17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR BENTON COUNTY

8	an individual,	
9	Plaintiff,	No. 3
10	vs.) COMPLAINT FOR INJURIES AND DAMAGES
11	ALEXANDER ORTOLANO, MD, and JANE DOE ORTOLANO, husband and wife))
12	individually and on behalf of the marital community composed thereof; and ARBOR) ARBITRATION)
13	HEALTH CARÉ FOR WOMEN, PC, a Washington State Corporation,) [X] DECLINIG VOLUNTARY) ARBITRATION
14	, and the same of)
	Defendants.)
15		

COMES NOW the Plaintiff by by and through her attorney of record, Michael A. Maxwell of Maxwell Graham, P.S., and alleges the following for cause of action:

I. PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1.1 Plaintiff is a resident of Benton County, Washington.
- 1.2 Defendant Alexander Ortolano, MD, is a resident of Benton County, Washington.
- 1.3 It is not known whether Defendant Alexander Ortolano is married, the name Jane Doe Ortolano is added, should he be so.
- 1.4 Defendant Arbor Health Care for Women, PC, is a Washington State Corporation domiciled in Benton County.

MAXWELL | GRAHAM, P.S. Trial Lawyers THE ARBOR BUILDING

THE ARBOR BUILDING 1621 114^{7H} Ave SE BELLEVUE, WASHINGTON 98004 (206) 527-2000 FAX (425) 484-2012

1.5 The Benton County Superior Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action, has personal jurisdiction over the parties, and is an appropriate venue for this action.

II. FACTS

- 2.1 At all times material to the matters complained of herein, Defendant Ortolano was acting within the scope of his employment with Defendant Arbor Health Care for Women, PC.
- 2.2 In January 2013 Plaintiff established care with Defendant Ortolano for obstetrical care.
- 2.3 On March 07, 2013, Plaintiff delivered her daughter at Kaldec Hospital, attended by Dr. Ortolano.
- 2.4 During the delivery of the placenta, Defendant Ortolano was observed falling asleep.
- 2.5 Upon waking up Defendant Ortolano tugged on the umbilical cord repeatedly. Eventually he removed the placenta but failed to observe that the placenta was not whole and intact which indicated that part of the placenta had been retained in Plaintiff unterest.
- 2.6 In tugging on the umbilical cord and failing to note that the placenta was not whole and therefore a portion had been retained in Plaintiff uterus, Defendant Ortolano failed to exercise the degree of care, skill, and learning expected of a reasonably prudent health care provider at that time in the profession or class to which he or she belongs, in the state of Washington, acting in the same or similar circumstances.
- 2.7 After medication prescribed to expel the retained placenta, Plaintiff underwent dilation and curettage surgery to remove the retained placenta on March 27, 2013.
- 2.8 After the dilation and curettage surgery, Plaintiff consolited with Defendant Ortolano regarding tubal ligation as a means of permanent birth control, Defendant Ortolano instead recommended Plaintiff have Essure coils placed in her fallopian tubes, claiming placing the Essure coils would be a less invasive procedure.

- 2.9 When recommending the Essure procedure, Defendant Ortolano failed to inquire as to whether Plaintiff had a sensitivity to nickel, a serious contraindication for Essure.
- 2.10 By failing to ascertain whether Plaintiff was sensitive to nickel before recommending and implanting the Essure device, Defendant Ortolano failed to exercise the degree of care, skill, and learning expected of a reasonably prudent health care provider at that time in the profession or class to which he or she belongs, in the state of Washington, acting in the same or similar circumstances.
- 2.11 Defendant Ortolano scheduled Plaintiff for the Essure procedure on April 24, 2013 four weeks after the dilation and curettage procedure for the retained placenta.
- 2.12 By failing to wait six weeks after the dilation and curettage procedure to implant the Essure device in Plaintiff Defendant Ortolano failed to exercise the degree of care, skill, and learning expected of a reasonably prudent health care provider at that time in the profession or class to which he or she belongs, in the state of Washington, acting in the same or similar circumstances.
- 2.13 On April 24, 2013 Dr. Ortolano performed the Essure implantation on Plaintiff
 Dr. Ortolano first implanted an Essure coil in the right fallopian tube without incident.

