

1 **CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.**
 2 Glenn A. Danas (SBN 270317)
 3 gdanas@clarksonlawfirm.com
 4 Shireen M. Clarkson (SBN 237882)
 5 sclarkson@clarksonlawfirm.com
 6 Zarrina Ozari (SBN 334443)
 7 zozari@clarksonlawfirm.com
 8 22525 Pacific Coast Highway
 9 Malibu, CA 90265
 10 Tel: (213) 788-4050
 11 Fax: (213) 788-4070

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE**
 14 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15 SUZANNE KISTING-LEUNG and AYESHA
 16 SMILEY, individually and on behalf of all other
 17 similarly situated,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20 CIGNA CORPORATION, CIGNA HEALTH
 21 AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, and
 22 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

23 Defendant.

Case No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1. BREACH OF THE IMPLIED COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING;
2. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW, BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200, *et seq.*;
3. INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS;
4. UNJUST ENRICHMENT.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
 22525 Pacific Coast Highway
 Malibu, CA 90265

1 Plaintiffs Suzanne Kisting-Leung and Ayesha Smiley (“Plaintiffs”), individually and on
2 behalf of all others similarly situated (the “Class”), by and through their attorneys, bring this class
3 action against Defendants Cigna Corporation and Cigna Health and Life Insurance Company, and
4 Does 1-50, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants” or “Cigna”) and allege as follows:

5 **I. INTRODUCTION**

6 1. This action arises from Cigna’s illegal scheme to systematically, wrongfully, and
7 automatically deny its insureds the thorough, individualized physician review of claims guaranteed
8 to them by California law and, ultimately, the payments for necessary medical procedures owed to
9 them under Cigna’s health insurance policies. Cigna is a major medical insurance company in the
10 United States, with approximately 2.1 million members in California.¹ Cigna pledges that the
11 company is “committed to improving the health and vitality” of its members.² In reality, Cigna
12 developed an algorithm known as PXDX that it relies on to enable its doctors to automatically deny
13 payments in batches of hundreds or thousands at a time for treatments that do not match certain pre-
14 set criteria, thereby evading the legally-required individual physician review process.

15 2. Relying on the PXDX system, Cigna’s doctors instantly reject claims on medical
16 grounds without ever opening patient files, leaving thousands of patients effectively without
17 coverage and with unexpected bills. The scope of this problem is massive. For example, over a
18 period of two months in 2022, Cigna doctors denied over 300,000 requests for payments using this
19 method, spending an average of just *1.2 seconds* “reviewing” each request.³

20 3. The PXDX system saves Cigna money by allowing it to deny claims it previously
21 paid and by eliminating the labor costs associated with paying doctors and other employees for the
22 time needed to conduct individualized, manual review for each Cigna insured.

23
24 _____
25 ¹ Based on Cigna’s 18 million members nationwide,
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/985102/medical-customers-of-cigna/>; California Health Care
26 Almanac, <https://www.chcf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/HealthInsurersAlmanac2022.pdf>
(last accessed on July 24, 2023).

27 ² The Cigna Group Company Profile, <https://www.cigna.com/about-us/company-profile/> (last
accessed on July 24, 2023).

28 ³ Patrick Rucker, et al., How Cigna Saves Millions by Having Its Doctors Reject Claims Without
Reading Them, ProPublica, Mar. 25, 2023, [https://www.propublica.org/article/cigna-pxdx-
medical-health-insurance-rejection-claims](https://www.propublica.org/article/cigna-pxdx-medical-health-insurance-rejection-claims) (last accessed on July 20, 2023).

1 4. Cigna also utilizes the PXDX system because it knows it will not be held accountable
2 for wrongful denials. For instance, Cigna knows that only a tiny minority of policyholders (roughly
3 .2%)⁴ will appeal denied claims, and the vast majority will either pay out-of-pocket costs or forgo
4 the at-issue procedure.

5 5. Plaintiffs and members of the alleged Class had their claims rejected by Cigna using
6 the PXDX system. Cigna failed to use reasonable standards in evaluating the individual claims of
7 Plaintiffs and Class members and instead allowed its doctors to sign off on the denials in batches.

