

450004-0019

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION 2013 JUL 18 PM 3: 11

MUTHY BROWN	
GF CIRCUIT COURT	
CAN DIAISIBI	FILED
)	N/
)	JUL 1 8 2013
)	7.00
) No 00 I 1	Anderson, Rasor & Partners, LLF
) 10.091.1	3202(D)
)	9
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	Tild Control of the C
)	
)	
	OF CIRCUIT COURT OF CIRCUIT COURT No. 09 L 1 OF CIRCUIT COURT

RUSH-COPLEY MEDICAL CENTER'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW

NOW COMES the defendant, RUSH-COPLEY MEDICAL CENTER, (hereinafter "RCMC") by and through its attorneys, ANDERSON, RASOR & PARTNERS, LLP, and in answer to Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint at Law, states as follows:

RECITAL

- 1. Defendant admits only that it was an Illinois corporation in Kane County at the time alleged. Defendant denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 1.
- 2. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 based upon information and belief.
- 3. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 3.

- 4. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 4.
- 5. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 based upon information and belief.
- 6. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 6.
 - 7. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 7.
 - 8. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 8.
 - 9. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 9.
- 10. Defendant admits that at the time stated, Dahlia was transported to an operating room to undergo a procedure to ligate the patent ductus arteriosus (PDA).
- 11. Defendant admits that Dr. Pillai was the surgeon who began the procedure at the time alleged.
 - 12. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 12.
- 13. Defendant admits only that certain nursing duties were handled by Nurse Lloyd and denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 13.
- 14. Defendant admits that on the date alleged, after the administration of anesthesia had begun, Dahlia was injured by a fire in the Operating Room.
 - 15. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 15.

COUNT I RUSH-COPLEY MEDICAL CENTER

16. Defendant adopts and restates its answers to Paragraphs 1 through 15 of Plaintiffs'

Second Amended Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

- 17. Defendant objects to allegations calling for a legal conclusion. Notwithstanding said objection, defendant admits only that Nurse Lloyd was an employee of RCMC at the time alleged and denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of Count I.
 - 18. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 18 of Count I.
 - 19. Defendant denies the allegations as stated in Paragraph 19 of Count I.
 - 20. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 20 of Count I.
- 21. Defendant admits only that duty imposed by Illinois law and denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 21 of Count I.
- 22. Defendant admits only that duty imposed by Illinois law and denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of Count I.
 - 23. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of Count I.
 - 24. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 24 of Count I.
- 25. Defendant admits only that duty imposed by Illinois law and denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of Count I.
- 26. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 26 of Count I and more specifically denies each and every allegation of subparagraphs (a) through (i).
 - 27. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 27 of Count I.

<u>COUNT II</u> SRIKUMAR PILLAI, M.D.

The allegations set forth in Count II of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint at Law are not directed toward this defendant, therefore, this defendant makes no answer hereto. To the

extent that the allegations contained in Count II can be construed as being directed toward this defendant, those allegations are denied.

COUNT III BONAVENTURE MEDICAL FOUNDATION, L.L.C.

The allegations set forth in Count III of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint at Law are not directed toward this defendant, therefore, this defendant makes no answer hereto. To the extent that the allegations contained in Count III can be construed as being directed toward this defendant, those allegations are denied.

COUNT IV ALEXIAN BROTHERS AMBULATORY GROUP

The allegations set forth in Count IV of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint at Law are not directed toward this defendant, therefore, this defendant makes no answer hereto. To the extent that the allegations contained in Count IV can be construed as being directed toward this defendant, those allegations are denied.

COUNT V WAYNE PHAM, M.D.

The allegations set forth in Count V of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint at Law are not directed toward this defendant, therefore, this defendant makes no answer hereto. To the extent that the allegations contained in Count V can be construed as being directed toward this defendant, those allegations are denied.

COUNT VI GUARDIAN ANESTHESIA ASSOCIATES, S.C.

The allegations set forth in Count VI of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint at Law are not directed toward this defendant, therefore, this defendant makes no answer hereto. To the

extent that the allegations contained in Count VI can be construed as being directed toward this defendant, those allegations are denied.

COUNT VII KIMBERLY LLOYD, R.N.

The allegations set forth in Count VII of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint at Law are not directed toward this defendant, therefore, this defendant makes no answer hereto. To the extent that the allegations contained in Count VII can be construed as being directed toward this defendant, those allegations are denied.

COUNT VIII

- 67. Defendant adopts and restates its answers to Paragraphs 1 through 66 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
 - 68. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 68 of Count VIII.
 - 69. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 69. of Count VIII.

COUNT IX FAMILY EXPENSE ACT

- 70. Defendant adopts and restates its answers to Paragraphs 1 through 69 of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 71. Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 71 of Count IX.
- 72. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 72 of Count IX.

WHEREFORE, the defendant, RUSH-COPLEY MEDICAL CENTER, denies that plaintiffs are entitled to judgment in the sum alleged or any sum whatsoever and prays that this action be dismissed with costs.

Respectfully submitted,

One of the Attorneys for Defendant

RUSH-COPLEY MEDICAL CENTER

R. Dennis Rasor Michele C. Anderson Amy L. Pleuss ANDERSON, RASOR & PARTNERS, LLP 100 S. Wacker Drive, 10th Floor Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 673-7800 Firm I.D. #41529

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned, a non-attorney, on oath state that I caused a copy of the foregoing RUSH-COPLEY MEDICAL CENTER'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW to be served upon:

William A. Cirignani
Cirignani, Heller & Harman, LLP
150 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2600
Chicago, IL 60606
wac@medsuit.com
daa@medsuit.com
amber@medsuit.com

Spyridon J. Demakis Cunningham Meyer & Vedrine, P.C. One East Wacker Drive, Suite 2200 Chicago, IL 60601

David C. Hall Mike Koptik Hall Prangle & Schoonveld, LLC 200 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3300 Chicago, IL 60606

via electronic mail to plaintiff's counsel and mailing a true copy thereof in a first class, postage prepaid envelope and depositing said envelope(s) in the U.S. Mail chute located at 100 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois, to co-counsel before the hour of 5:00 p.m. on July 18, 2013.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of July, 2013.

NOTARY PUBLIC

OFFICIAL SEAL

NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF ILLINOIS MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JULY 23, 2016