 During the implantation of the left coil, Dr. Ortolano struggled to place the coil in the left tube,

 Plaintiff found the procedure to be extraordinarily painful and requested Defendant

 Ortolano stop the procedure.
- 2.14 Defendant Ortolano and his staff advised Plaintiff that procedure should not be stopped. Dr. Ortolano's staff brought Plaintiff and father from the waiting room to the procedure room to comfort Plaintiff and and resumed the procedure.
- 2.15 By continuing to advance the Essure device against excessive resistance and after complaints of excessive pain by Plaintiff (), Defendant Ortolano failed to exercise the degree of care, skill, and learning expected of a reasonably prudent health care provider at

that time in the profession or class to which he or she belongs, in the state of Washington, acting in the same or similar circumstances.

- 2.16 On September 10, 2013 Plaintiff underwent a routine hysterosalpingogram to evaluate whether the Essure devices had sealed both fallopian tubes. Defendant Ortolano read the hysterosalpingogram and dictated the report noting that the left tube had not sealed. Defendant Ortolano failed to note that contrast material had escaped the fallopian tubes indicating that the Essure devices had ruptured fallopian tumbes.
- 2.17 By failing to observe or diagnose the fallopian tube rupture or have the hysterosalpingogram read by a radiologist, Defendant Ortolano failed to exercise the degree of care, skill, and learning expected of a reasonably prudent health care provider at that time in the profession or class to which he or she belongs, in the state of Washington, acting in the same or similar circumstances.

III. CAUSE OF ACTION

- 3.0 As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Ortolano's failure to follow the standard of care as complained of herein, Plaintiff was injured and Plaintiff is entitled to compensation therefor in an amount to be proven at time of trial.
- 3.1 As a direct and proximate result of the failure to follow the standard of care as alleged herein, Plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur medical expenses and other out-of-pocket expenses and is entitled to be compensated therefor.
- 3.2 As a direct and proximate result of the failure to follow the standard of care as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer physical pain and suffering and loss of enjoyment of life and is entitled to be compensated therefor.
- 3.3 As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' failure to follow the standard of care as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered mental and emotional distress and is entitled to be compensated therefor.

25

26

- 3.4 As the direct and proximate result of the Defendants' failure to follow the standard of care as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered loss of wages and benefits.
 - 3.5 Plaintiff is entitled to recover her attorney's fees pursuant to RCW 4.84.
 - 3.6 Plaintiff is entitled to costs and disbursements herein.

IV. LIMITED WAIVER OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Plaintiff pursuant to RCW 5.60.060, as amended by the laws of 1986, hereby grants limited waiver of the physician-patient privilege. The scope of this waiver is as follows:

- A. This waiver shall take effect regarding this lawsuit for personal injuries on the 89th day from the date the action was filed;
- B. This waiver shall be subject to such limitations as the Court may impose. The waiver shall at all times be limited by an order entered in connection therewith by the Benton County Superior Court; and
- C. This waiver shall only apply to the privilege which exists under RCW 5.60.060 and shall not be deemed to be broader in its scope nor apply to physician-patient privileges nor governed by RCW 5.60.060. Constitutional rights of privacy, impairment or interference with the doctor/patient relationship, and other rights not governed by RCW 5.60.060 regarding physician-patient relationships are not waived. This waiver is made solely to comply with the legal obligation required by the 1986 amendment to RCW 5.60.060 requiring such waiver within 90 days of the filing of an action for personal injuries.

V. ARBITRATION

Plaintiff declines voluntary arbitration.

VI. RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays as follows:

1. For a judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against the Defendants;

- 2. For an award of damages in favor of the Plaintiff and against the Defendants in amounts to be proven at the time of trial;
- 3. For an award of prejudgment interest at the statutory rate on Plaintiff's economic damages;
- 4. For an award of prejudgment interest on Plaintiff's non-economic damages to the extent allowed by law;
 - 5. For an award of Plaintiff's costs and disbursements herein;
 - 6. For an award of reasonable attorney's fees; and
 - 7. For such further relief as to the Court and/or the jury seems just.

DATED this 2 11 day of April, 2015

MAXWELL GRAHAM, PS

MICHAEL A. MAXWELL-WSBA # 21781

Attorney for Plaintiff