8 6. By engaging in this misconduct, Cigna breached its fiduciary duties, including its duty
9 of good faith and fair dealing, because its conduct serves Cigna's own economic self-interest and
10 elevates Cigna's interests above the interests of its insureds.

11 7. By bringing this action, Plaintiffs seek to remedy Cigna's past improper and unlawful
12 conduct by recovering damages to which Plaintiffs and the Class are rightfully entitled and enjoin
13 Cigna from continuing to perpetrate its scheme against its California insureds.

14 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
16 § 1332(d)(2). This is a class action in which there is a diversity of citizenship between at least one
17 Plaintiff Class member and one Defendant; the proposed Classes each exceed one hundred
18 members; and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$5,000,000.00, exclusive of interest and
19 costs.

20 9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391. Defendants regularly
21 conduct business in this District, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims asserted
22 herein occurred in this District. Plaintiff Kisting-Leung is a citizen of California who resides in this
23 District.

24
25
26
27

⁴ Claims Denials and Appeals in ACA Marketplace Plans in 2021, <https://www.kff.org/private-insurance/issue-brief/claims-denials-and-appeals-in-aca-marketplace-plans/> (last accessed on July
28 20, 2023).

1 **III. THE PARTIES**

2 10. Plaintiff Suzanne Kisting-Leung is, and at all times relevant to this action has been, a
3 citizen of California, residing in Placer County. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Plaintiff
4 was covered by a health insurance policy provided by the Cigna Defendants.

5 11. Plaintiff Ayesha Smiley is, and at all times relevant to this action has been, a citizen
6 of California, residing in San Diego County. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was
7 covered by a health insurance policy provided by the Cigna Defendants.

8 12. Defendant Cigna Corporation is a Connecticut corporation headquartered at 900
9 Cottage Grove Road, Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002. Defendant Cigna Corporation conducts
10 insurance operations throughout California, representing to consumers that Cigna and its
11 subsidiaries are a global health service organization. Defendant Cigna Corporation has a license to
12 use the federally registered service mark “Cigna,” markets and issues health insurance and insures,
13 issues, administers, and makes coverage and benefit determinations related to the health care
14 policies nationally through its various wholly owned and controlled subsidiaries, controlled agents
15 and undisclosed principals and agents, including Defendant Cigna Health and Life Insurance
16 Company. Defendant Cigna Corporation is licensed and regulated by the California Department of
17 Insurance (“CDI”) and the California Department of Managed Health Care (“CDMHC”) to transact
18 the business of insurance in the State of California, is in fact, transacting the business of insurance
19 in the State of California, and is thereby subject to the laws and regulations of the State of California.

20 13. Defendant Cigna Health and Life Insurance Company, incorporated in Connecticut,
21 is a wholly owned subsidiary of Defendant Cigna Corporation, with its principal place of business
22 at 900 Cottage Grove Road, Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002. Defendant Cigna Health and Life
23 Insurance Company markets and issues health insurance and insures, issues, administers, and
24 renders coverage and benefit determinations related to the health care policies. Defendant Cigna
25 Health and Life Insurance Company is licensed and regulated by the CDI and the CDMHC to
26 transact the business of insurance in the State of California, is in fact, transacting the business of
27 insurance in the State of California, and is thereby subject to the laws and regulations of the State
28 of California.

1 **IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

2 **A. Background**

3 14. The Cigna Defendants offered and sold health coverage to California consumers,
4 including Plaintiffs and Class members.

5 15. Plaintiffs and Class members enrolled with the Cigna Defendants to receive health
6 insurance coverage. The Cigna Defendants provided Plaintiffs and Class members with written
7 terms explaining the plan coverage Cigna offered them. According to these terms, Cigna must
8 provide benefits for covered health services and pay all reasonable and medically necessary
9 expenses incurred by a covered member.

10 16. From at least July 24, 2019, to the present, thousands of Cigna California insureds,
11 through healthcare providers, submitted bills to Cigna for reasonable and medically necessary
12 expenses covered by their plan terms.

