies and claims that Defendants' policies and payroll systems caused these systemic violations.

Lonconte-Crowe

The 2023 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

Excerpt:

*PPPS = Planned Parenthood Pacific Southwest affiliate
The individual Defendant is redacted to Ms. S.*

9. On or about May 22, 2023, PPPS hosted the 60th anniversary dinner for the non-profit organization at the Hilton Hotel . . . Ms. S yelled out to [Plaintiff] from across two tables. Ms. S quickly rushed to [Plaintiff], hugging [Plaintiff] from the side and rubbing [Plaintiff's] arm up and down.

10. [Plaintiff] could smell the alcohol in Ms. S's breath, causing [Plaintiff] to feel very uncomfortable. Ms. S's demeanor was very touchy, touching [Plaintiff's] shoulders, arms, and hands . . . It became clear that Ms. S was intoxicated when she persisted in touching [Plaintiff] excessively as they spoke.

11. At some point during the interaction Ms. S stopped mid-sentence, looked down at [Plaintiff's] cleavage, smiled and said, "oh yeah, you look very good". . . the entire situation made [Plaintiff] extremely nervous. [Plaintiff] managed to get away from Ms. S and actively tried to avoid Ms. Sedillo for the rest of the event.

12. At the end of the night [Plaintiff] headed to the elevator to leave. At the elevator [Plaintiff]bumped into Ms. S and PPPS supervisors . . . Ms. S once again started hugging [Plaintiff] and slowly caressing up and down [Plaintiff's] arm. Ms. S swayed back and forth, her speech slurred from how intoxicated she was . . .

13. . . . None of the PPPS supervisors that accompanied Ms. S corrected her behavior. Instead, they giggled, and proceeded to guide Ms. S into the elevator to leave . . . [Plaintiff] was confused as to why someone in a leadership role like Ms. S would be so negligent of their alcohol consumption in a professional setting . . .

15. Later that same day, [supervisors] spoke with [Plaintiff] and expressed their sentiments about what [Plaintiff] experienced. Both . . . stated that they believed [Plaintiff's] statement about the incident and admired [Plaintiff] for having the courage to speak up. [One] informed [Plaintiff] that several other people had mentioned that Ms. S was also very touchy with them .

17. . . . Although Ms. S did not work directly at the clinic, Ms. S would often visit the clinic without giving any prior notice. Having Ms. S show up to the clinic unannounced caused Shiloh a great deal of anxiety . . .

18. . . . Had Ms. S been a male . . . PPPS might have addressed the situation in an entirely different way. Frustrated with the way PPPS handled the situation, [Plaintiff] began to dread going into work. [Plaintiff] would experience crippling anxiety on the drive to work before every shift . . . [Plaintiff] . . . ultimately decided that leaving PPPS was the best option.

Mendoza

The 2019 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-diego

4. Plaintiff was hired by Defendants around 1985.

5. In late 2017, Plaintiff was told she should retire or Defendants would be forced to issue written discipline Plaintiff. Sure enough, Plaintiff was given unjustified written discipline as a pretext for age discrimination . . .

7. As a result of Defendants attempts to defame Plaintiff's work performance and refusal to remedy the situation, Plaintiff was forced to quit her employment due her age on January 19, 2018. Plaintiff was over 40 years old at the time of her constructive termination.

8. On information and belief, Plaintiff was replaced by someone significantly younger with much less experience . . .

42. Defendants willfully refused and continue to refuse to pay Plaintiff overtime in a timely manner, as required by the aforementioned statutes. Plaintiff therefore requests restitution and penalties as provided by California Labor Code §203 . . .

53. During the course of Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with mandated meal or rest periods and required Plaintiff to work during mandated meal and rest periods, in violation of the Industrial Welfare Commission Orders, Labor Code Section 226.7, subdivision (a), and Labor Code section 512 . . .

58. Within three (3) years last past, Defendants failed to comply with section 7 of IWC Order 4-2001, and with Labor Code § 1174 by failing to maintain certain records which employers are required to maintain, including records of overtime worked and compensated, meal periods provided to each employee and hours worked; and failed to provide their employees, including Plaintiff, with the information required by Labor Code §226.

Warren

Excerpt: Trellis Case Complaint Summary

Filing Date May 16, 2025 / Case #TCN-362079 / Matter Type Wage and Hour

The complaint, filed by Plaintiff Jenica Warren on behalf of herself and similarly situated current and former non-exempt hourly employees of Planned Parenthood of the Pacific Southwest and Does 1 through 50 in California over the past four years, alleges multiple violations of California labor laws by the Defendants. The claims assert that Defendants engaged in unlawful wage and hour practices, including failing to pay minimum wages and overtime for all hours worked—such as off-the-clock pre-shift activities and communications—and not incorporating non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, or shift differentials into the regular rate of pay for calculating overtime, double time, sick pay, PTO, and meal/rest break premiums.

