Clerk of the Superior Court
*** Electronically Filed ***
M. Owen, Deputy
1/13/2025 3:36:01 PM
Filing ID 19156523

Michael S. Burg (#031437)
David K. TeSelle (#032057)
Holly B. Kammerer (#032600)
Joshua A. Abromovitz (#038401)
Rachel N. Denning (#032172)
Eduardo R. Parra (#036633)
BURG SIMPSONELDREDGE HERSH & JARDINE, P.C.
2390 East Camelback Rd., Suite 403
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
Phone: (602) 777-7000
Fax: (602) 777-7008
azcourt@burgsimpson.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Richard D. Meadow (#037370)
Ashley C. Crowell (#027286)
Julia B. Gordon (#038171)
THE MEADOW LAW FIRM LLC
2390 East Camelback Rd., Suite 403
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
Phone: (480) 790-9206
Fax: (480) 930-4482
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

A.B., an individual; A.H., an individual; A.S., an individual; C.C., an individual; E.G., an individual; E.M., an individual; F.T., an individual; G.C., an individual; H.G., an individual, M.C., an individual; M.E., an individual; N.M., an individual; and T.F., an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MINGUS MOUNTAIN ACADEMY, a domestic nonprofit corporation; MINGUS MOUNTAIN ESTATE RESIDENTIAL CENTER, INC, a domestic nonprofit

Case No. CV2025-001537

COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

(Tort Negligence; Respondeat Superior; False Imprisonment; Assault; Battery; Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress; Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress; Negligent Hiring, Training, Supervision and Retention; and Punitive Damages; Tier 3)

corporation; VIVANT BEHAVIORAL HEALTHCARE, LLC, a foreign limited liability company; SEQUEL YOUTH AND FAMILY SERVICES, LLC, a foreign limited liability company; SEQUEL CARE OF ARIZONA LLC, a domestic limited liability company; SEQUEL YOUTH SERVICES OF ARIZONA, LLC, a domestic limited liability company; JOHN "JAY" RIPLEY and JANE DOE RIPLEY, a married couple; ADAM HARDIN and JANE DOE HARDIN, a married couple; JOHN and JANE DOES I-X; ABC COMPANIES I-X; and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS I-X;

Defendants.

Plaintiffs, by and through their attorneys undersigned, and for their Complaint against Defendants Mingus Mountain Academy, Mingus Mountain Estate Residential Center, Inc., Vivant Behavioral Healthcare, LLC, Sequel Youth and Family Services, LLC, Sequel Care of Arizona, LLC, Sequel Youth Services of Arizona, LLC, John "Jay" Ripley and Adam Hardin individually, (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Defendants") allege as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. The mental and psychological health of America's youth is in crisis. Never before in this Country's history have we faced the astoundingly high prevalence of mental

health issues that today's youth are experiencing. Nearly 20% of children ages 3-17 in the United States suffer from a mental, emotional, developmental, or behavioral disorder.[1]

2. One particular class of youth, minor American females, have proven to be particularly vulnerable to suffering from mental health issues. Many times, these complications also result in perceived behavioral issues and/or manifest into substance abuse.

3. One of the only safeguards to protect youth suffering from mental health, behavioral, or substance abuse issues are facilities created to foster growth and recovery for those suffering. Unfortunately, the guise of a behavioral health center ("BHC") also creates a harbor for harmful and nefarious activity, including the violent sexual assault of the very individuals seeking the facility's treatment.

4. These BHC's are not prisons nor detention centers. Their primary purpose is not to punish, but to treat young adolescents' mental health disorders. However, in many – if not all – cases these young adolescents are not free to leave of their own will. These young adolescents are at the will of the individuals who run these facilities and rely on the facilities to harbor a safe environment for them to receive treatment for their mental health disorders.

5. According to the American Journal of Preventative Medicine, one in four girls in the United States have been sexually abused by the age of 18.[2] The violent and intrusive

[1] *2022 National Healthcare Quality and Disparities Report*, AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY, (October 2022), https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK587174/

[2] *Teenagers & Sexual Violence,* NATIONAL SEXUAL VIOLENCE RESOURCE CENTER, (2018), https://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications/2019-02/Teenagers_508.pdf

nature of sexual assault results in life-lasting trauma and psychological harm that continue throughout the survivor's lifespan.

6. The prevalence of sexual assaults occurring in youth behavioral health and juvenile residential treatment centers is well-documented and continues to pose a significant threat to the health and welfare of those children seeking treatment.[3] [4]

7. Sadly, most abusers face no legal action and are permitted to continue assaulting children.[5]

8. Arizona is not immune from these predatory abusers who prey upon children at behavioral health and juvenile residential treatment centers.

9. Defendant Mingus Mountain Academy ("MMA") is a private, all-girls alternative high school which also serves as a Behavioral Treatment Center licensed by the Arizona Department of Health Services ("AZDHS").

10. MMA is owned and operated by Defendants Mingus Mountain Estate Residential Center, Inc. ("MMERC"), Sequel Youth and Family Services, LLC ("SYFS"), Sequel Care of Arizona, LLC ("SCA"), Sequel Youth Services of Arizona, LLC ("SYSA"), and Vivant Behavioral Healthcare, LLC ("VBH"). These entities treat adolescents suffering from mental and behavioral health disorders in numerous facilities throughout the country.

---

[3] JJIE Staff, *Federal bureau releases new data on reported sexual assault and harassment in juvenile facilities*, JUVENILE JUSTICE INFORMATION EXCHANGE, (April 13, 2023), https://jjie.org/2023/04/13/federal-bureau-releases-new-data-on-reported-sexual-assault-and-harassment-in-juvenile-facilities/

[4] Erica L. Smith and Jessica Stroop, *Sexual Victimization Reported by Youth in Juvenile Facilities 2018*, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, (December 2019), https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/sexual-victimization-reported-youth-juvenile-facilities-2018

[5] Tami Abdollah, *Juvenile detention staff who sexually victimized children face few legal sanctions, study says*, USA TODAY, (April 1, 2023), https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2023/04/01/most-juvenile-detention-staff-who-abused-children-faced-no-legal-action/11571406002/

11. Defendant SYFS is a private, for-profit operator of over 40 behavioral healthcare facilities throughout the country including residential treatment centers, group homes, special schools, and community-based programs. In September 2021, SYFS founder Jay Ripley formed Vivant Behavioral Healthcare, purportedly to "buy a majority of the businesses of [SYFS]."[6]

12. SYFS and its affiliates have a long history of being tied to rampant reports of sexual abuse, sexual assault, sexual battery, and physical violence including death at their facilities.

13. In 2019, Sequel closed Mount Pleasant Academy and Red Rock Canyon School, which were both located in St. George, Utah, after reports of sexual abuse and a violent riot at the Red Rock Canyon facility. Subsequently, 10 members of the Red Rock Canyon Staff were charged with child abuse.[7]

14. In April of 2020, a 16-year-old was killed by staff at Lakeside Academy, a Sequel facility in Kalamazoo, Michigan, which lost its license to operate and closed after investigation into the death.[8]

15. In January of 2021, the State of Illinois launched an investigation into Sequel's Northern Illinois Academy ("NIA"), after a staff member was sentenced to prison for ten years for sexually assaulting a child who was residing in the facility and after an

---

[6] Bennett Haeberle, *Sequel Pomegranate closes as advocates, Paris Hilton call for charge in 'troubled teen industry',* 10 WBNS, (October 21, 2021), https://www.10tv.com/article/news/investigations/10-investigates/sequel-pomegranate-closes-advocates-paris-hilton-call-change-troubled-teen-industry/530-540a17cc-22fb-42e7-9227-0d529507b04c

[7] Jessica Miller Schreifels, *Embattled company to close a second Utah treatment center for troubled teens*, THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE, (July 15, 2019), https://www.sltrib.com/news/2019/07/15/embattled-company-close/

[8] https://www.mlive.com/news/kalamazoo/2021/04/closed-kalamazoo-youth-home-where-teen-died-is-focus-of-msnbc-special.html

administrative report documented physical, sexual, and emotional abuse of children. The report resulted in the State classifying NIA as "non-approved" and transitioning all children out of the facility. [9]

16. In February of 2021, SYFS closed the Clarinda Academy in Iowa after the school, which operated under a contract with the Iowa Department of Human Services, was implicated and faced charges of rape, beatings, and indefinite use of solitary confinement of children.[10]

17. In March of 2021, a staff member of Falcon Ridge Academy in Virgin, Utah, (a school specifically designed to help girls suffering from sexual trauma), was arrested on charges of sexual battery and showing pornography to minors.[11]

18. Unfortunately, the above examples represent a small subset of a much larger number of recent infractions that have occurred in numerous Sequel facilities.

