

Handwritten signature and initials

FILED
09 MAY 26 PM 1:37

LEONARD M. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 LYNN S. CARMAN, State Bar 028860
2 Medicaid Defense Fund
3 28 Newport Landing Dr.
4 Novato, CA 94949-82 14
5 Telephone: (4 15) 927-4023
6 Facsimile : (4 15) 499-1687
7 Email: lynns carman@hotmail.com

8 Attorney for Plaintiffs
9 Gray Panthers of San Francisco
10 and Mark Beckwith

E-filing

EMC

Handwritten mark

11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

CV 09 2307

Civil Case No.

13 THE GRAY PANTHERS OF SAN
14 FRANCISCO, a nonprofit corporation,
15 and MARK BECKWITH,
16 Plaintiffs,

17 -vs.-

18 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor
19 of State of California; KIM BELSHE, Secretary
20 of Health and Human Services Agency of the
21 State of California; DAVID MAXWELL-
22 JOLLY, Director of Department of Health Care
23 Services of the State of California; JOHN
24 CHIANG, Controller of State of California;
25 BILL LOCKYER, Treasurer of State of
26 California; and MICHAEL E. GENEST,
27 Director of Finance of the State of
28 California,
29 Defendants. /

**COMPLAINT FOR
INJUNCTIVE AND
DECLARATORY
RELIEF**

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATIVE RELIEF

1 State of California. His duties under the California Constitution are to see that the
2 laws are faithfully executed. He is sued in his official capacity, only.

3 6. The defendant KIM BELSHE ("Secretary") of the Health and Human
4 Services Agency ("Agency") of the State of California. The Agency, by § 12801
5 Govt. Code, is under the supervision of the Secretary, and the Department of Health
6 Care Services is within and subordinate to the Agency.

7 7. (a) The defendant DAVID MAXWELL-JOLLY ("Director") is the
8 director of the Department of Health Care Services ("Department") of the State of
9 California. The Director is exclusively empowered by §§ 14000.1 and 14105
10 California Welfare & Institutions ("WI") Code to set all policies, rules, regulations,
11 and provider payment rates in the state-federal Medicaid program in California,
12 which operates under the Medicaid Act, Social Security Act § 1901 et seq., (42 U.S.C.
13 1396 et seq.).

14 (b) The defendant DAVID MAXWELL-JOLLY is sued in his official
15 capacity, only

16 (c) Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based on such belief allege
17 that the Director has an office in the City and County of San Francisco.

18 8. The defendant JOHN CHIANG is the Controller of the State of
19 California. The Controller, by § 12410 Govt. Code, superintends the fiscal concerns
20 of the State of California. Under California Constitution, article XVI, section 7,
21 money may be drawn from the Treasury of the State only upon the Controller's duly
22 drawn warrant. The Controller is sued in his official capacity, only.

23 9. The defendant BILL LOCKYER is the Treasurer of the State of
24

1 California. Under § 12320 Govt. Code all moneys of the State are received and kept
2 by the Treasurer, and under § 12324 Govt. Code, the Treasurer may only pay out State
3 monies upon warrants drawn by the Controller. The Treasurer is sued in his official
4 capacity, only.

5 10. The defendant MICHAEL E. GENEST is the Director of Finance of the
6 State of California. The Director of Finance is authorized by § 13300 Govt. Code to
7 supervise the accounts of each department of the State, and may, by certain
8 statutes made and provided therefore, veto certain expenditures of the State.

9 **Standing**

10 11. The SF Gray Panthers have a membership of approximately 150, and
11 work in coalition with other groups on senior health, housing, social justice, and
12 war/peace issues. The membership of the SF Gray Panthers is predominantly over the
13 age of 65.

14 12. A primary function and purpose of the SF Gray Panthers is to advocate
15 and advance the health care and the health care rights and civil rights of its members,
16 – most of whom are on Medicare, with approximately 10%, or at least 15, who are
17 beneficiaries of the state-federal funded Medicaid program (called “Medi-Cal” in
18 California), either in the Medi-Cal fee-for-service program or the Medi-Cal managed
19 care program, as the case may be.

