the last several months of his life in near-constant pain, confined to his bed and a wheelchair,

before ultimately succumbing to the disease. Mr. Williams was 63 years old at the time of his death. He left behind a wife and four children. If it had not been for DOC's shocking mistreatment, he would be alive today and be looking forward to his release from prison this year.

#### II. PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff Denise Johnson is the Personal Representative of the Estate of Kenneth Williams. The Estate of Kenneth Williams was formed in King County, Washington, and is maintained under the jurisdiction of the King County Superior Court, under Cause No. 20-4-00757-6 SEA. Ms. Johnson, acting in her capacity as the Personal Representative, brings this action on behalf of the Estate and the Estate's beneficiaries under Washington's wrongful death and survival statutes, RCW 4.20.005 *et seq*.
- 3. The Estate's beneficiaries are Mr. Williams' surviving spouse, Denise Johnson, and his four surviving adult children, Julie Gobble, Angela Helgeson, Sarah Gendreau and Kenneth Williams, II.
- 4. The Defendant is the State of Washington, acting through its Department of Corrections (DOC). DOC is responsible for administering adult correctional programs in Washington, including the operation of the State's adult prisons. It is responsible for the safety and well-being of more than 15,000 prisoners in its custody. By taking custody of people and confining them in its prisons, where they are powerless to obtain their own medical care, DOC undertakes an affirmative duty to provide necessary care for prisoners' serious medical conditions, consistent with accepted professional standards of care. Through its employment of persons licensed by the State of Washington to provide health care to people in its custody, DOC is a "health care provider" under RCW 7.70.020(3). Under traditional principles of *respondeat*

*superior*, DOC is vicariously liable for the negligent or otherwise tortious conduct of its employees.

5. As of the commencement of this action, the Defendant has agreed to accept original service of the Summons and Complaint in this matter by email at <a href="mailto:serviceATG@atg.wa.gov">serviceATG@atg.wa.gov</a>. See <a href="https://www.atg.wa.gov/electronic-service-original-summons-complaint">https://www.atg.wa.gov/electronic-service-original-summons-complaint</a>.

# III. JURISDICTION & VENUE

- 6. This Court has original jurisdiction over this suit pursuant to RCW 2.08.010 and RCW 4.92.010.
- 7. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to RCW 4.92.010(1) because the Estate of Kenneth Williams was formed and is maintained in King County, Washington.

### IV. FACTS

- 8. Kenneth Williams was 60 years old when he entered DOC custody on May 24, 2016. At all times material to this lawsuit, Mr. Williams was confined at the Monroe Correctional Complex in Monroe, Washington.
- 9. On March 4, 2018, during a nursing assessment at the Monroe Correctional Complex-Twin Rivers Unit, DOC nurse C. Klimper felt a lump underneath the skin above Mr. Williams' left nipple. She reported this finding to DOC physician assistant P. Ngo. However, neither provider—both of whom were employees of DOC—took any steps to diagnose the lump or arrange for further evaluation. Their failures take these steps fell below the accepted standard of care.
- 10. Two months later, on May 8, Mr. Williams went to sick call complaining about the lump. The nurse who saw him, who was employed by DOC, wrote in his chart, "MA

notified[;] appointment made to see provider." However, no appointment was actually made. The nurse's actions and omissions here fell below the accepted standard of care.

- I need to see a provider. I have signed up 5 times, wrote one kite, went to sick call where the nurses felt the lump in my breast and told me that I would surely see a provider but still nothing on the call outs. This has been going on for 6 months now and I feel that I have been very patient, could you please help me. Thank you.
- 12. Instead of assuring Mr. Williams that he would see a provider about the lump in his breast, the grievance coordinator employed by DOC responded by asking for the dates he signed up for sick call so that the grievance coordinator could assess whether he had complied with the 20-day grievance time limit. When Mr. Williams did not respond within seven days, the grievance coordinator withdrew the grievance. The grievance coordinator did not take any steps to ensure that Mr. Williams received necessary medical attention.
- 13. A physician assistant employed by DOC finally saw Mr. Williams on June 5, 2018—more than three months after the breast lump was first documented in his medical chart. During that visit, Mr. Williams reported "sharp, knife-like stabbing pain" in his left breast. The DOC provider, R. Smith, confirmed the mass, noted that Mr. Williams' left nipple was now inverted, and recommended an "urgent" consult for imaging of the mass, noting that a mammogram and ultrasound were indicated.
- 14. Despite the provider's request for an "urgent" consult, DOC inexplicably waited more than a month before providing Mr. Williams with the required diagnostic tests. This delay by DOC fell below the accepted standard of care.
- 15. A mammogram and ultrasound performed on July 11 confirmed the mass in Mr. Williams' left breast. The report noted that his mother had had breast cancer at the age of 30. The

consulting radiologist, Dr. Nancy Neubauer, concluded that the "[a]rea in the left breast is suspicious," recommended a biopsy, and notified DOC nurse practitioner Mary Gumbo of the results and recommendation.