19. Largely due to Sequel's repeated failures and abuses, both the states of Oregon and California chose to bring home all the foster children it sent out-of-state to Sequel facilities, in 2019 and 2021, respectively.[12]

---

[9] *Administration to Transition Students Out of Northern Illinois Academy Following Findings of State-Commissioned Equip for Equality Report*, ILLINOIS.GOV, (May 14, 2021), https://www.illinois.gov/news/press-release.23312.html

[10] Andrea May Sahouri, *Clarinda Academy closing after years of alleged abuse, sexual assault of teens*, DES MOINES REGISTER, (February 5, 2021), https://www.desmoinesregister.com/story/news/2021/02/05/clarinda-academy-iowa-closing-after-years-alleged-abuse-sexual-assault-teens/4414216001/

[11] Kaityln Bancroft, *Employee at teen behavior facility arrested for sexual battery, showing porn to minors*, THE SPECTRUM, (March 11, 2021), https://www.thespectrum.com/story/news/2021/03/11/teen-facility-employee-arrested-sexual-battery-porn-minors/4658486001/

[12] Justin Ray, *Child abuse investigation leads to law banning faraway treatment programs*, LOS ANGELES TIMES, (July 29, 2021), https://www.latimes.com/california/newsletter/2021-07-29/children-california-treatment-sequel-cornelius-fredericks-essential-california

20. Defendant MMA's purported mission is "to provide a safe, healthy, therapeutic environment where clients can achieve hope and healing on their journey to living a healthier emotional and physical lifestyle." However, instead of fostering an environment for growth and recovery, MMA was more akin to a virtual prison and a venue for employee-abusers to repeatedly violate, rape, abuse, and sexually assault the same minor female residents they were charged with keeping safe.

21. Defendants, by and through both negligent and intentional practices, created an unescapable nightmare for the minor female residents attending MMA.

22. From 2011 through present, Plaintiffs experienced unspeakable horrors from staff members ranging from false imprisonment, sexual assault, and sexual abuse to forcible rape and other violent and intentional acts which have irreparably harmed Plaintiffs.

23. As a result of the failures of all Defendants, Plaintiffs suffered irreparable and significant physical, emotional and psychological damage as they were repeatedly abused, assaulted, and violated by staff members of MMA.

24. This action is filed pursuant to Arizona Revised Statute § 12-514, which provides survivors of childhood sexual abuse a period of twelve (12) years after attaining eighteen (18) years of age in which to commence an action for damages. All Plaintiffs bringing claims here are subject to A.R.S. § 12-514 as all claims fall within the 12-year period provided. Plaintiffs' claims are therefore not barred by any statute of limitations.

THE PARTIES

25. Plaintiff A.B. is a resident of Pima County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff A.B. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or

emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

26. Plaintiff A.H. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff A.H. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

27. Plaintiff A.S. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff A.S. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

28. Plaintiff C.C. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff C.C. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

29. Plaintiff E.G. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff E.G. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

30. Plaintiff E.M. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff E.M. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

31. Plaintiff F.T. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff F.T. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

32. Plaintiff G.C. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff G.C. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

33. Plaintiff H.G. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff H.G. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

34. Plaintiff M.C. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff M.C. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

35. Plaintiff M.E. is a resident of Mohave County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff M.E. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

36. Plaintiff N.M. is a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff N.M. was a minor and resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or

emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

37. Plaintiff T.F. is a resident of Pima County, Arizona. At the time of abuse, Plaintiff T.F. was a minor and a resident at the MMA facility. The physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse that took place at MMA occurred under the supervision of Defendants and the acts that led to this Complaint all occurred within the State of Arizona.

38. Defendant Mingus Mountain Academy ("MMA") is a domestic corporation with its principal place of business located in Yavapai County, Arizona, located at 15801 E. Don Carlos Dr., Prescott Valley, Arizona 86315, the location at which the alleged negligent, intentional, and tortious acts took place. Defendant MMA may be served via its statutory agent, William Don Carlos, at 13802 W. Meeker Blvd., Sun City West, Arizona 85375.

39. Defendant Mingus Mountain Estate Residential Center, Inc. ("MMERC") is a domestic corporation and subsidiary of Defendant VBH, conducting business in Yavapai County, Arizona, located at 15801 E. Don Carlos Dr., Prescott Valley, Arizona 86315. Defendant MMERC owns, directs, and/or is responsible for the operation, safety and maintenance of the MMA facility, as well as the supervision of employees and agents of Defendant MMA, the location at which the alleged negligent, intentional, and tortious acts took place. Defendant MMERC may be served via its statutory agent, the Forakis Law Firm, located at 346 E. Palm Lane, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

40. Defendant Vivant Behavioral Healthcare LLC ("VBH") is a foreign corporation based in Loudoun County, Virgina, located at 15201 Highview Court, Waterford, Virginia 20197, and conducting business in Yavapai County, Arizona, the

location of where the alleged abuse took place. Defendant VBH owns, directs, and/or is responsible for the operation, safety and maintenance of the MMA facility, as well as the supervision of employees and agents of Defendant MMA, the location at which the alleged negligent, intentional, and tortious acts took place. Defendant VBH may be served via its statutory agent, Corporation Service Company, located at 8825 N. 23rd Avenue, Ste. 100, Phoenix, Arizona 85021.

41. Defendant Sequel Youth and Family Services ("SYFS") is a foreign corporation domiciled in Madison County, Alabama, located at 1131 Eagletree Lane SW, Suite 300, Huntsville, Alabama 35801, and conducting business in Yavapai County, Arizona. Defendant SYFS is a for-profit operator of behavioral healthcare facilities for children and Defendant SYFS owns, directs, and/or is responsible for the operation, safety, and maintenance of the MMA facility, as well as the supervision of employees and agents of Defendant MMA, the location at which the alleged negligent, intentional, and tortious acts took place. Defendant SYFS may be served via its statutory agent, Corporation Service Company, located at 8825 N. 23rd Avenue, Ste. 100, Phoenix, Arizona 85021.

42. Defendant Sequel Care of Arizona a/k/a/ Brighter Heights Arizona, LLC, ("SCA") is a domestic corporation conducting business in Coconino County, Arizona, located at 8800 N. Marys Dr., Flagstaff, AZ, 86004. Defendant SCA owns, directs, and/or is responsible for the operation, safety and maintenance of the MMA facility, as well as the supervision of employees and agents of Defendant MMA, the location at which the alleged negligent, intentional, and tortious acts took place. Defendant SCA may be served via its

statutory agent, Corporation Service Company, located at 8825 N. 23rd Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85021.