20 **Prudential *jus tertii* suit by the plaintiff SF Gray Panthers**

21 12. In each of the Claims for Relief in this Complaint, the plaintiff SF Gray
22 Panthers sue on its own behalf and in a prudential *jus tertii* capacity to assert,
23 respectively, the interests of its respective members who are beneficiaries of the Medi-
24

1 Cal fee-for-service program as well as those of its respective members who are
2 beneficiaries in the Medi-Cal managed care program, to obtain injunctive and
3 declaratory relief from and in respect to injury threatened injury by the State action
4 complained of.

5 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

6 **For injunction against State action, preempted under the Supremacy**
7 **Clause, which threatens injury.**

8 13. Plaintiffs refer to the allegations in each of the preceding Paragraphs
9 and incorporate each of the said allegations as if fully set forth herein.

10 14. As of July 1, 2008 and presently, California's state Medicaid plan which
11 is required by the Medicaid Act, (42 U.S.C. 1396a) to be filed with and approved by
12 the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, (the "State
13 Medicaid plan") included and includes the following benefits and services which are
14 optional and are not mandatory under the Medicaid Act to be provided by a State, in
15 its State Medicaid plan, as a minimum condition for the State to participate in the
16 Medicaid program, and thereby to receive federal funds specified by the Medicaid
17 Act, (called the "federal medical assistance percentage," or "FMAP"), for such
18 participation by the State in the Medicaid program of the Medicaid Act:

- 19 1. Adult dental services, (except medical and surgical services which, if
20 provided by a physician, would be considered physician services),
21 2. Acupuncture services,
22 3. Audiology services,
23 4. Speech therapy services,
24 5. Chiropractic services,
6. Optometric and optician services,
7. Podiatric services,

- 1 8. Psychology services, and,
- 2 9. Incontinence creams and washes,

3 (herein, “the 9 optional services”).

4 15. However, California Welfare & Institutions (“WI”) Code § 14131.10
5 (which statute was enacted and became in effect on March 3, 2009 by California
6 Assembly Bill (“AB”) X3 5, chaptered as Chapter 20, California Statutes 2009-2010),
7 eliminated the 9 optional benefits, effective July 1, 2009.

8 16. However, on February 17, 2009, Congress enacted the American
9 Revoery and Reinvestmant Act of 2009, (Public Law 111-5), (herein, the “Stimulus
10 Act”), in which:

11 - (1) § 5000, subd. (a), provides as follows:

12 “(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are as follows:

13 (1) To provide fiscal relief to States in a period of economic downturn.

14 (2) To protect and maintain State Medicaid programs during a period of
15 economic downturn, including by helping to avert cuts to provider payment
16 rates and benefits or services . . . ”

17
18 - (2) § 5001, subds. (a), (b), (c) provide that the Federal medical
19 assistance percentage (“FMAP”), – as defined in § 1905(b) Social Security Act (42
20 U.S.C. 1396(b), – shall be temporarily increased to 67% for the duration of the period
21 beginning on October 1, 2008 and ending on December 31, 2010, (the “recession
22 adjustment period”); such that thereby the federal government now contributes \$2 to
23

24

1 every \$1 a State expends for health care services (called “medical assistance”) to
2 qualified Medicaid beneficiaries, under the State's Medicaid plan filed with the
3 Secretary of U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, during the recession
4 adjustment period, compared to the FMAP of only \$1 to every \$1 similarly expended
5 by a State before the Stimulus Act was enacted.

6 - (3) § 5001, subd. (f)(1)(A) provides:

7 “STATE INELIGIBILITY; LIMITATION; SPECIAL RULES.—

8 “(f) STATE INELIGIBILITY; LIMITATION; SPECIAL RULES.—

9 (1) MAINTENANCE OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

10 (a) IN GENERAL.— [A] State is not eligible for an increase in
11 its FMAP under subsection (a), (b), or (c), . . . if eligibility standards,
12 methodologies, or **procedures** under its State plan under title XIX of the Social
13 Security Act (including any waiver under such title or under section 1115 of
14 such Act (42 U.S.C. 1315) are more restrictive than the eligibility standards,
15 methodologies, or procedures, respectively under such plan (or waiver) as in
16 effect on July 1, 2008.” (Boldface emphasis supplied.)