The complaint further alleges that Defendants violated Labor Code provisions by failing to provide timely, uninterrupted 30-minute meal breaks and 10-minute rest breaks as required, and by not paying premium wages for missed or inadequate breaks.

Defendants are also accused of issuing inaccurate wage statements that omitted required compensation components and underreported hours worked, failing to pay all wages timely upon termination or resignation, neglecting to maintain accurate payroll records, and failing to reimburse necessary business expenses such as cell phone costs.

These unlawful labor practices are asserted to constitute unfair business practices under California's Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq. The complaint includes class action allegations with multiple subclasses addressing minimum wage, overtime, meal and rest breaks, wage statements, termination pay, payroll records, expense reimbursements, and unfair business practices.

Santa Barbara

Withers

The 2021 Complaint can be found under Santa Barbara at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-s-to-z

6. Plaintiff began his employment with Defendant on or about October 19, 2015. At the time of Plaintiff's wrongful termination on or about April 30, 2020, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a Lead System Analyst . . .

8. Unfortunately, on or about January 24, 2020, Plaintiff suffered a Transient Ischemic Attack ("TIA") and/or mini stroke while at work. Following the TIA and/or mini stroke, Plaintiff only took approximately two days off of work to heal and recover and thereafter returned to work.

9. After Plaintiff returned to work, he worked for approximately two weeks. However, after consulting with his healthcare providers, Plaintiff's healthcare providers recommended a medical leave of absence. Therefore, Plaintiff requested and Defendant granted Plaintiff a medical leave of absence.

10. On or about February 25, 2020, while Plaintiff was on his medical leave of absence, Plaintiff suffered a second TIA and/or mini stroke and thereafter, requested an extension of his medical leave of absence through March 2020.

11. Plaintiff returned to work on or about April 6, 2020 . . . Plaintiff's supervisor Systems Administrator . . . began to discriminate and/or retaliate against Plaintiff by, among other things, avoiding Plaintiff, taking away his job duties, over scrutinizing his work performance and ultimately giving Plaintiff a false and/or pretextual write up on or about April 24, 2020 . . .

13. Shockingly . . . within a few days after Plaintiff's complaint to Defendant's Human Resources department, Defendant wrongfully terminated Plaintiff for the false and/or pretextual reason of violation of company values.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant wrongfully terminated Plaintiff on account of his perceived and/or disabilities and/or medical conditions and/or in retaliation for his requests for leaves of absence and/or taking leaves of absence and/or requesting accommodations and/or protesting discrimination and/or retaliation.

Chapter 7



California



A South Jersey nurse practitioner is suing Planned Parenthood alleging race discrimination. Her case is one of many against the reproductive health giant.

by Sarah Gantz, *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 18, 202

Excerpt:

The cases detail how inappropriate behavior, racist tropes, microaggressions, and unequal expectations went unchecked, even after employees complained. A few examples . . . A Black nurse practitioner in California said she was called a “homie” by a supervisor who also made comments about her hair and used racial slurs when referring to other Black people. The Planned Parenthood affiliate settled the case privately in 2019.

Los Angeles

Bryant

The 2017 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

1. Plaintiff . . . was employed by defendant Planned Parenthood Los Angeles . . . she began her employment on or about July 11, 2016. Plaintiff's race is African -American. Her title was Family Nurse Practitioner.

2. During her employment, defendant PPLA's managerial and supervisory Employees . . . harassed and discriminated against plaintiff and other co -employees because of their African - American race.

3. This harassment and discrimination occurred on a daily basis and included, but was not limited to, the following:

- a) Calling African -Americans "homies;"
- b) Criticizing the performance of African -American employees;
- c) Making comments about the hair and braids of African -American employees; and
- d) Making derogatory racial slurs about African -Americans.

4. Non-African-American employees were not treated in such a manner . . .

9. On or about August 2, 2017, plaintiff was terminated. Plaintiff was terminated because she was a witness in support of another employee's complaints of discrimination and harassment and because she complained of harassment and discrimination.

Jones

The 2004 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

8 . . . Plaintiff was the first African American male employee to ever be hired in his particular department by PPLA, and was the first such minority to hold his specific position . . .

