1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BRYAN M. GARRIE (SBN 131738) BRYAN M. GARRIE, APC Post Office Box 2731 La Jolla, California 92038 Telephone: (858) 459-0020 Facsimile: (858) 459-0777 MATTHEW P. TYSON (SBN 178427) LAW OFFICE OF MATTHEW P. TYSON 5580 La Jolla Blvd. #170 La Jolla, California 92037 Telephone: (619) 787-0614 Attorneys for Plaintiff Evangeline Ortega	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT JUN 27 2022 BY
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	
10	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO	
11	EVANGELINE ORTEGA,	Case Cd.V SB 2 2 1 3 4 4 2
12	Plaintiff,	Unlimited Jurisdiction
13	v.	Jury Trial Demanded
14 15 16 17 18	REDLANDS COMMUNITY HOSPITAL; BENJAMIN CHOU, MD; JISANG KIM, MD; JULIE SMITHWICK, DO; and DOE 1 through DOE 25, inclusive, Defendants.	COMPLAINT FOR SURVIVAL ACTION AND WRONGFUL DEATH SOUNDING IN: 1. CONSTRUCTIVE FRAUD; AND 2. VIOLATION OF THE ELDER ABUSE AND DEPENDENT ADULT CIVIL PROTECTION ACT
19		
20		
21		
22	///	
23	///	
24	///	
25	///	
	Complaint by Evangeline Ortega	1

Plaintiff Evangeline Ortega (Evangeline) alleges:

Introduction

1. Evangeline's husband of 46 years, Armando Ortega (Armando), was a healthy 65-year-old man who faced a very low risk (a less than 1% chance) of dying from COVID-19.



- 2. Armando's risk of death dramatically changed for the worse (by 3,000%) when physicians and staff of Redlands Community Hospital (RCH) failed to disclose, to Armando or Evangeline, the risks associated with the medically unnecessary and extremely dangerous drug Remdesivir, or their financial incentive to administer the drug, before administering it to Armando.
- 3. RCH physicians and other staff administered the Remdesivir to Armando without the knowledge or informed consent of Armando or Evangeline.
- 4. The Remdesivir caused Armando to suffer kidney failure, severe and enduring pain and suffering including multiple organ failure, and death, and it caused Evangeline to suffer the loss of her husband.

Parties, Jurisdiction, and Venue

- 5. Evangline is an individual residing in San Bernardino County and the wife of, and successor in interest to, her deceased husband, Armando.
- 6. Evangeline has executed and filed with this complaint a sworn declaration of successor-in-interest.
- 7. Evangeline, as successor-in-interest, seeks survivor action general damages pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 377.30, *et seq.*, including 377.34, subdivision (b).
- 8. Evangeline also seeks wrongful death general and special damages pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 377.60, *et seq*.
- 9. RCH is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization with its principal place of business in San Bernardino County.
- 10. Benjamin Chou, MD, Jisang Kim, MD, and Julie Smithwick, DO are licensed physicians of unknown domicile who had privileges to provide medical care to RCH patients in San Bernardino County.
- 11. Drs. Chou, Kim, and Smithwick, and DOE 1 through DOE 15, were apparent and/or ostensible agents of RCH.
- 12. The true name and capacity and/or bases of liability of DOE 1 through DOE 25, inclusive, is unknown, and Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this complaint to identify their true names and capacities when known.
- 13. On information and belief, each of the fictitiously named DOE defendants is responsible for, or has contributed to, the loss and damages alleged herein and the matters giving rise to the relief sought.
- 14. The conduct giving rise to the causes of action alleged herein occurred within San Bernardino County and within the City of Redlands.
 - 15. Evangeline seeks a damages award of more than the \$25,000 jurisdictional limit.

16.	This action is not subject to removal to federal court under the PREP Act because	
(1) defendan	ts were not acting under a federal official and performing a duty of the government,	
(2) Congress	s did not intend the PREP Act to completely preempt all state-law claims related to	
the pandemic, and (3) there is no embedded federal question in these claims. (Saldana v.		
Glenhaven H	Healthcare LLC, 27 F.4th 679 (9th Cir. 2022).) Removal in disregard of the holding	
in Saldana n	nay be sanctionable.	

Remdesivir

- 17. Remdesivir is a failed Ebola drug that was found to be terminally toxic to the kidneys. It was pulled from an Ebola study because more than fifty-three-percent (53%) of the Remdesivir recipients died.
- 18. In COVID-19 healthcare circles across the country, Remdesivir has carried the nickname "Run, death is near."
- 19. According to Peter McCullough, MD, MPH, FAACC, FAHA, FNKF, FNIA, FCRSA, "Remdesivir has two problems: First, it doesn't work. Second, it is toxic and kills people."
 - 20. Remdesivir is medically unnecessary for treatment of COVID-19.
- 21. An extensive study sponsored by the World Health Organization, conducted in 405 hospitals across 30 countries on more than 10,000 patients, found that Remdesivir does not help patients with COVID-19 survive, and that it does not shorten the recovery time for those COVID-19 patients who do survive.
- 22. On November 19, 2020 the World Health Organization's Guideline Development Group, a panel of international experts who provide advice to the agency, published their conclusion that there is no evidence that Remdesivir has meaningful effect on mortality or on other important outcomes for COVID-19 patients, such as the need for mechanical ventilation or time for clinical improvement.