43. Defendant Sequel Youth Services of Arizona LLC, ("SYSA") is a domestic corporation conducting business in Yavapai County, Arizona, located at 2224 Sax Canyon Rd, Anthem, Arizona 85086. Defendant SYSA owns, directs, and/or is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the MMA facility, as well as the supervision of employees and agents of Defendant MMA, the location at which the alleged negligent, intentional, and tortious acts took place. Defendant SYSA may be served via its statutory agent, Corporation Service Company, located at 8825 N. 23rd Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85021.

44. Defendant John "Jay" Ripley ("Ripley") is the owner, founder, and current Chairman of the Board of Defendant SYFS. Defendant Ripley is the owner and founder of Defendants VBH, SCA, and SYSA, the companies responsible for the negligent, intentional, and tortious acts committed against Plaintiffs alleged herein. Defendant Ripley is responsible for planning, directing, and implementing policies and decisions, including the operation, safety, maintenance, and supervision of the MMA facility. Defendant Ripley was responsible for the operation of SYFS and its affiliates and caused events to occur in the State of Arizona, which form the substance of this Complaint. If married, his spouse is JANE DOE RIPLEY who is listed fictitiously at this time. Although Defendant Ripley's spouse, if married, did not cause the injuries described herein, she is listed as a defendant to comply with Arizona's community property laws.

45. Defendant Adam Hardin ("Hardin") is or was, a manager, employee and staff member of Defendant MMA. Upon information and belief, Defendant Adam Hardin is a

resident of Yavapai County, Arizona, and/or caused events to occur in Yavapai County. If married, his spouse is JANE DOE HARDIN who is listed fictitiously and upon information and belief is also a resident of Yavapai County, Arizona. Although Defendant Adam Hardin's spouse, if married, did not cause the injuries described herein, she is listed as a defendant to comply with Arizona's community property laws.

46. The term "Defendants" refers to all named or fictitiously named Defendants, in their individual or collective capacity. At all times herein, Defendants were acting by and through their duly authorized agents, employees, or contractors.

47. Defendants John Does I-X, ABC Companies I-X, and XYZ Partnerships I-X are persons, companies, corporations, partnerships, and/or business entities, liable to Plaintiffs for the negligence, intentional torts, injuries and damages described herein. These Defendants are listed fictitiously because their true identities are not known to Plaintiffs currently. Plaintiffs will seek leave to substitute their true identities upon learning of same.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

48. Maricopa County Superior Court has the legal authority to hear and decide this case because the value of the case exceeds the minimum jurisdictional requirements, Defendants MMA, MMERC, SCA, and SYSA reside in Maricopa County, Arizona, for the purposes of fulfilling A.R.S. §12-401, and Defendants Ripley, VBH, and SYFS control the operations of domestic Defendants Hardin, MMA, MMERC, SCA, and SYSA

49. Defendants whose statutory agent resides in Maricopa County, Arizona, include Defendants MMA, MMERC, VBH, SYFS, SCA, and SYSA.

50. Article XIV, § 8 of the Arizona Constitution expressly permits a suit to be maintained against a foreign corporation in the county where an agent of such corporation may be found.

51. Additionally, A.R.S. §12-401(18) permits an action against a corporation in any county in which the defendant has an agent or representative.

52. Furthermore, A.R.S. §12-401(7) permits an action to be brought in the county in which any of the defendants reside, when there are several defendants residing in different counties.

53. Domestic corporation Defendants MMA, MMERC, SCA, and SYSA are incorporated and have principal places of business in Arizona and, therefore, are subject to the general jurisdictional requirements of the 5th and 14th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution in order to bring this action to this court. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Lemaire*, 242 Ariz. 357 (2017).

54. Domestic citizen Defendant Adam Hardin lives in the State of Arizona and, therefore, is subject to the general jurisdictional requirements of the 5th and 14th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution in order to bring this action to this court. *Id.*

55. Foreign corporation Defendants VBH and SYFS are subject to the specific and personal jurisdictional requirements of the 5th and 14th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution in order to bring this action to this court, as both Defendants engaged in purposeful conduct with Arizona and both have sufficient contacts within Arizona such that the maintenance of this suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice; such contacts

include but are not limited to Defendants MMA, MMERC, SCA, and SYSA. *Planning Group of Scottsdale v. Lake Mathews Mineral Props., Ltd.,* 226 Ariz. 262, 266 (2011).

56. Foreign non-citizen Defendant Ripley is subject to the specific and personal jurisdictional requirements of the 5th and 14th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution in order to bring this action to this court, as Defendant Ripley engaged in purposeful conduct with Arizona and has sufficient contacts within Arizona such that the maintenance of this suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, by and through his founding and operation of Defendants MMA, MMERC, SCA, SYSA, VBH, and SYFS. *Id.*

57. The amount in controversy exceeds the minimal jurisdictional requirements of this Court.

58. Pursuant to Rules 8 and 26.2(c), Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs certify this action is subject to Tier 3 discovery limits based on the damages sought.

59. Plaintiffs request and demand a trial by jury.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

60. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

61. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs were minor residents under the exclusive supervision and control of Defendants.

62. Defendant MMA is situated in the remote mountains of Prescott Valley, Arizona, approximately a 30-minute drive or a five-hour walk to the nearest town. The minors victimized in the abuse complained of herein had no avenue to escape without Defendants' intervention.

63. Plaintiffs consist of minor female residents who were enrolled at and who's safety was placed in the hands of Defendants to foster an environment for safe and healthy therapeutic and educational growth.

64. Rather than receive the benefits Defendants touted at the MMA facility, Plaintiffs were subjected to and suffered severe and continued sexual abuse at the hands of its employee-abusers as outlined below:

A. 2017 Rape and Sexual Assaults of Plaintiff M.C.

65. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff M.C. was a ward of the State of Arizona in 2017.

66. Subsequently, Plaintiff M.C. was sent to Defendant MMA in 2017 for a period of one year.

67. MMA implemented a program where staff members would be assigned as "shadows" to the residents.

68. Residents were required to always follow their assigned "shadow".

69. This practice enabled and perpetuated abuse from staff members.

70. Plaintiff M.C. was assigned to Mr. Brad Stepan ("Mr. Brad") as a shadow.

71. Mr. Brad was a staff member employed by Defendants at Defendant MMA in charge of supervising, directing, and assisting residents sent to Defendant MMA for treatment.

72. While shadowing Plaintiff M.C., Mr. Brad would follow Plaintiff M.C. into the shower and would block the entryway from anyone else entering the shower area, thereby also preventing Plaintiff M.C. from leaving the shower area.

73. Mr. Brad proceeded to force Plaintiff M.C. to get naked and bend over, where he then would digitally penetrate her vagina against her will.

74. When Plaintiff M.C. attempted to scream, Mr. Brad would tell Plaintiff M.C. to "shut up" and "be quiet."

75. On other occasions, Mr. Brad would block the exit doorway and force Plaintiff M.C. to get on her knees and grope his penis.

76. Mr. Brad would proceed to force Plaintiff M.C. to give him oral sex, forcing her to place his penis in her mouth.

77. On other occasions, Mr. Brad would thrust his erect penis into Plaintiff M.C., raping her while she was forcibly being bent over.

78. Mr. Brad threatened Plaintiff M.C. that if she ever discussed or reported the sexual assault, he would make sure that she would never leave MMA until she was eighteen years old since, "she didn't have a family to go home to anyway."

79. MMA staff members, including Mr. Brad, knew that residents at MMA could not leave on their own volition and that Defendants asserted control over the resident's length of stay at MMA.

80. Plaintiff M.C. tried to refrain from showers to limit the repeated sexual assaults from Mr. Brad, however, this only fueled other residents to mock and bully her as she was unable to clean herself.