12. Among other things, as alleged below, Plaintiff refused to engage in PPLA promotional practices that were intended to deceive the African American community in South Los Angeles . . . Plaintiff, an African American, was not comfortable being forced to misrepresent facts to other similarly situated persons.

13. During this same time period, PPLA was also engaged in other activities having a deleterious effect on African American persons, including Plaintiff's fellow employee, one Nick Nkwuda, an African immigrant. Specifically, in or around January of 2004, Mr. Nkwuda was referred to as a "nigger." PPLA's management did nothing to punish the management employee who used such degrading language toward an employee similarly situated to Plaintiff in terms of minority status . . .

14. In fact, throughout 2003 and most of 2004, PPLA had created and allowed the continuation of an environment that was hostile toward African American and other minority employees, especially male employees. A female accounting supervisor referred to male employees in position of authority and officers of the company as "dickheads," and other derogatory terms, constantly defaming and engaging in confrontational behavior which was known throughout and brought to the attention of Human Resources and the interim and permanent CEO and President of PPLA. These terms were most often uttered by the female executive management of PPLA.

15. At the time of Plaintiff's employment, PPLA's white, female management staff also caused openly discriminatory comments and representations to be made that would have made a reasonable person feel uncomfortable . . .

16. The various circumstances described above created an environment that was racist and sexist in tone, policy and practice. These practices have not been abated by PPLA and continue to cause harm to individuals employed by PPLA. PPLA is the subject of multiple verified complaints having been filed with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing within the last six months.

Nwuda

The 2006 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

PPLA = Planned Parenthood Los Angeles

12. Around January 2004, PPLA hired one [person] . . . Upon her hiring by PPLA, [she] immediately began to get into verbal altercations with plaintiff and others. She constantly used profanity and created a very hostile work environment. This culminated in an incident where she used the word “nigger” directed at plaintiff. Plaintiff immediately placed his concerns in writing and requested disciplinary action with the human resources department at PPLA. Nothing ever happened to correct this wrong. In fact, plaintiff was later put on probation by a female supervisor and then was forced to quit on March 6, 2004 due to a hostile environment.

13. On or about January 2004, plaintiff complained about the derogatory racial terms and slurs and profanity used by [a different staff member], Operations Account. All the accounting staff was in close quarters and these terms were heard by everyone. On February 5, 2004, plaintiff complained in an electronic mail . . . He informed here of the insults and verbal confrontations . . . Nothing was done to prevent further racial harassment and an increasing hostility in the work place environment by management.

Chapter 8



We detail large data breaches here.

The website includes many individual complaints listed under the specific locations at which they occurred, but they're not re-iterated here.

Los Angeles



400,000 Patients Potentially Affected by Planned Parenthood Ransomware Attack
by Steve Alder. *The HIPPA Journal*, December 3, 2021



Planned Parenthood Los Angeles Settles Class Action Data Breach Lawsuit for \$6 Million
by Steve Alder. *The HIPPA Journal*, April 8, 2024

Court Complaints for a class action lawsuit were originally filed separately from:
A.K.,
Danchick,
Garza,
Jane Doe,
Orellana, and
T.S.

The full documents can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

San Jose

Balli

The 2022 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-san-jose

22. Defendants hired Plaintiff as VoIP Architect on October 7, 2019. Plaintiff was hired with more than 20 years of relevant work experience. Plaintiff's work responsibilities included . . . general information technology responsibilities, ensuring data security . . .

32. On or about November 15, 2019, Plaintiff learned that Defendants had experienced a serious data breach which had exposed confidential and private Personal Health Information ("PHI") protected by . . . (HIPPA). Plaintiff immediately reported the breach to [J.L.] Plaintiff reported that the PHI of hundreds of individuals had been unlawfully disclosed . . . [and] that the breach needed to be addressed as soon as

possible . . . [and] that Defendants were required to inform the Company's Ethics and Compliance Department and the State of California about the PHI data breach.

33. [J.L.] stated that she could not take any steps to address or remedy the PHI data breach because doing so would risk PPMM's accreditation status with parent entity Planned Parenthood Federation of American. Plaintiff nonetheless continued to insisted that the PHI data breach be reported to the proper authorities and remedied according to applicable regulations.

34. [J.L.] became agitated and ordered Plaintiff not to discuss the PHI data breach with any other individual. She threatened Plaintiff and told him that if he disobeyed her instruction his employment with Defendants would be terminated.

35. Plaintiff believed that Defendants PHI data breach needed to be further reported and remedied. Initially, however, he complied with [J.L.]'s orders because he relied upon the income from his employment with Defendants to support himself and his family.