- 23. On November 20, 2020 the World Health Organization published its conditional recommendation that physicians do **not** treat COVID-19 patients with Remdesivir. The conditional recommendation meant that there was not enough evidence to support its use.
 - 24. Remdesivir presents risk of serious injury and death.
- 25. Remdesivir presents a roughly three-thousand-percent (3,000%) increase in the rate of acute renal failure as compared to other drugs prescribed in comparable situations.
- 26. Roughly one (1) out of every five (5) hospitalized COVID-19 patients who receives Remdesivir suffers acute renal failure.
- 27. RCH would receive a financial bonus when Remdesivir was administered to a COVID-19 patient with Medicare. The financial bonus to RCH was of personal economic interest to physicians working at RCH's facility and affected their professional judgment.

Fiduciary Duty and Constructive Fraud

- 28. A fiduciary must tell its principal of all information it possesses that is material to the principal's interests. A fiduciary's failure to share material information with the principal is constructive fraud.
- 29. A person of adult years and in sound mind has the right, in the exercise of control over his or her own body, to determine whether or not to submit to lawful medical treatment.
- 30. A physician is under a fiduciary duty to disclose all information material to a patient's decision to receive or decline a particular medical treatment.
 - 31. A physician is under a fiduciary duty to disclose medical errors to a patient.
- 32. A physician must disclose personal interests unrelated to a patient's health, whether research or economic, that may affect the physician's professional judgment.
 - 33. It is medically unethical to administer an unnecessary medical treatment.
- 34. It is medically unethical, and a violation of California, federal, and International laws, to administer a medical treatment without informed consent.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Survival Action and Wrongful Death Sounding in Constructive Fraud

By Plaintiff Evangeline Ortega Against Defendants Jisang Kim, MD, Redlands Community Hospital, and DOE 1 through DOE 25, inclusive

- 52. Paragraphs 1 through 50 are re-alleged.
- 53. Drs. Chou, Kim, and Smithwick, and DOE 1 through DOE 15 held a fiduciary duty to Armando.
- 54. Drs. Chou, Kim, and Smithwick, and DOE 1 through DOE 15 knew, or should have known, that Armando, Evangline, and a reasonable person in the position of Armando and/or Evangeline, would consider the following information, which was not disclosed to Armando or Evangeline, to be material in considering whether to consent to the administration of Remdesivir:
- a. The largest study of Remdesivir found that it does not help patients with COVID-19 survive, and that it does not shorten the recovery time for those COVID-19 patients who do survive:
- b. Remdesivir may increase the risk of death, and it presents a significant and/or a twenty-percent (20%) chance of acute renal failure;
- c. RCH would receive a financial bonus if Remdesivir was administered to a Medicare patient; and/or
- 55. The World Health Organization published a conditional recommendation that physicians do **not** treat COVID-19 patients with Remdesivir, and that the conditional recommendation meant that there was not enough evidence to support its use.
- 56. Drs. Chou, Kim, and Smithwick, and DOE 1 through DOE 15 caused Remdesivir to be administered to Armando without the knowledge or informed consent of Armando or Evangeline.

- 67. The conduct of Defendants in leaving left Armando in a prone position until he suffered bedsores and his nose was burned black was reckless.
- 68. The conduct of Defendants, in administering Remdesivir to Armando without the knowledge or informed consent of Armando or Evangeline, constituted a battery under Penal Code Section 240 and physical abuse under Welfare and Institutions Code Section 15610.63.
- 69. The conduct of Defendants, in administering the medically unnecessary and extremely dangerous drug Remdesivir to Armando without the knowledge or informed consent of Armando or Evangeline, constituted a failure to protect from health and safety hazards, and neglect, under Welfare and Institutions Code Section 15610.57.
- 70. The conduct of Defendants, in administering Remdesivir to Armando without the knowledge or informed consent of Armando or Evangeline, was reckless, fraudulent, and/or oppressive.
- 71. Armando was harmed. He suffered pre-death physical injuries, acute kidney failure, bedsores and facial burn, severe pain and suffering, and ultimately death.
- 72. The conduct of Defendants was a substantial factor in causing Armando's harm, and ultimately death.
- 73. Evangeline was harmed. She suffered loss of love, affection, intimacy, society, service, relationship, comfort, care, support, right of support, expectations of future support and counseling, companionship, solace and mental support, training, guidance, as well as other benefits and assistance, from Armando, as well as funeral and related expenses.
 - 74. The conduct of Defendants was a substantial factor in causing Evangeline's harm.
- 75. The conduct of Drs. Chou, Kim, and Smithwick, and DOE 1 through DOE 15 was authorized, approved, or ratified by officers, directors, and/or managing agents of RCH and/or DOE 16 through 25.

25 | | ///

1	76. The conduct of Defendants warrants the imposition of punitive and exemplary	
2	damages.	
3	PRAYER FOR RELIEF	
4	Evangeline Ortega prays for entry of judgment in her favor and against Redlands	
5	Community Hospital, Benjamin Chou, MD, Jisang Kim, MD, Julie Smithwick, DO, and DOE 1	
6	through DOE 25, for survivor pre-death pain and suffering general damages, wrongful death	
7	general and special damages, statutory damages, punitive and exemplary damages, attorney's	
8	fees as provided by law and/or statute, costs of suit, including expert witness fees, and for such	
9	other and further relief as the court deems just.	
10		
11	Respectfully,	
12	BRYAN M. GARRIE, APC	
13	LAW OFFICE OF MATTHEW P. TYSON	
14	0011	
15	Dated: June 25, 2022 By: BRYAN M. GARRIE	
16	MATTHEW P. TYSON Attorneys for Plaintiff Evangeline Ortega	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
2425		
23	11	

Complaint by Evangeline Ortega