13 17. To determine whether a submitted claim is medically necessary, the Cigna Defendants
14 are required to conduct and diligently pursue a “thorough, fair, and objective” investigation into
15 each bill for medical expenses submitted, per California Insurance Regulations, Cal. Code Regs. tit.
16 10, § 2695.7 (d). This means Cigna’s medical directors must examine patient records, review
17 coverage policies, and use their expertise to decide whether to approve or deny claims to avoid
18 unfair denials.

19 18. The Cigna Defendants have deliberately failed to fulfill their statutory obligation to
20 review individual claims in a “thorough,” “fair,” and “objective” manner, instead denying the claims
21 for medical expenses of its California insureds without conducting *any* investigation, let alone a
22 thorough, fair, or objective investigation.

23 19. The Cigna Defendants utilize the PXDX system, which employs an algorithm to
24 identify discrepancies between diagnoses and what the Cigna Defendants consider acceptable tests
25 and procedures for those ailments and automatically deny claims on those bases. After the PXDX
26 system denies claims, Cigna doctors then sign off on the denials in batches without opening each
27 patient’s files to conduct a more detailed review of, for example, the treatment/procedure at issue
28

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

1 and related injuries, the patient’s prior medical or surgical history, the chronology of medical events,
2 or any ambiguities and complications.

3 20. In violation of California law, the Cigna Defendants wrongfully delegated their
4 obligation to evaluate and investigate claims to the PXDX system, including determining whether
5 medical expenses are reasonable and medically necessary.

6 21. In violation of Cal. Code Regs. tit. 10, § 2695.7 (b)(1), the Cigna Defendants failed to
7 inform their insureds in writing of the decision to deny their claims and failed to provide statements
8 listing all bases for such denial, including factual and legal bases for each reason given for such
9 denial.

10 22. The Cigna Defendants fraudulently misled California insureds into believing that their
11 health plan would individually assess their claims and pay for medically necessary procedures.

12 23. Had Plaintiffs and Class members known that the Cigna Defendants would evade the
13 legally required process for reviewing patient claims and delegate that process to its PXDX
14 algorithm to review and deny claims, they would not have enrolled with Cigna.

15 24. The Cigna Defendants knowingly committed unfair and deceptive acts or practices
16 with a frequency indicating a general practice in violation of California Insurance Code, § 790.03.

17 25. The Cigna Defendants’ review system of California insureds’ claims undermines the
18 principles of fairness and meaningful claim evaluation, which insureds expect from their insurers.

19 **B. Plaintiff Suzanne Kisting-Leung**

20 26. Plaintiff Suzanne Kisting-Leung has been enrolled with Cigna since 2018.

21 27. On August 19, 2022, Ms. Kisting-Leung underwent a transvaginal ultrasound after
22 being referred by her doctor due to a suspected risk of ovarian cancer. The ultrasound results
23 revealed that Ms. Kisting-Leung had a dermoid cyst on her left ovary.

24 28. On or around October 17, 2022, Ms. Kisting-Leung received a letter from radiology
25 informing her that Cigna denied her claim for the ultrasound procedure, stating that the procedure
26 was not medically necessary. As a result, Ms. Kisting-Leung was left responsible for the \$198 bill.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

1 29. According to Cigna’s Medical Coverage Policy, a transvaginal ultrasound is
2 considered “medically necessary for the evaluation of suspected pelvic pathology or for screening
3 or surveillance of a woman at increased risk for ovarian or endometrial cancer.”⁵

4 30. Ms. Kisting-Leung vigorously appealed Cigna’s decision to deny coverage. To date,
5 Cigna has not paid Ms. Kisting-Leung’s claim.

6 31. On November 30, 2022, Ms. Kisting-Leung was referred to and underwent another
7 transvaginal ultrasound. Ms. Kisting-Leung’s procedure was medically necessary as was confirmed
8 by her referring doctor.

9 32. Around December 2022, Ms. Kisting-Leung was informed by her medical provider
10 that Cigna again denied coverage for her claim, stating that the procedure was not medically
11 necessary.