17 and,

18 - (4) § 5001, subd. (f)(3) provides:

19 “STATE'S APPLICATION TOWARD RAINY DAY FUND.—A State is not
20 eligible for an increase in its FMAP under subsection (b) or (c) . . . if any
21 amounts attributable (directly or indirectly) to such increase are deposited or
22 credited into any reserve or rainy day fund of the State.”

23 17. The extra federal FMAP amounts paid to states, including California,
24 under the foregoing §§ 5000-5001 of the Stimulus Act are know as “Stimulus funds.”

18. The State of California has elected to receive Stimulus Funds under the
Stimulus Act in respect to its expenditures of State funds pursuant to and under the
State Medicaid plan of the State of California in and by which the State of California

1 participates in the state-federal Medicaid program, under the Medicaid Act.

2 19. However, despite each and all of the provisions of Stimulus Act which
3 are set forth in the prior Paragraph 16 of this Complaint, (namely, § 5000, and subds.
4 (a),(b),(c), and (f)(1)(A), and (f)(3) of the Stimulus Act), each of the defendant State
5 officials has adopted a policy, intends, and will unless restrained by the Court,
6 implement the elimination of the 9 optional Medicaid services (as enacted by the state
7 statute, WI Code § 14131.10, by AB X3 5), by refusing to pay for any of the 9
8 optional Medicaid services which are furnished on or after July 1, 2009, even though
9 **the refusal of the defendants to use any savings to the State from the extra FMAP**
10 **payments to pay for the continuation of the 9 optional Medicaid services:**

11 - (1) violates the express and implied duty, imposed by the State accepting
12 extra FMAP payments for the express purpose under § 5000 of the Stimulus
13 Act of:

14 - enabling the State to protect and maintain its Medicaid program at the
15 same level and inclusions of services as existed on July 1, 2008, and,

16
17 - enabling the State to avert cuts to Medicaid benefits or services;

18
19 - (2) violates the express prohibition of subd. (f)(1)(A) of the Stimulus Act,
20 against restricting “procedures,” (i.e., against restricting services), in the State's
21 Medicaid program to less than were in effect on July 1, 2008; and,

22
23 - (3) violates the express prohibition of subd. (f)(3) of the Stimulus Act not to
24

1 indirectly deposit or credit into any reserve or rainy day fund any amount
2 attributable to the extra FMAP payments, (here, the savings from the extra
3 FMAP funds which sink unidentified into the General Fund of the State of
4 California, for use by the Legislature as a real but unidentified source of funds
5 for non-Medicaid purposes);
6 such that therein and thereby, the policies and actions of each of the defendant State
7 officials which are alleged in this Paragraph 19, constitute and comprise State action
8 which is in violation of, hence preempted, under the Supremacy Clause, by § 5000 and
9 subds. (a),(b) and (c), and subd. (f)(1)(A), and (f)(3) of § 5001 of the Stimulus Act,
10 and defeat and prevent wholly and in substantial part the full accomplishment of the
11 purposes of Congress in enacting these provisions of the Stimulus Act.

12 20. Further, hundreds of thousands of Medi-Cal beneficiaries, including the
13 plaintiff MARK BECKWITH, and the 15 members of the plaintiff SF Gray Panthers
14 who are beneficiaries in the Medi-Cal fee-for-service and managed care programs,
15 will suffer injury and be threatened with injury by reason and cause of the preempted
16 acts of the defendant State officials which are alleged in Paragraph 19, by being
17 denied by defendants and being unable to obtain any of the 9 optional services for:

18 - (1) treatment and cure of, and relief of pain and suffering from, injury,
19 diseases and conditions of their teeth, mouth, jaws, ability to eat, and facial
20 appearance (dentistry); bodily functions and health (acupuncture and
21 chiropractic services); hearing (audiology); speech (speech therapy); sight
22 (optometric and optician services); feet (podiatry); mental health (psychology);
23 and,
24

1 - (2) treatment and relief of pain and suffering from incontinence,
2 (incontinence creams and washes);
3 which injuries are irreparable and inexcusably insufferable in their nature and
4 character.