- 16. The next day, Nurse Gumbo submitted a request for a biopsy. She noted that the mass in Mr. Williams' breast was causing him pain and that he had a "significant family [history] of breast cancer." She marked the request as "urgent," to be completed within one week. But Mr. Williams did not receive the biopsy until roughly three weeks later, on August 1, 2018. This significant delay by DOC in providing Mr. Williams with the "urgent" biopsy in a timely manner fell below the accepted standard of care.
- 17. When the "urgent" biopsy finally occurred, Mr. Williams was diagnosed with invasive ductal carcinoma.
- 18. The results of the biopsy were discussed with Jaimie Arcand at DOC on August 7, 2018, but astoundingly, nobody from DOC bothered to notify Mr. Williams of his cancer diagnosis until a week later, when he happened to visit his DOC provider because he was suffering severe pain. This delay in informing Mr. Williams of his cancer diagnosis fell below the accepted standard of care.
- 19. On August 17, 2018, DOC physician assistant Adelaide Horne asked for an emergent CT scan to be completed within two days, noting that a recent chest x-ray showed "an osseous lesion with pathologic fracture of the left 9th rib and a fracture of the 5th left rib."
- 20. DOC ignored P.A. Horne's "emergent" request for a full ten days before approving it. Incredibly, it then allowed two more months to pass before sending Mr. Williams out for the scan—a scan that was supposed to be completed within two days. DOC's decision to

ignore P.A. Horne's emergent request and its decision to allow two more months to pass before sending Mr. Williams out for the scan fell below the accepted standard of care.

- 21. DOC finally arranged for Mr. Williams to see an oncologist on August 23, 2018—almost six months after Nurse Klimper first discovered the lump in his breast. DOC's gross delay in this regard fell below the accepted standard of care.
- 22. After performing an assessment, the outside oncologist wrote, "[I]t is likely [Mr. Williams] has a metastatic breast cancer from the left breast." He recommended that Mr. Williams be referred to a surgeon and a radiation oncologist and that he "start chemotherapy ASAP." He also recommended a port placement, a CT scan, a brain MRI, and a bone scan.
- 23. But DOC's inexcusable foot-dragging continued. The agency waited almost two months to complete the CT scan and bone scan. It never arranged for a port placement and never started chemotherapy—or any other treatment for that matter. DOC's delays and failures in regard to these recommendations fell below the accepted standard of care.
- 24. Weeks went by as the cancer continued to spread and Mr. Williams endured persistent and worsening pain.
- 25. On October 2, 2018, Mr. Williams sent a written note to medical staff with the following complaint:

The pain meds that you have been giving me are no longer taking the pain away. The cancer is so bad in my ribs and my lungs and my back that I can no longer lay down.

26. He filed a grievance the same day, practically begging for treatment:

Have not received or heard any results from the taking of water off my knee, in order to find out if I have an infection that will keep me from undergoing chemotherapy. Need to treat infection or start chemo immediately. I do not have long to live according to an outside specialist who is the fourth leading cancer doctor in the world. He told me I need to

start chemo aggressively right away or would not live nine months. This was 2 months ago. What is taking so long?

27. A few days later Mr. Williams submitted yet another grievance pleading with DOC to start treatment:

> The oncologist told me on August 22nd, 2018 that I needed to start aggressive chemotherapy, a.s.a.p. and said he would schedule me for the following week. This was now seven weeks ago, almost two months and I have not been given any reasons for the delay. I am dying, what is holding up my treatment that will save my life?

- 28. As before, the DOC grievance coordinator callously ignored the substance of Mr. Williams' pleas and instead responded to both grievances by citing administrative defects and noting that the grievances appeared to be beyond the 20-day grievance timeline.
- 29. The grievance coordinator dismissed both grievances when Mr. Williams, now in excruciating pain, failed to rewrite them.
- 30. The grievance coordinator did not take any steps to investigate or address the serious treatment delay about which Mr. Williams complained. As a result, the untreated cancer continued to spread, and Mr. Williams continued to suffer.
- 31. Throughout this period, Mr. Williams' family repeatedly contacted DOC officials, imploring them to intervene to get their loved one the treatment he needed. But their appeals went unheeded.
- 32. Mr. Williams underwent a whole-body bone scan on October 16, 2018, which revealed "Multifocal skeletal metastatic disease."
- 33. A chest CT on the same day showed (1) a left chest wall mass measuring 3.3 x 2.8 cm, (2) multiple pulmonary nodules "which could represent pulmonary or pleural metastases," and (3) "[i]nnumerable lytic lesions throughout the entire visualized skeleton with multiple subacute appearing pathologic rib fractures, extensive involvement of the lower thoracic and COMPLAINT – Page 7 BUDGE HEIPT, PLLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 808 E. Roy St. SEATTLE, WA 98102 TELEPHONE: (206) 624-3060

lumbar spine, and a more permeative appearing lesion in the proximal right femoral shaft." The consultation report back to DOC included a recommendation that Mr. Williams be "transported by stretcher in future due to severe pain issues during transfer to imaging table."