12 33. On May 18, 2023, Ms. Kisting-Leung received a \$525 bill from her medical provider
13 for the second ultrasound.

14 34. Ms. Kisting-Leung immediately appealed Cigna’s decision to deny her claim. To date,
15 Cigna has not paid for Ms. Kisting-Leung’s second claim.

16 35. Upon information and belief, the Cigna Defendants used the PXDX system to
17 “review” and deny Ms. Kisting-Leung’s claims.

18 36. Upon information and belief, the Cigna Defendants failed to have their doctors
19 conduct a thorough, fair, and objective investigation into each of Ms. Kisting-Leung’s claims and
20 instead denied them based on the automated PXDX process.

21 **C. Plaintiff Ayesha Smiley**

22 37. Plaintiff Ayesha Smiley has been enrolled with Cigna since 2020.

23 38. On or around January 2023, Ms. Smiley’s doctor determined that it was medically
24 necessary to check her Vitamin D levels to confirm she had no Vitamin D deficiency. Accordingly,
25 Ms. Smiley’s doctor ordered such a test, which was administered the same month.

26
27
28

⁵ Cigna Medical Coverage Policy, Transvaginal Ultrasound, Non-Obstetrical,
https://static.cigna.com/assets/chcp/pdf/coveragePolicies/medical/mm_0398_coveragepositioncrit_eria_transvaginal_ultrasound.pdf (last accessed on July 24, 2023).

1 39. On or around January “2023, Cigna verbally informed Ms. Smiley that Cigna denied
2 her claim and she was required to pay for the testing out-of-pocket.

3 40. Ms. Smiley did not receive any written correspondence from Cigna explaining the
4 reasons for the denial, as required by Cal. Code Regs. tit. 10, § 2695.7 (b)(1).

5 41. Upon information and belief, the Cigna Defendants used the PXDX system to
6 “review” and deny Ms. Smiley’s claims.

7 42. Upon information and belief, the Cigna Defendants failed to have their doctors
8 diligently pursue a thorough, fair, and objective investigation into Ms. Smiley’s claim.

9 **V. CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

10 43. Plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf of all other persons
11 similarly situated pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Class which
12 Plaintiffs seeks to represent comprises:

13 All persons who had purchased health insurance from Cigna in the State of
14 California during the period of four years prior to the filing of the complaint
15 through the present.

16 The class definition may be further defined or amended by additional pleadings, evidentiary
17 hearings, a class certification hearing, and orders of this Court.

18 44. The Class is so numerous that their individual joinder herein is impracticable. On
19 information and belief, members of the Class number in the hundreds of thousands or millions
20 throughout California. The precise number of Class members and their identities are unknown to
21 Plaintiffs at this time but may be determined through discovery. Class members may be notified of
22 the pendency of this action by mail and/or publication through the distribution records of Defendants
23 and third-party retailers and vendors.

24 45. Common questions of fact and law predominate over questions that may affect
25 individual class members, including the following:

26 a. Whether the Cigna Defendants’ delegation of patient claims review to the
27 PXDX algorithm resulted in its failure to diligently conduct a thorough, fair, and
28 objective investigation into determinations of claims for medical expenses

1 submitted by insureds and/or healthcare providers in violation of Cal. Code Regs.
2 tit. 10, § 2695.7 (d)?

3 b. Whether the Cigna Defendants automatically denied payment for claims
4 submitted by insureds and/or healthcare providers without having a medical director
5 examine patient records, review coverage policies and use their expertise to decide
6 whether to approve or deny claims?

7 c. Whether the Cigna Defendants' denials of claims are based on its use of the
8 PXDX system, which employs an algorithm to identify discrepancies between
9 diagnoses and what the Cigna Defendants consider acceptable tests and procedures
10 for those ailments and automatically deny claims on those bases?

11 d. Whether the Cigna Defendants failed to adopt and implement reasonable
12 standards for the prompt investigation and processing of claims arising under
13 insurance policies?