81. Plaintiff M.C. attempted to report the sexual assaults to Mr. Brad's supervisor, Mr. Marlon.

82. However, Mr. Marlon told Plaintiff M.C. to "shut up" or she would be unable

to go home.

83. On multiple occasions, Mr. Marlon, Mr. Brad, and another staff member, only known at this time as Mr. George, would take Plaintiff M.C. out of MMA, away from cameras, where they would throw her in the snow and forcefully restrain her with their body weight.

84. While Plaintiff M.C. was restrained, Mr. Marlon, Mr. Brad, and Mr. George Would assault Plaintiff, groping her breasts, buttocks, and vagina. During these occasions, Ms. Youngblood, a lead behavioral health therapist, was present and would also take turns restraining Plaintiff while making sexual comments to Plaintiff.

85. Plaintiff M.C. attempted to report the abuse to administrative staff at MMA and to her case worker, however, she was only ridiculed by the administrative staff and ignored by her case worker.

86. She was also punished on numerous occasions for her attempts to report the incidences of sexual assaults and abuse. As a form of punishment, on several occasions, Plaintiff M.C. was forcibly held by Mr. Brad in the center of a group of other girls while the girls screamed insults and profanity at Plaintiff.

87. On other occasions, after Mr. Brad would forcibly restrain Plaintiff by her hair, he would slam her down on the ground, causing physical injuries.

88. Other times, Mr. Brad dragged Plaintiff by her hair through cacti, rocks, etc., causing scarring on her knees and hands.

89. Plaintiff M.C. was sexually assaulted by Mr. Brad on approximately 80 different occasions.

90. Plaintiff M.C. was sexually abused by Mr. Marlon, Mr. George, and Ms. Youngblood on approximately 10 different occasions.

91. Plaintiff M.C. was fifteen years old when she was sexually and physically assaulted by staff members at Defendant MMA.

92. Upon information and belief, Defendant made no report of the sexual assaults nor were any remedial actions taken against Mr. Brad, Mr. Marlon, Ms. Youngblood, or Mr. George.

B. 2015 Rape of Plaintiff C.C.

93. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff C.C. was in the custody of the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections ("AZDJC") in 2015.

94. Subsequently, Plaintiff C.C. was sent to Defendant MMA in 2015.

95. Plaintiff C.C. was residing in the Willow dorm and had "Mountain Lion" status, which was considered the top-level status, and included more privileges than the other residents.

96. A staff member, only known at this time as "Mr. Youngblood," was responsible for escorting girls amongst the facility as a shadow.

97. On one occasion, Plaintiff C.C. notified Mr. Youngblood about an appointment with her case manager so that she could be escorted, in accordance with Defendant MMA policy regarding shadows.

98. At this point, Plaintiff C.C. had been residing at the facility for approximately three months and was close to being allowed to go home.

99. Mr. Youngblood told Plaintiff C.C. that prior to the appointment, they needed to stop at the chapel because the pastor wanted to meet with Plaintiff C.C.

100. Once at the chapel, Mr. Youngblood sat down Plaintiff C.C. in a room in the back area of the chapel.

101. Mr. Youngblood sat down Plaintiff C.C. on a couch and began asking her about her personal life.

102. Mr. Youngblood then put his hand on Plaintiff C.C.'s thigh and moved it up her leg towards her vagina.

103. Mr. Youngblood then began speaking to Plaintiff C.C. about how she would be getting to leave the facility soon and how it would be unfortunate for her to lose her Mountain Lion status and not be able to go home.

104. Mr. Youngblood placed his hand on her vagina and asked if she was a virgin.

105. Mr. Youngblood then began to massage Plaintiff C.C.'s vagina over her clothing.

106. Mr. Youngblood then put his hands insider of her pants and digitally penetrated Plaintiff C.C.'s vagina.

107. Mr. Youngblood proceeded to grope Plaintiff C.C.'s breasts under her shirt and forced her hands on his penis.

108. On a second occasion at the chapel, Mr. Youngblood forced Plaintiff C.C. to grope each other's genitals.

109. Mr. Youngblood then proceeded to rape Plaintiff C.C. by penetrating her vagina with his penis.

110. Mr. Youngblood ejaculated inside of Plaintiff C.C.

111. On a third occasion, Mr. Youngblood forced Plaintiff C.C. to give him oral sex and proceeded to rape Plaintiff C.C. again by penetrating her vagina with his penis.

112. Plaintiff C.C. was fifteen years old when she was raped and sexually assaulted by Mr. Youngblood.

113. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual assault nor were any remedial actions taken against Mr. Youngblood.

C. 2019-2020 Rape of Plaintiff E.G.

114. On or around 2019 or 2020, Plaintiff E.G. was struggling with suicidal ideations, substance abuse, and mental health concerns.

115. As a result, Plaintiff E.G. was sent to Defendant MMA for approximately six months for mental health treatment.

116. Defendant MMA allowed Plaintiff E.G. to be watched by male employees when showering under its "shadow" policy.

117. A staff member, only known at this time as "Johnathan," was tasked with supervising Plaintiff E.G, in accordance with Defendant MMA's policy regarding shadows.

118. Plaintiff E.G. was showering when soap accidentally contacted her eyes, and she cried out as a result.

119. Johnathan then pulled open the shower curtain and saw Plaintiff E.G.'s naked body.

120. Approximately one to two weeks later, Plaintiff E.G. left her room and went outside without a shadow.

121. Plaintiff E.G. noticed Johnathan following behind her.

122. Johnathan stated that he was there to help Plaintiff E.G.

123. Plaintiff E.G. called Johnathan a "pervert."

124. Johnathan then proceeded to push Plaintiff E.G. against a wall and pulled her pants down while pulling his pants down.

125. Johnathan restrained Plaintiff E.G. with his body weight, rendering Plaintiff E.G. incapable of resisting.

126. Johnathan then penetrated Plaintiff E.G.'s vagina with his penis and raped her.

127. Johnathan stopped when he heard another staff member approaching nearby.

128. Plaintiff E.G. then dressed herself and apologized to Johnathan in front of the other staff member.

129. Johnathan responded to Plaintiff E.G. that he was only there to help her.

130. Plaintiff E.G. was approximately fourteen or fifteen when Johnathan raped her.

131. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual assault nor were any remedial actions taken against Johnathan.

D. <u>2016 Rape of Plaintiff F.T.</u>

132. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff F.T. was in the custody of the AZDJC in approximately 2016.

133. Plaintiff F.T. was sent to Defendant MMA for a period of approximately ten months after leaving the custody of the AZDJC.

134. A staff member, only known at this time as "Mr. Winter," worked at Defendant MMA.

135. On one occasion, Mr. Winter entered Plaintiff F.T.'s room while she was alone and proceeded to assault her by putting his hands in Plaintiff F.T.'s pants and groping her vagina.

136. Mr. Winter then pulled down Plaintiff F.T.'s pants and pulled his penis out of his pants.

137. Mr. Winter then forced Plaintiff F.T. to fondle his penis.

138. On two different occasions, Mr. Winter again assaulted Plaintiff by groping her bare vagina; forcing her to fondle his bare, erect penis; and forcibly conducting oral sex on Plaintiff F.T.

139. During both assaults, Mr. Winter then proceeded to forcibly rape Plaintiff F.T., penetrating her vagina with his penis.

140. After the assaults, Mr. Winter provided Plaintiff F.T. with a cigarette, in an attempt to keep Plaintiff F.T. from disclosing the abuse.

141. Plaintiff F.T. was fifteen years old when Mr. Winter raped her.

142. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual assault nor were any remedial actions taken against Mr. Winter.

E. <u>2015 Rape of A.B.</u>

143. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff A.B. was in the custody of the AZDJC shortly prior to 2015.

144. Plaintiff A.B. was sent to Defendant MMA for a period of approximately a year-and-a-half after leaving the custody of the AZDJC.