36. On or about January 28, 2020, Plaintiff reported the November 2019 PHI data breach to the Company's Interim General Counsel and Chief Compliance Officer . . .

38. Plaintiff further reported to [her] that Defendants were poised to expose additional HIPAA-protected PHI due to the compromised nature of Defendant's network infrastructure.

39. [She] told Plaintiff that the Company had made multiple mistakes . . . [and] thanked Plaintiff for reporting the data breach and assured him that there would be no retaliation for his actions.

40. The very next day, January 29, 2020, Defendants revoked Plaintiff's information technology (IT) account rights so that he could not perform his job duties. Defendants' Human Resources department informed Plaintiff that he was being suspended form work effective immediately. Plaintiff surrendered his work laptop, keys, and security badge.

Chapter 10



California

Los Angeles

Dawson

The 2017 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

17. Plaintiff . . . had expressed dissatisfaction with the work being performed by a direct-mail vendor to PPLA . . . owned and operated by [his supervisor B.B.]’s husband . . . This was a blatant conflict of interest from which [B.B.] received direct financial benefit . . . It did not matter to [B.B.] that her husband’s company was performing substandard work, often delayed . . .

18. The challenge faced by Plaintiff in being forced to work with [B.B.]’s husband and his untouchable (though incompetent) company became increasingly difficult . . . There are many vendors to choose from in this very competitive field. Instead, [B.B.] compounded the challenge by informing Plaintiff in 2014 that her husband’s company would now be retained not only as a direct mail vendor, but as a “consultant” at \$2,500 per month . . .

19. At a certain point, Plaintiff had had to hire a new [person] . . . because the first one had successfully sought a new job because of, among other reasons, the frustration from being forced to work with this vendor. This second person . . . eventually left PPLA as well . . . in large measure due to the same issues . . . Plaintiff was forced to hire a third employee . . . she encountered the very same problems . . . during the time Plaintiff supervised her, not one Direct Mail mailing went out without significant negative impact caused by the vendor’s failures.

Jones

The 2004 Complaint can be found at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Excerpt:

18. On or about May 10, 2004, Plaintiff specifically noted and again placed Defendant PPLA on notice of “accounting miscues, angry patients, and disgruntled gatekeepers,” all of which relate to programs overseen and administered by the other Defendants. Unbeknownst to the Plaintiff, PPLA had already received negative independent “single audit” findings prior to April 2004, a condition that was brought to the attention of the PPLA Board members by their independent auditors for a number of years past. PPLA’s accountants had to reconstruct the books of record of the company,

its General Ledger, fund accounting coding, and sub-ledgers . . . In fact, Ms. Swiller formerly acknowledged in her memorandum that ‘...PPLA [financial] systems were non functional to barely functional.’ Moreover, certain members of the PPLA Board actively sought to conceal the findings from funding sources . . . During Plaintiff’s tenure there were indeed serious financial control lapses affecting the truth and accuracy of statements made to the official defendants named herein, and federal funding sources (i.e., Title X).

San Diego Audit

[CA San Diego – Audit from California Department of Health Services](#)

Excerpt:

Failure to comply with Family PACT billing instructions has resulted in the Department reimbursing PPH for claims in excess of cost. Reimbursement in excess of cost for the audit period totaled \$5,213,645.92

Lack of Legally Required Transparency
[California – Los Angeles](#)

Articles of special interest for all states:

	<p>Botched Care and Tired Staff: Planned Parenthood in Crisis by Katie Benner, <i>The New York Times</i>, February 15, 2025</p>
---	---

	<p>You scheduled an abortion. Planned Parenthood's website could tell Facebook. The organization left marketing trackers running on its scheduling pages by Tatum Hunter, <i>The Washington Post</i>, June 29, 2022</p>
---	---

Compilation of reviews on specific topics:

	<p>Reviews Report - Medical Dangers</p>
--	---

	<p>Reviews Report - Racism</p>
---	--

	<p>Reviews Report - Employee Rights</p>
---	---

	<p>Reviews Report - Financial Ethics</p>
---	--

Members of the Problems at Planned Parenthood Committee:
Rachel MacNair, Sarah Terzo, Thad Crouch

Interns: *Anna Connor, Ashley Moorman, Josephine Moorman, and Regina Thompson*

Graphics: *Sonja Morin.*

Contact:

811 Emanuel Cleaver II Boulevard, Kansas City, MO 64110

info@problemsatplannedparenthood.org

Voice: 816-753-2057

Send:

- *any questions or comments*
- *any documentation of further problems*
- *requests for later updated editions*