14 e. Whether the Cigna Defendants have a practice of relying on the PXDX system
15 to review and deny certain claims instead of having medical directors use their
16 expertise to decide whether to approve or deny those claims?

17 46. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class and arise from the same
18 common practice and scheme used by the Cigna Defendants to deny the claims of the members of
19 the Class. In each instance, the Cigna Defendants used the PXDX system to review, process, and
20 deny insured claims without the medical director's review. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately
21 represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiffs have retained competent and experienced
22 counsel in class action and other complex litigation.

23 47. Plaintiffs and the Class members have suffered injury, in fact, and have lost money as
24 a result of Defendants' misconduct. Plaintiffs and the Class had their claims automatically rejected
25 by Cigna using the PXDX system without individualized evaluation of their medical records by
26 Cigna's medical directors.

1 48. A class action is superior to other available methods for fair and efficient adjudication
2 of this controversy. The expense and burden of individual litigation would make it impracticable or
3 impossible for the Class to prosecute their claims individually.

4 49. The trial and litigation of Plaintiffs' claims are manageable. Individual litigation of
5 the legal and factual issues raised by Defendants' conduct would increase delay and expense to all
6 parties and the court system. The class action device presents far fewer management difficulties and
7 provides the benefits of a single, uniform adjudication, economics of scale, and comprehensive
8 supervision by a single court.

9 50. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the entire Class, thereby
10 making final injunctive relief and/or corresponding declaratory relief appropriate with respect to the
11 Class as a whole. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create the
12 risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual Class members that would
13 establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants.

14 51. Absent a class action, Defendants will likely retain the benefits of their wrongdoing.
15 Because of the small size of the individual Class members' claims, few, if any, Class members could
16 afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein. Absent a representative action, the
17 Class will continue to suffer losses and Defendants will be allowed to continue these violations of
18 law and to retain the proceeds of its ill-gotten gains.

19
20 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
21 **Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing**
22 **Against all Defendants**
23 **(On Behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class)**

24 52. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding allegations as though
25 fully set forth herein.

26 53. Plaintiffs and Class members entered into written contracts with the Cigna Defendants
27 and Does 1 through 50, inclusive, which provided for coverage for medical services administered
28 by healthcare providers.

1 54. Pursuant to the contracts, in exchange for insureds' premium payments, the Cigna
2 Defendants and Does 1 through 50, inclusive, implied and covenanted that they would act in good
3 faith and follow the law and the contracts with respect to the prompt and fair payment of Plaintiffs'
4 and Class members' claims.

5 55. The Cigna Defendants and Does 1 through 50, inclusive, have breached their duty of
6 good faith and fair dealing by, among other things:

- 7 a. Improperly delegating their claims review function to the PXDX system, which uses
8 an automated process to improperly deny claims;
- 9 b. Allowing their medical directors to sign off on the denials in batches without
10 reviewing each patient's file;
- 11 c. Failing to have its medical directors conduct a thorough, fair, and objective
12 investigation of each submitted claim, such as examining patient records, reviewing
13 coverage policies, and using their expertise to decide whether to approve or deny
14 claims to avoid unfair denials.

15 56. Defendants' practices as described herein violated their duties to Plaintiffs and Class
16 members under the insurance contracts and California law.

17 57. Defendants' practices as described herein constitute an unreasonable denial of
18 Plaintiffs' and Class members' rights to a thorough, fair, and objective investigation of each of their
19 claims by a doctor and breaches the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing arising from the
20 Cigna Defendants and Does 1 through 50, inclusive, insurance contracts.

21 58. Defendants' practices as described herein further constitute an unreasonable denial to
22 pay benefits due to Plaintiffs and Class members in breach of the implied covenant of good faith
23 and fair dealing arising from the Cigna Defendants and Does 1 through 50, inclusive, insurance
24 contracts.

