FO	OR THE	DIS				
NAME OF DIAINTIE			DIVISION			
NAME OF PLAINTIFI	-					
•	V.)	NO.			_
NAME OF DEFENDA	NT)))				
	JUI	RY TRIAL DI	EMANDED			
		COMPLA	INT			
This is an act public policy, breach Court the following fa		d malicious in				
		I.				
Plaintiff, H	is address is	, is an a	dult resident •	citizen of	the stat	e of
Defendant, and state of incorpora its registered agent,		, an	d may be served	its principle placess	place of bu by service	siness upon
ar	nd may be ser	ved with pro	cess by servic	e upon him	at his pla	ace of
		II.				
This Court has of the state of of business and s ir	tate of incorp	not of	De	efendant has it	ts principle	place
		Ill.				

Defendant, _____, under the employment contract attached hereto as Exhibit "A", employed plaintiff.

IV.

On, Defendant advised Plaintiff, by letter, of termination of his contract effective See letter attached hereto as Exhibit B.
V.
On, Defendant removed Plaintiff from the clinic and declined to allow him to see patients any further. See letter attached hereto as Exhibit "C."
VI.
Defendant,, was guilty of breach of contract in its termination of Plaintiff. Specifically, the contract with Plaintiff states, in paragraph 4(b):
Employer and employee acknowledge and agree that employee has the sole responsibility and authority to direct and perform the medical, professional, and ethical aspects of employee's medical practice and employee agrees that employee has the sole responsibility to obey laws and regulations as they pertain to employees' practice of medicine.
Defendant,
VII.
While Plaintiff recognizes that contract clause 5a.v. allows termination upon ninety days notice, this provision must be read in light of paragraph 4(b) which disallows termination when it would be for reasons interfering with Plaintiff's ability to have the "sole responsibility" and authority to direct and perform the medical, professional, and ethical aspects of Plaintiff's medical practice. For a description of the ways Defendants so acted to interfere with Plaintiff's sole responsibility for conducting his practice, see paragraph X, A,B,C and paragraph XI.
VIII.
Terminating Plaintiff before the end of the contract for reasons based upon the refusal of Defendant,, to allow Plaintiff to "perform the medical, professional, and ethical aspects of employee's medical practice" was a breach of contract entitling Plaintiff to

damages for lost income in the amount he would have earned from the date he was improperly removed from the medical practice until the termination date of the contract which was through						
IX.						
Defendant,						
X.						
Additionally, Plaintiff's termination violated the public policy of the state of and represented a refusal of Defendant,, to carry out its contractual obligation with Plaintiff in good faith. Specifically, Defendant violated public policy and failed to carry out its contractual obligation in good faith by terminating Plaintiff because he insisted upon proper medical care for his patients, rather than basing medical decisions solely upon maximization of income. Plaintiff insisted upon refraining from practices which jeopardize the patients' interest, such as excessive prescriptions of pain medications, including narcotics, and insisted upon taking those steps that were in the best medical interest of the patient, notwithstanding that this would not necessarily maximize income for the clinic. Specific examples of occurrences which proximately resulted in Plaintiff's discharge and which constitutes interference in Plaintiff's sole responsibility to conduct his practice are:						
A. A patient,, desired Plaintiff to continue narcotics treatment, which had been prescribed by another physician. Plaintiff declined to prescribe further narcotics for this treatment because it was not medically indicated and this further prescription would be in violation of medical ethics and would not be in the best interest of the patient. The patient, who was not a physician, became angry at Plaintiff and refused referral to physical therapy, which was medically indicated. Agents of Defendant desired that Plaintiff give the patient whatever would "please her," so as to assure that she remain a patient of Defendant,, since this would tend to maximize the income of Defendant and would hold down patient complaints.						
B. A patient,, desired to obtain medication from Plaintiff, which, in Plaintiff's opinion, was not medically indicated. It was Plaintiff's opinion, based upon his						

