24

25

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

JOHN SMITH,

Plaintiff,

VS.

JANE DOE, individually, JOHN ROE, individually, and ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD, a constitutionally and legally established entity of the State of Arizona,

Defendants.

Case No.:

COMPLAINT FOR DEFAMATION, CIVIL CONSPIRACY, TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP, AND INVASION OF PRIVACY/FALSE LIGHT

PLAINTIFF JOHN SMITH hereby alleges the following complaint against Defendants JANE DOE, JOHN ROE, and ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD, as follows:

#### JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS

- 1. This is an action for damages that is greater than the sum of \$1,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 2. At all times material to this lawsuit, Plaintiff JOHN SMITH ("Plaintiff") was a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona.
- 3. At all times material to this lawsuit, Defendants JANE DOE and JOHN ROE ("Doe/Roe") were residents of Maricopa County Arizona.

- 4. At al times material to this lawsuit, Defendant ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD ("AMB") was a constitutionally and legally established entity of the State of Arizona with its principal offices located in Maricopa County, Arizona.
  - 5. All causes of action set forth below accrued in Maricopa County, Arizona.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 6. In July, 2007, Plaintiff was performing physician medical services in the medical office of Dr. Frank Smith located in Anthem, Arizona.
- 7. During Plaintiff's affiliation with Dr. Smith, Defendant AMB initiated an investigation of Dr. Smith's medical/business practices, and Defendant AMB ultimately revoked Dr. Smith's allopathic physician's license for unprofessional conduct.
- 8. In the course of Defendant AMB's investigation of Dr. Smith, authorized representative(s) of Defendant AMB disseminated multiple public statements on the AMB website and/or to media outlets disparaging Plaintiff as "an unlicensed physician" or "an unlicensed doctor" who performed surgical procedures in Dr. Smith's office. Defendant AMB continued to issue such public statements from July, 2007 until January, 2008.
- 9. In reality, at all times material to this lawsuit, Plaintiff held unrestricted allopathic physician's licenses from the State of California and the State of Utah, and an unrestricted homeopathic physician's license from the State of Arizona.

- 15. Defendants' subject statements were intentional and unprivileged.
- 16. Defendants' subject statements were intentionally and knowingly disseminated/published to numerous third parties for the purpose of harming Plaintiff's professional and personal reputation.
- 17. As a proximate result of Defendants' intentional and malicious publication of the subject statements, Plaintiff has suffered compensable monetary injury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks a judgment for compensatory damages against all Defendants, a judgment for punitive damages against Defendants Doe/Roe, and the costs of this action.

# COUNT TWO (Invasion of Privacy/False Light – all Defendants)

Plaintiff realleges all allegations set forth in Paragraphs One (1) through Thirteen (13) as though fully rewritten herein.

- 18. Defendants' dissemination of the subject statements constitutes giving publicity to a factual matter concerning Plaintiff that placed Plaintiff before the public in a false light for the purpose of causing Plaintiff economic and emotional injury.
- 19. The false light in which Plaintiff was placed alleging that Plaintiff performed surgical procedures without the proper licensure is highly offensive to a reasonable person.

- 20. Defendants had knowledge of or acted in reckless disregard as to the falsity of the publicized matter and the false light in which Plaintiff would be placed.
- 21. As a proximate result of Defendants' intentional and malicious dissemination of the subject statements, Plaintiff has suffered compensable monetary injury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks a judgment for compensatory damages against all Defendants, a judgment for punitive damages against Defendants Doe/Roe, and the costs of this action.

#### **COUNT THREE**

## (Tortious Interference with Contractual Relationship – Defendants Doe/Roe)

Plaintiff realleges all allegations set forth in Paragraphs One (1) through Thirteen (13) as though fully rewritten herein.

- 22. Plaintiff's business relationship with Acme constituted a valid contractual relationship or business expectancy.
- 23. Defendants Doe/Roe had specific knowledge of Plaintiff's contractual relationship or business expectancy with Acme.
- 24. Defendants Doe/Roe's dissemination of the subject statements to representative(s) of Acme constitutes an intentional and malicious interference with Plaintiff's contractual relationship or business expectancy with Acme for the specific

purpose of inducing or causing a breach or termination of said contractual relationship or business expectancy.

- 25. Defendants Doe/Roe acted with improper and malicious motive when interfering with Plaintiff's contractual relationship or business expectancy with Acme.
- 26. As a proximate result of Defendants Doe/Roe's intentional and malicious interference, Plaintiff suffered compensable monetary injury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks a judgment for compensatory and punitive damages against Defendants Doe/Roe, and the costs of this action.

### COUNT FOUR (Civil Conspiracy – Defendants Doe/Roe)

Plaintiff realleges all allegations set forth in Paragraphs One (1) through Thirteen (13) as though fully rewritten herein.

- 27. Defendants Doe/Roe formed an agreement to accomplish an unlawful purpose, *to wit*, to injure Plaintiff's professional and personal reputation and effect the termination of Plaintiff's business relationship with Acme.
- 28. In furtherance of this agreement, Defendants Doe/Roe, acting in concert, engaged in intentional tortious conduct directed at Plaintiff by disseminating the subject statements to representative(s) of Acme.

1	29. As a proximate result of Defendants Doe/Roe's conspiracy to injure Plaintiff
2	Plaintiff has suffered compensable monetary injury.
3	
4	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks a judgment for compensatory and punitive damages
5	against Defendants Doe/Roe, and the costs of this action.
6	
7	DATED this day of, 20
8	
9	
10	
11	John Smith
12	0000 E Main St. Pankan, AZ 00000
13	Tel: 000-000-0000
14	Fax: 000-000-0000
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	