145. Plaintiff A.B. was assigned to live in the Willow Dorm at MMA.

146. A few months after Plaintiff A.B. arrived at MMA, a staff member, only known at this time as "Mr. Vince", began frequently interacting with Plaintiff A.B to solicit her friendship.

147. Mr. Vince attempted to "befriend and groom" Plaintiff A.B. by telling her that if she was compliant and did extra tasks for him, he would persuade the other staff members to think she was a good student.

148. Mr. Vince also provided Plaintiff A.B. with THC edibles, knowing that she struggled with a substance abuse disorder.

149. Mr. Vince's intentions were deeply malicious.

150. When Plaintiff A.B. was alone, Mr. Vince would seek her out in her dorm room, empty classrooms, or deserted areas of the campus grounds.

151. Once Mr. Vince was alone with Plaintiff A.B., he would fondle her breasts, buttocks, and vagina underneath her clothes. He would also force Plaintiff A.B. to grope his penis and masturbate him until he was erect.

152. Mr. Vince would force Plaintiff A.B. to give him oral sex while he would digitally penetrate her vagina.

153. Mr. Vince would then vaginally rape Plaintiff with his penis.

154. Upon information and belief, Mr. Vince wore a condom and ejaculated into the condom during the first approximately five rapes and assaults. Thereafter, Mr. Vince stopped wearing a condom and would ejaculate on Plaintiff A.B.'s body or into his hand.

155. Mr. Vince repeated these acts approximately 160 times, approximately three to four times a week.

156. Mr. Vince repeatedly threatened to keep Plaintiff A.B. at MMA permanently (until she turned eighteen years old), threatening false negative reports if she ever disclosed the abuse.

157. Plaintiff A.B. was sixteen years old when she was raped and sexually assaulted by Mr. Vince.

158. Upon information and belief, Mr. Vince had a reputation amongst the girls at Defendant MMA as being inappropriate with the minor female residents.

159. It is also believed that Mr. Vince was sexually active with other minor female residents at Defendant MMA.

160. Mr. Vince's sexually abhorrent reputation was not exclusive to the minor female residents, as staff members and Defendant MMA were, or should have been, aware of Mr. Vince's propensity to assault the minor female residents.

161. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the rapes nor were any remedial actions taken against Mr. Vince.

F. <u>2011 Sexual Assault of Plaintiff E.M.</u>

162. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff E.M. was in the custody of Arizona Child Protective Services ("CPS") prior to her enrollment at MMA in 2011.

163. Subsequently, Plaintiff E.M. was sent to Defendant MMA in 2011, where she was held for approximately two years.

164. Upon information and belief, a staff member worked at Defendant MMA, only known at this time as "Mr. Gabe."

165. On one occasion, Plaintiff E.M. was placed in restraints at MMA by Mr. Gabe.

166. Mr. Gabe restrained Plaintiff E.M. by laying on her with the full weight of his body.

167. While Mr. Gabe was restraining Plaintiff E.M., he began to rub Plaintiff E.M.'s vagina with his bare hands over her clothes.

168. During the sexual assault, Mr. Gabe told Plaintiff E.M. that "he had seen her" when she entered MMA and that other minor female residents told Mr. Gabe that Plaintiff E.M. "liked girls." Mr. Gabe told Plaintiff E.M. that "he could change that" if she let him.

169. Plaintiff E.M. begged Mr. Gabe to release her and cease his sexual assault, however, Mr. Gabe did not let Plaintiff E.M. out of her restraints.

170. Mr. Gabe restrained Plaintiff E.M. for approximately one hour during which he assaulted Plaintiff.

171. Plaintiff E.M. reported the sexual assault to Defendant MMA, however, nothing came of the report.

172. The abuse from Mr. Gabe started to escalate after Plaintiff E.M. made the report.

173. On a second occasion, Mr. Gabe forcefully held Plaintiff down, restraining her, and sexually assaulted her using his body weight to hold her in place.

174. Mr. Gabe, again, grabbed and fondled Plaintiff E.M.'s vagina against her will while she was restrained and unable to resist.

175. Plaintiff E.M. begged Mr. Gabe to stop his sexual assault but to no avail.

176. On a third occasion, Plaintiff E.M. was taking a shower when she began to harm herself. The other residents noticed that Plaintiff E.M. was harming herself and alerted staff members of MMA.

177. Plaintiff E.M. unequivocally asked for a female staff member to help her.

178. Outrageously, Mr. Gabe arrived alone and removed the other residents from the shower area.

179. Plaintiff E.M. pleaded with Mr. Gabe not to touch her.

180. Mr. Gabe then proceeded to physically restrain Plaintiff E.M. and told her, "this is probably why you like girls."

181. Mr. Gabe proceeded to grope Plaintiff E.M.'s naked body and began to rub Plaintiff E.M.'s vagina.

182. Plaintiff E.M. began to scream for another staff member.

183. Once another staff member arrived, Mr. Gabe ceased the assault and told Plaintiff E.M. not to tell anyone.

184. On a fourth occasion, Plaintiff E.M. was being restrained by Mr. Gabe and another staff member of Defendant MMA.

185. The staff member was restraining Plaintiff E.M. around her upper body and Mr. Gabe was restraining her lower body.

186. Mr. Gabe inserted his hand inside of Plaintiff E.M.'s pants and underwear and started groping and fondling Plaintiff E.M.'s vagina with his bare hand, again.

187. Plaintiff E.M. told the other staff member that Mr. Gabe was sexually

assaulting her, however, the staff member refused to stop Mr. Gabe.

188. Plaintiff E.M. actively resisted, however, she was unable to stop Mr. Gabe from sexually assaulting her.

189. Plaintiff E.M. was sixteen years old when she was sexually assaulted by Mr. Gabe.

190. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual abuse nor were any remedial actions taken against the staff member.

G. 2017 Sexual Assault of Plaintiff T.F.

191. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff T.F. was a ward of the State of Arizona in 2017.

192. Subsequently, Plaintiff T.F. was sent to Defendant MMA for a period of seven months.

193. A staff member, only known at this time as "Mr. Youngblood," was filling in for the regular group leader that was tasked with checking the rooms of the girls who stayed at MMA.

194. On one occasion, Mr. Youngblood stood at the doorway to Plaintiff T.F.'s room while she was changing and began to grope his genitals until he became erect.

195. On another occasion, a staff member only known at this time as "Mr. Jeff" was supervising Plaintiff T.F. while she was tasked with several chores.

196. While Plaintiff T.F. was filling a mop bucket in the cafe area, Mr. Jeff approached Plaintiff T.F. from behind and began kissing her neck and fondling her breasts over her clothes.

197. Mr. Jeff then put his hands insider her shirt and began fondling her breasts.

198. Mr. Jeff then reached for the button on Plaintiff T.F.'s pants, however, when Plaintiff T.F. verbally resisted, Mr. Jeff "shushed" her.

199. Mr. Jeff then unbuttoned Plaintiff T.F.'s pants and began to digitally penetrate her vagina with several of his fingers.

200. Mr. Jeff then asked Plaintiff T.F. "do you like this?" and "we have to hurry before someone sees us."

201. Mr. Jeff then threatened Plaintiff T.F. after the sexual assault that they would both "be in trouble" if she disclosed what happened.

202. Plaintiff T.F. was seventeen years old at the time of the sexual assaults.

203. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual assaults nor were any remedial actions taken against either Mr. Youngblood or Mr. Jeff.

H. 2018 Sexual Assault of Plaintiff H.G.

204. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff H.G. was in the custody of CPS prior to being sent to MMA in 2018.

