

Problems at Planned Parenthood

Information for Protecting Our Health

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

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org



Los Angeles page:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles



This report organizes problems with a section 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 July 24, 2026

Section 1



This section 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).

Long Beach

Castillo

The 2025 Malpractice Complaint is under Long Beach:

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

Excerpt:

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 is 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 is under the Hollywood Center:

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 is 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 is under the Taper Foundation Center:

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.

Section 2



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.

Section 3



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)

Los Angeles

Lenihan



Diocese Pays \$1.2 Million In Sex Lawsuit
by Greg Winter, *The New York Times*, April 2, 2002

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, is 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 is 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.

Section 4



Los Angeles

Abutaleb

The 2022 Complaint is 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 off 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 is at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

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 is 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 . . .

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.

Section 5



Bryant

The 2017 Complaint is 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 is 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 is 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.

Section 6



This reports on a major data breach.

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



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 are at:

www.problemsatplannedparenthood.org/california-los-angeles

Section 7



Dawson

The 2017 Complaint is 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 is 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).

Articles of special interest for all states:

	<u>Botched Care and Tired Staff: Planned Parenthood in Crisis</u> by Katie Benner, <i>The New York Times</i> , February 15, 2025
	You scheduled an abortion. <u>Planned Parenthood's website could tell Facebook.</u> The organization left marketing trackers running on its scheduling pages by Tatum Hunter, <i>The Washington Post</i> , June 29, 2022

Compilation of reviews on specific topics:

	<u>Reviews Report - Medical Dangers</u>
	<u>Reviews Report - Racism</u>
	<u>Reviews Report - Employee Rights</u>
	<u>Reviews Report - Financial Ethics</u>