25 59. The Cigna Defendants and Does 1 through 50, inclusive, wrongful denial of Plaintiffs'
26 and Class members' right to a thorough, fair, and objection investigation and wrongful denial of
27 claims damaged Plaintiff and Class members.
28

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

1 60. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ breaches, Plaintiffs and Class
2 members have suffered and will continue to suffer in the future economic losses, including the
3 benefits owned under the health insurance plans in the millions, the interruption in Plaintiffs’ and
4 Class members’ businesses, and other general, incidental, and consequential damages, in amounts
5 according to proof at trial. Plaintiffs and Class members are also entitled to recover statutory and
6 pre-judgment interest against Defendants and each of them.

7 61. Defendants’ misconduct was committed intentionally, in a malicious, fraudulent,
8 despicable, and oppressive manner, entitling Plaintiff and Class members to punitive damages
9 against Defendants.

10 62. By reason of the conduct of Defendants as alleged herein, Plaintiffs have necessarily
11 retained attorneys to prosecute the present action. Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to reasonable
12 attorney’s fees and litigation expenses, including expert witness fees and costs, incurred in bringing
13 this action.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
Violation of California Unfair Competition Law,
Business & Professions Code Section 17200, et. seq.
Against all Defendants
(On Behalf of All Plaintiffs and the Class)

17 63. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding allegations as though
18 fully set forth herein.

19 64. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section
20 17500, et seq., on their own behalf and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated.

21 65. California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) prohibits “any unlawful, unfair... or
22 fraudulent business act or practice.” Cal. Bus & Prof. Code section 17200, et. seq.

23 66. Under the California Insurance Code, § 790.03(h), the following are classified as
24 unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts or practices in the business of insurance
25 when they are knowingly committed or performed with such frequency as to indicate a general
26 practice:

27 a. “Failing to adopt and implement reasonable standards for the prompt investigation
28 and processing of claims arising under insurance policies.”

1 b. “Not attempting in good faith to effectuate prompt, fair, and equitable settlements of
2 claims in which liability has become reasonably clear.”

3 c. “Failing to provide promptly a reasonable explanation of the basis relied on in the
4 insurance policy, in relation to the facts or applicable law, for the denial of a claim or
5 for the offer of a compromise settlement.”

6 67. Under Cal. Code Regs. tit. 10, § 2695.7 (b)(1) when “an insurer denies or rejects a
7 first party claim, in whole or in part, it shall do so in writing and shall provide to the claimant a
8 statement listing all bases for such rejection or denial and the factual and legal bases for each reason
9 given for such rejection or denial which is then within the insurer’s knowledge. Where an insurer’s
10 denial of a first party claim, in whole or in part, is based on a specific statute, applicable law or
11 policy provision, condition or exclusion, the written denial shall include reference thereto and
12 provide an explanation of the application of the statute, applicable law or provision, condition or
13 exclusion to the claim. Every insurer that denies or rejects a third-party claim, in whole or in part,
14 or disputes liability or damages shall do so in writing.”

15 68. Under Cal. Code Regs. tit. 10, § 2695.7 (d), insurers must “diligently pursue a
16 thorough, fair and objective investigation and shall not persist in seeking information not reasonably
17 required for or material to the resolution of a claim dispute.”

18 69. Under Cal. Code Regs. tit. 10, § 2695.7 (e), in relevant parts, provides that “[n]o
19 insurer shall delay or deny settlement of a first party claim on the basis that responsibility for
20 payment should be assumed by others.”

21 70. **Unlawful Prong:** Defendants’ conduct violates the unlawful prong of § 17200
22 because they violate California’s express statutory and regulatory requirements regarding insurance
23 claims handling pursuant to California Insurance Code § 790.03(h), Cal. Code Regs. tit. 10, §
24 2695.7, and Cal. Health & Saf. Code §1367.01.

25 71. Defendants violated the unlawful prong of § 17200 when they did not attempt in good
26 faith to effectuate prompt, fair, and equitable settlements of claims for Plaintiffs and Class members
27 as required by California Insurance Code § 790.03(h).
28

1 72. Defendants violated the unlawful prong of § 17200 when they failed to implement
2 reasonable standards for the thorough, fair, and objective investigation and processing of claims
3 arising under their policies for Plaintiffs and Class members as required by Cal. Code Regs. tit. 10,
4 § 2695.7 (d).