205. As a result, Plaintiff H.G. was sent to MMA in 2018 for a period of six months.

206. On one occasion, Plaintiff H.G. was asleep in her room by herself during the night, when she woke up to a staff member, only known at this time as "Mr. James," who mounted himself on top of her.

207. Mr. James was a staff manager who was responsible for the shift between the day and overnight hours.

208. On this occasion, Mr. James began groping Plaintiff H.G.'s bare breasts and vagina underneath her clothes.

209. Mr. James proceeded to penetrate Plaintiff H.G.'s vagina with his fingers.

210. Mr. James then told Plaintiff H.G. to touch his penis, which Plaintiff H.G. refused to do.

211. Mr. James then instructed Plaintiff H.G. to remain silent and threatened to ensure that she would remain at either Defendant MMA or another juvenile detention center if she ever disclosed the abuse.

212. Mr. James further threatened that Plaintiff H.G. would be physically harmed outside of the facility if she disclosed the abuse.

213. Plaintiff H.G. was sixteen years old when she was sexually abused by Mr. James.

214. Upon information and belief, Mr. James was terminated three days after this incident for unrelated inappropriate conduct with other residents at Defendant MMA.

215. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual assault.

I. 2022 Sexual Assault of Plaintiff M.E.

216. In 2022, Plaintiff M.E. was sent to Defendant MMA.

217. A staff member at MMA, only known at this time as "Mrs. Clay," oversaw Plaintiff M.E. and other residents with increased privileges and responsibilities.

218. While Plaintiff M.E. would be showering, Mrs. Clay would watch Plaintiff and make suggestive sexual comments about Plaintiff M.E.'s body.

219. Mrs. Clay would also bring male staff members of MMA to supervise the communal shower area.

220. While showering, Mrs. Clay would approach Plaintiff M.E. and begin to fondle her breasts.

221. Mrs. Clay would then digitally penetrate Plaintiff M.E.'s vagina while still in the communal shower area in front of other female residents.

222. The sexual abuse would occur daily every time Plaintiff M.E showered.

223. Plaintiff M.E. witnessed these same acts of sexual abuse from Mrs. Clay occurring with the other female residents in the shower.

224. If any of the female residents did not comply with Mrs. Clay or resisted Mrs. Clay's advances, the supervising male staff member would restrain and physically assault the uncooperating female residents.

225. Plaintiff M.E. was seventeen years old when she was sexually assaulted by Mrs. Clay.

226. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual assault nor were any remedial actions taken against said Mrs. Clay.

J. <u>2012 Sexual Abuse suffered by Plaintiff N.M.</u>

227. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff N.M. was a ward of the State of Arizona in 2012.

228. As a result, Plaintiff N.M. was sent to Defendant MMA for a year.

229. Plaintiff N.M. was located in the "Mountain Lion" section of the facility, which was considered the upper echelon section of the facility.

230. It was commonly known amongst the minor female residents that the male staff assigned to the Mountain Lion section were notorious for being sexually active with the minor female residents in that section.

231. A staff member, only known at this time as "Justin," began to target Plaintiff N.M. as a potential victim.

232. When Plaintiff N.M. was alone in her room, Justin would come in and begin to fondle her breasts, buttocks, and vagina under her clothes.

233. Justin would force Plaintiff N.M. to fondle his penis until he was erect.

234. Justin would also simulate the act of sex with Plaintiff N.M.

235. To keep Plaintiff N.M. from disclosing the abuse, Justin would give Plaintiff N.M. extra attention and privileges.

236. For example, Justin would let Plaintiff N.M. stay up late beyond curfew, give Plaintiff N.M. phone and internet time, and allow Plaintiff N.M. to roam the facility freely.

237. The abuse occurred approximately fifteen times.

238. Plaintiff N.M. was sixteen years old when she was sexually abused by Justin.

239. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual abuse nor were any remedial actions taken against Justin.

K. 2013 Sexual Abuse suffered by Plaintiff G.C.

240. In approximately 2013, Plaintiff G.C. was struggling with suicidal ideations and was sent to Defendant MMA for treatment for approximately ten months.

241. On one occasion, Plaintiff G.C. was walking around the grounds of MMA when a staff member, believed to be either individuals known only at this time as "Mr. Paul"

or "Mr. Michael," approached Plaintiff G.C. in a hallway. This staff member grabbed and fondled Plaintiff G.C.'s buttocks over her pants.

242. Plaintiff G.C. was fourteen years old when she was sexually abused by the staff member.

243. The staff member threatened to isolate G.C., tamper with her medications, and to force medical sedation on her if she disclosed the abuse.

244. Staff members were known to use the threat of isolation and/or medications to keep residents from reporting any acts of abuse.

245. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual abuse nor were any remedial actions taken against the staff member.

L. 2013 Sexual Abuse of Plaintiff A.S.

246. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff A.S. was in the custody of CPS prior to her enrollment at MMA.

247. Plaintiff A.S. was enrolled at Defendant MMA in 2013 for approximately one year.

248. Upon arrival at MMA, Defendant Adam Hardin, a staff member at MMA and employed by Defendants, was responsible for checking incoming residents' bags.

249. Defendant Hardin initially made sexualized comments about Plaintiff A.S.'s clothing and underwear as he checked her bag.

250. Shortly thereafter, Plaintiff A.S. was in the laundry room by herself.

251. Defendant Hardin entered the laundry room and confined Plaintiff A.S. in the room so that she was unable to escape.

252. Defendant Hardin forcibly reached under Plaintiff A.S.'s shirt and began violently groping her bare breasts. Defendant Hardin then proceeded to grope and fondle Plaintiff A.S.'s vagina underneath her clothes.

253. On another occasion, Defendant Hardin entered the laundry room while Plaintiff A.S. was alone and proceeded to grope Plaintiff A.S.'s vagina, breasts, and buttocks underneath her clothes.

254. On a third and fourth occasion, Defendant Hardin again cornered Plaintiff A.S. by herself in the laundry room and groped Plaintiff A.S.'s vagina and buttocks underneath her clothes.

255. Defendant Hardin attempted to force Plaintiff A.S. to touch his penis, but Plaintiff A.S. refused.

256. Plaintiff A.S. was thirteen years old when she was sexually abused by Defendant Hardin.

257. Defendant Hardin was well known amongst the entire facility for being sexually inappropriate with the residents.

258. Defendant Hardin would supply other vulnerable residents with outside food, marijuana, pharmaceutical pills, tobacco, and alcohol to keep the residents from disclosing the sexual abuse.

259. Plaintiff A.S. filed a report outlining the multiple sexual abuse incidents perpetrated by Defendant Hardin to MMA administration.

250. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA performed minimal or no investigation into the incidents and no internal report of the sexual abuse was completed. No remedial actions were taken against Defendant Hardin.

251. The sexual abuse of A.S. occurred over the span of approximately three months.

M. 2016 Sexual Abuse of Plaintiff A.H.

252. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff A.H. was a ward of the State of Arizona in 2016.

253. In 2016, Plaintiff was sent to MMA for approximately three months.

254. On one occasion, staff at MMA placed Plaintiff A.H. in restraints against her will.

255. Then, another staff member entered the room in which Plaintiff A.H. was restrained. While Plaintiff A.H. was alone, confined to her restraints and unable to move, the MMA staff member began groping Plaintiff A.H.'s breasts, buttocks, and vagina.

256. Plaintiff A.H. screamed for help, at which point the staff member ceased the sexual assault.

257. Plaintiff A.H. was sixteen years old at the time of the sexual assault.

258. Upon information and belief, Defendant MMA made no report of the sexual assault nor were any remedial actions taken against said staff member.