- 34. On November 9, 2018, having been deprived of treatment for approximately eight months in gross violation of the applicable standards of care, in severe pain and not wanting to prolong his suffering, Mr. Williams signed a form declining treatment. The reason he cited for declining treatment was "too much pain to travel." In fact, there is no indication that DOC ever actually offered Mr. Williams any treatment for his cancer.
- 35. Mr. Williams spent the last seven months of his life in a prison medical ward, confined to a bed or wheelchair, in severe and near-constant pain. He died on June 12, 2019.
- 36. Mr. Williams' death was not the result of a good-faith error in judgment by a well-meaning medical provider. Rather, it was the result of systemic negligence that permeated the DOC healthcare system, causing many patients with life-threatening illnesses to suffer. The Washington Office of the Corrections Ombuds has identified at least thirteen cases over just the past four years in which DOC failed to provide timely diagnosis and/or treatment to patients with cancer, causing worsening conditions, suffering, and/or death.
- 37. Throughout most of the period of Mr. Williams' illness, medical care at the Monroe Correctional Complex was overseen by MCC Medical Director Julia Barnett. Two months before Mr. Williams died, DOC fired Dr. Barnett, in part because she failed to "make timely and necessary arrangements for adequate medical care to be provided to patients outside of MCC; ensure that providers whom [she] clinically supervised were providing timely, adequate medical care, evaluation or assessments; [and] ensure that sufficient documentation and charting was occurring so that the patient's condition could be adequately monitored."

38. Mr. Williams suffered severe personal damages as a direct and proximate result of DOC's systemic negligence and its employees' individual and collective failures to act reasonably and follow accepted standards of care with regard to his serious medical condition. Mr. Williams' damages include, but are not limited to, severe physical pain and suffering, anxiety, and emotional distress.

39. Mr. Williams died as a direct and proximate result of DOC's systemic negligence and its employees' individual and collective failures to act reasonably and follow accepted standards of care with regard to his serious medical condition. Each of Mr. Williams' statutory beneficiaries under RCW 4.20.020 suffered severe personal damages as a direct and proximate result. Those damages include, but are not limited to, the loss of Mr. Williams' love, affection, care, companionship, guidance, society, and consortium.

#### V. CAUSES OF ACTION

- 40. Defendant DOC had duty to establish adequate policies and procedures to ensure that prisoners with serious medical conditions received timely and appropriate medical care. DOC breached this duty.
- 41. DOC had a duty to adequately train and supervise its staff to ensure that prisoners with serious medical conditions received timely and appropriate medical care. DOC breached this duty.
- 42. Defendant DOC is liable for its systemic negligence and for its employees' failures to exercise reasonable care and to follow the accepted professional standards of care in addressing Mr. Williams' serious health concerns. As a direct and proximate result of these failures, DOC caused Mr. Williams' death and the other damages described in this complaint,

23

22

18

19

20

subjecting Defendant to liability under RCW 7.70.030-040 and the common law tort of negligence.

43. The claims in this lawsuit are brought against DOC by Plaintiff on behalf of the Estate of Kenneth Williams and Mr. Williams' beneficiaries, as authorized under RCW 4.20.010 *et seq*.

# VI. SATISFACTION OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

- 44. In compliance with RCW 4.92.100, Plaintiff submitted a tort claim to the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services, Office of Risk Management on October 5, 2020. Plaintiff's tort claim substantially complied with the requirements of that statute. More than 60 days have elapsed since Plaintiff filed the claim.
- 45. The Plaintiff does not elect to submit this dispute to arbitration pursuant to RCW 7.70A.020. Counsel's declaration confirming this decision is submitted with this complaint.

### VII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff asks this Court to order the following relief:

- 46. All compensatory damages authorized by law to the Estate of Kenneth Williams for the injuries suffered by Mr. Williams as a result of the actions and inactions described in this Complaint and as otherwise learned in the course of discovery.
- 47. All compensatory damages authorized by law to Mr. Williams' surviving beneficiaries for the injuries they suffered as a result of the actions and inactions described in this Complaint and as otherwise learned in the course of discovery.
  - 48. An award of all allowable costs and attorney fees; and
  - 49. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

23

1	Dated this 29th day of April, 2021.
2	BUDGE & HEIPT, PLLC
3	808 E. Roy St. Seattle, WA 98102
4	
5	s/ Hank Balson Hank Balson, WSBA #29250
6	Edwin S. Budge, WSBA #24182  hank@budgeandheipt.com
7	ed@budgeandheipt.com (206) 624-3060 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
8	Attorneys for Flaminis
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	