5 73. Defendants violated the unlawful prong of § 17200 when they failed to notify
6 Plaintiffs and Class members in writing about their rejection or denial of claims and include a
7 statement listing all bases for such rejection or denial and the factual and legal bases for each reason
8 given for such rejection or denial as required by Cal. Code Regs. tit. 10, § 2695.7 (b)(1).

9 74. Defendants violated the unlawful prong of § 17200 when they allowed the PXDX
10 system to review and deny Plaintiffs' and Class members' claims instead of having a licensed
11 physician who is competent to evaluate the specific clinical issues involved in the health care
12 services requested by the provider to deny or modify requests for authorization of health care
13 services for an enrollee for reasons of medical necessity as required by Cal. Health & Saf. Code
14 §1367.01(e).

15 75. Defendants violated the unlawful prong of § 17200 when they failed to communicate
16 to Plaintiffs and Class members in writing their decision to deny Plaintiffs' and Class members'
17 claims and provide a clear and concise explanation of the reasons for the plan's decision, a
18 description of the criteria or guidelines used, and the clinical reasons for the decisions regarding
19 medical necessity, including the information as to how Plaintiffs and Class members may file a
20 grievance with the plan, as required by Cal. Health & Saf. Code §1367.01(h)(4).

21 76. **Unfair Prong:** Defendants' actions violated the unfair prong of § 17200 because the
22 acts and practices set forth above, including Defendants' use of the PXDX system to process and
23 deny claims, rejection of claims in batches without a thorough, fair, and objective investigation
24 offend established public policy and cause harm to consumers that greatly outweighs any benefit
25 associated with those practices. Defendants' actions also violate the unfair prong because they
26 constitute a systematic breach of consumer contracts.

27 77. **Fraudulent Prong:** Defendants have violated the fraudulent business practices prong
28 of § 17200 because their misrepresentations and omission regarding the Cigna insurance policies

1 and Plaintiffs' rights under the policy, including the denial of claims on sham pretenses, were likely
2 to deceive a reasonable consumer, and this information would be material to a reasonable consumer.

3 78. Defendants fraudulently misled Plaintiffs and Class members into believing that their
4 health plans would ensure thorough, fair, and objective investigations by medical professionals into
5 each submitted claim and provide coverage for reasonable and medically necessary procedures.

6 79. Plaintiffs and Class members would not have enrolled with Defendants had they
7 known Defendants failed to diligently pursue a thorough, fair, and objective investigation into each
8 submitted claim.

9 80. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violation of § 17200, Plaintiffs and
10 Class members have been injured in fact and suffered lost money in that Defendants failed to provide
11 benefits owed to their insureds under the insurance policies Defendants issued.

12 81. To date, Defendants continue to violate the Unfair Competition law by breaching their
13 insurance contracts.

14 82. To date, Plaintiffs and Class members are still insured by Defendants.

15 83. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiffs and Class members
16 seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendants from denying benefits owed to Cigna insureds
17 through its scheme involving the PXDX processing system. Without such an order, there is a
18 continuing threat to Plaintiffs and Class members, as well as to members of the general public, that
19 Defendants will continue to systematically deny and reduce benefits to California consumers
20 through its use of the PXDX system.

21 84. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiffs and Class members
22 seek an order of this Court awarding Plaintiffs and Class members restitution of the money
23 wrongfully acquired by Defendants by means of responsibility attached to Defendants' failure to
24 disclose the existence and significance of said misrepresentations in an amount to be determined at
25 trial.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
Intentional Interference with Contractual Relations
Against all Defendants
(On Behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class)

1
2
3 85. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding allegations as though
4 fully set forth herein.

5 86. Plaintiffs and Class members entered into written contracts with Defendants, whereby
6 Defendants were required to pay for Plaintiffs' and Class members' medically necessary services
7 rendered by healthcare providers.

8 87. Defendants were aware that they are bound by contracts under which the Cigna
9 Defendants and Does 1 through 50, inclusive were required to authorize payments for medically
10 necessary services rendered by healthcare providers to Plaintiffs and Class members.