N. Systemic Abuse from Sequel Juvenile Detention Centers

259. Owner and Founder of Defendants SYFS and VBH, Defendant Ripley, was quoted in a speech to students at the Merrick School of Business at the University of Baltimore

stating, "We focused on public pay because we figured kids are always going to have issues and they're always going to get in trouble, and again, the government has to figure out a way to take care of them . . . You can make money in this business if you control staffing . . . you can't have too much staffing to eat that profit." [13] [14]

260. Defendant SYFS's annual revenue regularly tops $200 million; as of 2017, 90% of their revenue came from Medicaid, Medicare, and approximately 500 additional federal, state and local programs. [15]

261. Defendant Ripley's goal for Defendants SYFS and VBH is not to provide good, mediocre, or even decent healthcare for its patients. It is strictly to make a profit. Hiring inadequate staff, and/or maintaining a lack thereof, is the formula that drives profits for Defendants.

262. Additionally, while many federal and state regulations require these treatment centers (like Defendant MMA) to be legally organized as separate non-profit centers, the non-profit centers send back a combined 82% of state funding revenue to Defendants SYFS and VBH to "manage and operate" the facilities. This has allowed Defendants to implement "for-profit" practices under the guise of promoting welfare and treatment as a non-profit organization. [16]

---

[13] Hanna Rappleye, et al., *A profitable 'death trap': Sequel youth facilities raked in millions while accused of abusing children*, NBC NEWS (December 16, 2020), at pg. 12-13,https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/profitable-death-trap-sequel-youth-facilities-raked-millions-while-accused-n1251319

[14] U.S. Senate Committee on Finance. *Warehouses of Neglect: How Taxpayers are Funding Systematic Abuse in Youth Residential Treatment Facilities* (June, 2024), at pg. 28, https://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/rtf_report_warehouses_of_neglect.pdf

[15] *Id.*

[16] Joaquin Palomino, Sara Tiano, and Cytnhia Dizikes*, Far from Home Far from Safe*, THE IMPRINT, (December 11, 2020), https://imprintnews.org/child-welfare-2/california-ends-out-of-state-placements/50095

263. Defendant Ripley has also exploited corporate structures to evade oversight from regulators. In 2017, Defendant Ripley sold a majority stake in SYFS to a private equity firm. In 2021, after being plagued by reports on abuse and neglect allegations, Sequel sold thirteen facilities to a newly incorporated company, VBH, a company also founded by Defendant Ripley. Vivant retained many members of Sequel leadership, and its footprint has significant overlap with Sequel.[17]

264. Numerous of Defendant SYFS's facilities have been investigated following reports of children being sexually and physically assaulted by staff members at their facilities, a problem directly correlated to Defendant's intentionally deficient hiring practices for profit.

265. One of Defendant SYFS's facilities, Northern Illinois Academy ("NIA"), came under scrutiny after a staff member was sentenced to prison for ten years for sexually assaulting a child who was residing in the facility. [18]

266. Following documented physical, sexual, and emotional abuse of children at NIA, the State of Illinois launched an investigation. In January 2021, the State of Illinois revoked NIA's status as an approved facility for education services, finding in an administrative report that NIA had inadequate and overextended staffing; insufficient incident reporting, including elopements; lack of meaningful programming and treatment planning;

[17] *Id.* at pg. 6

[18] *Worker at juvenile mental health facility in Aurora gets 10 years for sex assault of child*, AURORA BEACON-NEWS, (May 22, 2019), https://www.chicagotribune.com/2019/02/23/worker-at-juvenile-mental-health-facility-in-aurora-gets-10-years-for-sex-assault-of-child/

undocumented and improper restraint and seclusions; and insufficient adherence to COVID-19 health and safety requirements. [19]

267. The issues highlighted at NIA are merely a reflection of the issues seen at facilities run by Defendants SYFS and VBH, including at Defendant MMA.

268. On April 29, 2020, Cornelius Frederick, a resident of Lakeside Academy in Kalamazoo, MI (a facility run by Defendant SYFS), was killed by staff members after being tackled and restrained by at least six employees for twelve minutes for merely throwing a sandwich. The video showed staff placing their weight directly on Cornelius Frederick's chest for nearly ten minutes as he lost consciousness. [20]

269. Michigan Department of Health and Human Services' ("MDHHS") investigation into the death of Cornelius Frederick revealed ten licensing violations at Sequel Lakeside Academy and, subsequently, revoked the facility's license. [21]

270. At Owens Crossroads, a residential treatment facility for girls in northeast Alabama run by Defendant SYFS, staff members would put adolescent girls into violent restraints, to the point where they struggled to breathe, and girls would harm themselves just to get out of the facility.[22]

---

[19] *Administration to Transition Students Out of Northern Illinois Academy Following Findings of State-Commissioned Equip for Equality Report*, https://www.illinois.gov/news/press-release.23312.html

[20] Tyler Kingkade, *Video shows fatal restraint of Cornelius Frederick, 16, in Michigan foster facility,* NBC NEWS (July 7, 2020), https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/video-shows-fatal-restraint-cornelius-fredericks-16-michigan-foster-facility-n1233122

[21] Christine Hauser & Michael Levenson, *Three Charged in Death of Michigan Teenager Restrained at Youth Academy*, THE N.Y. TIMES, (June 24, 2020), https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/24/us/cornelius-frederick-lawsuit-lakeside-academy.html

[22] *A profitable 'death trap': Sequel youth facilities raked in millions while accused of abusing children*, at pg. 8

271. Red Rock Canyon School in Utah, a facility once run by Defendant Sequel Youth and Family Services was shut down in 2019 after a riot instigated by staff members within the facility left several teens injured. [23]

272. In March 2014, a 29-year-old staff member at Red Rock Canyon School was convicted of forcible sexual abuse after sexually abusing three male students in the facility.[24]

273. Red Rock Canyon School had been frequently visited by police investigating staff members for child abuse, drugs, and sex crimes. Police records showed that officers were called to the facility nearly 200 times since 2014, with 35 calls in 2019 alone. Ten staff members at Red Rock Canyon School had been charged with child abuse since 2017. [25]

274. Sequel Pomegranate, a now closed psychiatric facility once run by Defendant SYFS, was reported to have children in their care who were being punched and put in chokeholds by staff members, who also exhibited "disturbing levels" of bullying.[26]

275. Clarinda Academy, a now-closed juvenile detention center in Iowa and run by Defendant SYFS until 2021, was reported to have staff punching, kicking, choking, and sexually assaulting youth at the facility. [27]

---

[23] Jessica Miller Schreifels, *Foster boy sues Oregon officials who sent him to Red Rock Canyon School in St. George*, THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE, (November 21, 2019), https://www.sltrib.com/news/2019/11/21/an-oregon-foster-boy/

[24] Mori Kessler, *Former youth worker sentenced in sex abuse case,* ST GEORGE NEWS, (June, 2014), https://www.stgeorgeutah.com/news/former-youth-worker-sentenced-in-sex-abuse-case/article_f83b9d7c-67c6-5bfc-bbd8-6cd986413db0.html#.YWB4-UZKj0r

[25] *Id.*

[26] Sara Tiano, *Federal Watchdogs Find Abuse at For-Profit Youth Residential Programs in 18 States*, THE IMPRINT, (November 2, 2021), https://imprintnews.org/top-stories/federal-watchdogs-find-widespread-abuse-at-youth-residential-programs/60071

[27] Joaquin Palomino, Sara Tiano, and Cytnhia Dizikes*, After abuse probe, another Sequel-run program that housed California youth will close*, THE IMPRINT, (February 8, 2021), https://www.lmtonline.com/bayarea/article/After-abuse-probe-another-Sequel-run-program-15934785.php

276. In 2017, a male Clarinda Academy staff member raped a seventeen-year-old girl who resided in the facility and pled guilty to sexual misconduct with a juvenile. [28]

277. For decades, adolescents detained and committed in juvenile BHCs run by Defendants SYFS and VBH have suffered physical, psychological, emotional, and sexual abuse at the hands of staff members, all while Defendants knew and wantonly ignored this culture of abuse.