medical experience and his training as a rheumatologist, that the patient should be examined by a psychologist. If Defendant,, was upset about Plaintiff's failure to please, and desired that the patient be "pleased," so that she would remain a patient,
even though it was in the patient's best medical interest not to be treated by medication, but to
obtain a psychological examination.
C. A patient,, became distressed at Plaintiff because he recommended
psychological counseling for the patient, and delayed agreeing to assist in
obtaining her social security disability, in lieu of psychological treatment designed to alleviate her symptoms. Defendant,, desired that Plaintiff please, so
as to keep her as a patient, rather than afford the medical advice, which Plaintiff believed was
medically indicated. Referring, or other patients, for psychological treatment
generates no income for Defendant,, since, does not
employ a psychologist or psychiatrist.
It is, thus, in the financial interest of Defendant,, to retain patients through prescribing medications, rather than referring them for needed psychological or psychiatric treatment, or physical therapy services, which are not provided by Defendant,
Xl.
Defendant,, and particularly, Defendant, became
angry with Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's reluctance to retain a hospital patient by in lieu of transferring this patient to a psychiatrist, which would be in the best
interest of the patient, but would not be in the best interest of Defendant,, and
its desires to maximize income. Defendants were distressed at Plaintiff because of his hesitancy
to see this suicidal patient in lieu of transferring the patient to the psychiatric service. The
specific anger of Defendants over this patient, who had produced probable evidence that she ingested rat poison, was Plaintiff's hesitancy to see this patient over a weekend rather than attend
to this patient's immediate needs by seeing that the patient was transferred to the psychiatric
service. Defendants desired that Plaintiff continue to see this patient and delay the need that the
patient be transferred to the Behavioral Medicine Unit, for which Defendant,,
would receive no income.
7/II
XII.
In summary, Plaintiff's discharge was caused by Plaintiff's recommendations that certain
patients obtain services from entities other than Defendant,, including
psychiatric and psychological treatment and physical therapy in lieu of treatment by medication,
which was the service that Defendant,, provided. Plaintiff's advice in this regard was consistent with the public policy, which is to minimize the
regard was consistent with the public policy, which is to minimize the
excessive use of narcotics and consistent with the contract and public policy that patients be
treated in the manner which the physician deems medically indicated, whether or not such treatment would maximize income of the physician.

Defendant	_ is a	rheumatologist	employed by	Defendant,
, as Plaintiff wa				
medical practice differed from Pla				
should be "kept happy," and not re				
for them, especially within the				
's philosophy th	-	3		
income of Defendant,				
practice with an emphasis mostly of				
the medical practice in a manner, not maximize the income of Defen			of the patient, ev	zen n uns aid
not maximize the income of Defen	.uaiit,	•		
	Σ	KIV.		
Defendant	and Plair	ntiff had numerous	s disagreements b	ased upon the
essential differences between then				
became so dist	ressed durin	g these disagreeme	ents that he notifi	ed Defendant,
, that he or Pla	aintiff would	d have to be disc	harged. Thereafte	er, Defendant,
, determined to				
more lucrative to them than was				al philosophy
resulted in maximization of incom	e to Defenda	nt,	·	
	2	XV.		
Defendant	of malicious, and res. Defenda I represented tole for actua	reasons arising fr desire to maximizent ant a malicious interf al and punitive d	om his desires to ze income, rather's actions in erence with contra	maximize the than referring insisting that act and render
	Σ	ζVI.		
Plaintiff has suffered lost result of his discharge.	income, me	ental anxiety and	stress and embar	rassment as a
	X	IVII.		
Defendant contract and Defendant, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff to infringing upon patient's choice in	, i	s liable to Plainting for bad faith and for	ff for breach of o	contract. Both

PRAYER

Plaintiff prays for actual and punitive damages in an amount to be determined by a jury and for reasonable attorney's fees.

Respectfully submitted,