11 88. Defendants knew and understood that Plaintiffs and Class members, by enrolling with
12 Cigna, had entered into such contracts or had reasonable economic expectations.

13 89. Defendants intended to disrupt and interfere with the performance of Plaintiffs' and
14 Class members' contracts by denying payments for medically necessary services without any basis.

15 90. Defendants knew that disruption and interference with the performance of Plaintiffs'
16 and Class members' contracts were certain or substantially certain to occur when Defendants denied
17 payments for medically necessary services without any basis.

18 91. Defendants' interference with Plaintiffs' and Class members' contracts was improper
19 and based on false and misleading representations designed to enhance Cigna's profits through
20 automated batch denial of claims.

21 92. Defendants' business practices and conduct described herein were intended by
22 Defendants to cause injury to Plaintiffs and Class members, or the conduct was despicable conduct
23 carried on by Defendants with a willful and conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiffs and Class
24 members, subjecting Plaintiffs and Class members to cruel and unjust hardship in conscious
25 disregard of their rights.

26 93. Defendants' business practices and conduct did in fact cause injury to Plaintiffs and
27 Class members.
28

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

1 94. Defendants' business practices and conduct were a substantial factor in causing
2 Plaintiffs' and Class members' harm.

3 95. Defendants' misrepresentations, deceit, or concealment of material facts known to
4 Defendants were done with the intent to deprive Plaintiffs and Class members of property, legal
5 rights, or to otherwise cause injury, such as to constitute malice, oppression, or fraud under
6 California Civil Code § 3294, thereby entitling Plaintiffs and Class members to punitive damages.

7 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
8 **Unjust Enrichment**
9 **Against All Defendants**
10 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

11 96. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding allegations as though
12 fully set forth herein.

13 97. By delegating the claims review process to the automated PXDX system, Defendants
14 knowingly charged Plaintiffs and Class members insurance premiums for services that the Cigna
15 Defendants failed to deliver; this was done in a manner that was unfair, unconscionable, and
16 oppressive.

17 98. Defendants knowingly received and retained wrongful benefits and funds from
18 Plaintiffs and Class members. In so doing, Defendants acted with conscious disregard for the rights
19 of Plaintiffs and Class members.

20 99. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged herein, Defendants have been
21 unjustly enriched at the expense of, and to the detriment of, Plaintiffs and Class members.

22 100. Defendants' unjust enrichment is traceable to and resulted directly and proximately
23 from the conduct alleged herein.

24 101. Under the common law doctrine of unjust enrichment, it is inequitable for Defendants
25 to be permitted to retain the benefits they received, without justification, from arbitrarily denying
26 its insureds medical payments owed to them under Cigna's policies in an unfair, unconscionable,
27 and oppressive manner. Defendants' retention of such funds under such circumstances making it
28 inequitable to retain the funds, constitutes unjust enrichment.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

1 102. The financial benefits derived by Defendants rightfully belong to Plaintiffs and Class
2 members. Defendants should be compelled to return in a common fund for the benefit of Plaintiffs
3 and Class members all wrongful or inequitable proceeds received by Defendants.

4 103. Plaintiffs and members of the Class have no adequate remedy at law.

5 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, request
7 that this Court enter an order granting the following relief against Defendants:

- 8 a. Awarding actual damages, statutory damages, exemplary/punitive damages, costs and
- 9 attorneys' fees;
- 10 b. Awarding disgorgement and/or restitution;
- 11 c. Awarding pre-judgment interest to the extent permitted by law;
- 12 d. Appropriate declaratory and injunctive relief enjoining Cigna from continuing its
- 13 improper and unlawful claim handling practices as set forth herein'
- 14 e. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

15 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

16 Plaintiffs demand a jury trial on all triable issues.

17
18 DATED: July 24, 2023

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

19 By: /s/ Glenn A. Danas
20 Glenn A. Danas, Esq.
21 Shireen Clarkson, Esq.
22 Zarrina Ozari, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265