5 21. Also, the plaintiff SF Gray Panthers will also be irreparable injured by
6 the aforesaid preempted State action of the defendant State officials, from interference
7 with the ability of the SF Gray Panthers to obtain, on behalf of its members, adequate
8 health care, due to the elimination of the aforesaid 9 optional Medicaid services by the
9 defendants.

10 22. Plaintiffs have no plain, speedy, adequate or any relief from the
11 preempted action of the defendant State officials except by the injunctive and
12 declarative relief which is prayed for hereinbelow.

13 23. Plaintiffs have no administrative relief, and any administrative relief
14 which may be available to them is futile.

15 WHEREFORE, each of the plaintiffs respectfully pray for judgment as shall be
16 hereinafter specified:

17 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

18 **For declaratory relief in respect to State action, preempted under the**
19 **Supremacy Clause, which threatens injury**

20 24. Plaintiffs refer to the allegations in each of the preceding Paragraphs
21 and incorporate each of the said allegations as if fully set forth herein.

22 25. Pursuant to each and all of the facts alleged in the preceding Paragraphs
23 of this Complaint, there exists an actual controversy between the plaintiffs and each
24

1 of the defendants, in respect to which the plaintiffs request a declaration of the
2 respective rights and duties of defendants to the plaintiffs, as set forth in the Prayer to
3 this Second Claim for Relief.

4 26. Plaintiffs have no plain, speedy, adequate or any relief from the
5 preempted action of the defendant State officials except by the declarative relief
6 which is prayed for hereinbelow.

7 27. Plaintiffs have no administrative relief, and any administrative relief
8 which may be available to them is futile.

9 WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs respectfully pray for judgment as follows:

10 **On All Claims for Relief:**

11 1. That plaintiffs have judgment against each and all of the defendants, and
12 that the defendants take nothing.

13 **On the First Claim For Relief:**

14 2. That the Court find that MARK BECKWITH, the plaintiff Medi-Cal
15 beneficiary, and the 15 members of the plaintiff GRAY PANTHERS OF SAN
16 FRANCISCO (“SF Gray Panthers”) who are Medicaid beneficiaries, will be injured
17 and are threatened with injury, which is irreparable, from State action by each and all
18 of the defendant State officials which is contrary to, hence preempted under the
19 Supremacy Clause, by a contrary federal statute, (to wit, Section 5000, and subds.
20 (a),(b),(c) and (f)(1)(A) and (f)(3) of Section 5001 of the American Recovery and
21 Reinvestment Act of 2009, (the “Stimulus Act”); and that the plaintiff SF Gray
22 Panthers will also be irreparable injured by the aforesaid preempted State action of the
23 defendant State officials, from interference with the ability of the SF Gray Panthers to
24

1 obtain, on behalf of its members, adequate health care;

2 3. That the defendants and each of them be ordered by a temporary
3 restraining order, preliminary injunction, and permanent injunction, to refrain from
4 implementing California Welfare & Institutions Code § 141131.10, or any provision
5 of Assembly Bill X3 5, (chaptered as Chapter 20, California Statutes 2009-2010),
6 enacted and eff. March 3, 2009, including but not limited to refraining from
7 implementing their policy and policies to eliminate the 9 optional Medicaid services,
8 either on July 1, 2009 or at any other time or times whatsoever or at all; which 9
9 optional Medicaid services are, without limitation thereby:

- 10 1. Adult dental services, (except medical and surgical services which, if
11 provided by a physician, would be considered physician services),
12 2. Acupuncture services,
13 3. Audiology services,
14 4. Speech therapy services,
15 5. Chiropractic services,
16 6. Optometric and optician services,
17 7. Podiatric services,
18 8. Psychology services, and,
19 9. Incontinence creams and washes;

20 or that, in lieu of compliance with the said order, that the defendant State officials
21 notify the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that the
22 State of California (1) will no longer accept any extra FMAP payments under the
23 Stimulus Act, and (2) will return to the federal government all the extra FMAP
24 payments which the State of California has received from the federal government, at a
ratio of \$2 federal money for every \$1 of state money expended to furnish services to
Medi-Cal beneficiaries in the State of California's State Medicaid plan.