278. These adolescents are often unwillingly sent to these BHCs in order to receive treatment due to substance abuse and mental health disorders, making them particularly vulnerable to pervasive sexual abuse.

279. Many times, if not all, the vulnerable adolescent girls sent to these BHCs are wards of their respective State, struggling with mental health and/or substance abuse disorders, and are sent unwillingly to these facilities, even under the guise of seeking treatment.

280. Defendants have taken advantage of this vulnerable demographic of adolescents and children by intentionally understaffing and negligently hiring underqualified, poorly trained, inadequate, and often predatory employees.

281. The negligent staffing issues did not just lead to physical and sexual abuse on behalf of the staff members. During one recorded instance, a child at Defendant MMA was placed on heightened supervision protocols by their therapist, which required the child to be in direct line of sight at all times. During a staffing shift change, the child "was left

[28] Hannah Rappleye, Eric Salzman, and Kate Snow, '*They Told Me It Was Going To Be A Good Place': Allegations Of Abuse At Home For At-Risk Kids*, NBC NEWS (March 26, 2019), https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/they-told-me-it-was-going-be-good-place-allegations-n987176

unsupervised in the dorm for 14 minutes and tied a ripped piece of bedsheet around his/her neck in a suicide attempt." [29]

COUNT ONE: NEGLIGENCE
(Against all Defendants)

282. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

283. Defendants MMERC, SYFA, VBH, SCA, SYSA, and Ripley jointly and severally, own, operate, and manage Defendant MMA, the location by which the acts of sexual abuse and sexual assault took place.

284. Plaintiffs were all present at Defendant MMA as juveniles, and as such Defendants owed a specific duty to Plaintiffs as minors to exercise reasonable care and attention for their safety, taking into account their known mental, emotional, and physical conditions, and protecting said juveniles from harm, including self-harm, and ensuring their overall safety while in custody. *Maricopa County v. Cowart*, 106 Ariz. 69, 71 (1970).

285. Defendants are in charge of making business and operational decisions, implementing policies, hiring staff, directing and supervising staff, carrying out directives, and directing Defendant MMA.

286. Defendants had a duty to exercise reasonable care in housing and securing the safety of Plaintiffs and others present on its premises, including a duty of care to hire,

[29] *Warehouses of Neglect: How Taxpayers are Funding Systematic Abuse in Youth Residential Treatment Facilities* at pg. 121.

supervise, and retain individuals who were qualified to adequately ensure Plaintiffs' safety and who did not present a danger to Plaintiffs. *Id.*

287. In addition, Defendants had a duty to protect Plaintiffs from the criminal acts of third persons, because Defendants, as possessors of land where Plaintiffs were forcibly residing, owe a duty to tenants and guests from dangerous conditions on the land. *Martinez v. Woodmar IV Condos. Homeowners Ass'n*, 189 Ariz. 206, 209, (1997). "[S]ince 1970 courts have recognized the landlord's duty of care may include measures to protect others from criminal attacks, provided the attacks are reasonably foreseeable and preventable." *Id.*

288. Given the long history of physical and sexual abuse incidents at Defendant's facilities across the country, the tortious acts that were committed on Plaintiffs were reasonably foreseeable and preventable.

289. Defendants breached the duty owed to Plaintiffs in one or more of the following ways:

a. Defendants negligently failed to maintain and control a safe premises;

b. Defendants negligently and carelessly failed to have or enforce appropriate housing policies and procedures;

c. Defendants negligently and carelessly hired staff who were capable of committing such heinous criminal acts;

d. Defendants negligently and carelessly failed to adequately staff the MMA facility to sufficiently monitor its minor residents to protect them from harm;

e. Defendants negligently and carelessly failed to adequately train their staff to handle such vulnerable adolescents;

f. Defendants negligently failed to provide adequate lighting, door locks, cameras, or other security measures which might have prevented such criminal acts on Plaintiffs;

g. Defendants negligently and carelessly failed to implement, investigate, and enforce policies related to staff members committing criminal acts against minors housed in their facility;

h. Defendants negligently failed to intervene and respond accordingly to known sexually deviant staff members in the facility;

i. Defendants negligently failed to protect Plaintiffs from staff members known to be sexually inappropriate with residents at the facility;

j. Defendants negligently and carelessly placed Plaintiffs in a dangerous environment;

k. Defendants negligently and carelessly failed to prevent the sexual assaults from occurring within their facility;

l. Defendants negligently and carelessly failed to timely respond to the sexual assaults occurring within their facility;

m. Defendants failed to follow their own policies and procedures, and/or failed to implement sufficient policies and procedures, regarding the sufficient staffing levels, camera monitoring, patient supervision and monitoring, and housing of vulnerable minors;

n. Defendants were negligent in their supervision and training of their employees;

o. Defendants failed to reasonably anticipate a criminal attack, such as the attacks on Plaintiffs, and to take appropriate actions to prevent the attack; and

p. Such further acts or omissions as discovery and evidence will reveal.

290. Defendants facilitated the abuse and failed to properly monitor, investigate, and supervise the staff, thereby providing a violent and toxic platform for the horrific abuse continuously suffered by Plaintiffs.

291. Due to the negligence and carelessness of Defendants, Plaintiffs were severely and irreparably injured.

292. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants negligent acts, intentional acts, careless acts, and/or omissions described above, Plaintiffs suffered injuries including, but not limited to, physical, emotional, and mental damages, including severe discomfort, pain, and mental anguish.

293. Defendants knew, or in the exercise of ordinary care, reasonably should have known that severe bodily injury or death was substantially likely to occur as a result of the negligence and acts as described above.

COUNT TWO: RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR

(Against Defendants MMA, MMERC, SYFS, VBH, SCA, SYSA, and Ripley)

294. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

295. Defendants MMERC, SYFA, VBH, SCA, SYSA, and Ripley jointly and severally, own, operate, and manage Defendant MMA, the location by which the acts of sexual abuse and sexual assault took place.

296. The tortious acts that were committed by the staff members of Defendant MMA all occurred while staff members were acting "within the scope of employment."

297. The doctrine of respondeat superior holds an employer vicariously liable for the negligent work-related actions of its employees when such employees are acting within the scope of employment when the negligent, intentional, and tortious acts occur. *Engler v. Gulf Interstate Eng'g., Inc.,* 230 Ariz. 55, 57 (2012).

298. Furthermore, punitive damages can be awarded against an employer for the acts of its employees so long as the tortious acts were committed in the furtherance of the employer's business and the employee was acting within the scope of employment. *Haralson v. Fisher Surveying, Inc.*, 201 Ariz. 1, 7 (2001).

299. Subsequently, Defendants MMA, MMERC, SYFA, VBH, SCA, SYSA, and Ripley are vicariously liable for the negligent, intentional, and tortious work-related actions of its employees, including but not limited to, the sexual abuse and sexual assaults committed by staff members of Defendant MMA against Plaintiffs.

COUNT THREE: FALSE IMPRISONMENT
(Against all Defendants)

300. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

301. The Abusers acted intentionally to restrain Plaintiffs movements to areas within their control and to where Abusers could subject Plaintiffs to horrific sexual and physical abuse.

302. The Abusers acted without lawful authority and without Plaintiffs' consent.

303. The Abusers' acts resulted in the direct restraint of Plaintiffs, all minor female children, and obstructed their freedom of movement, either by actual force or by exploiting Plaintiffs' fear of force or other forms of retaliation, including, for example, falsifying negative reports to prevent Plaintiffs' release from the facility, withholding Plaintiffs' medications, sedating Plaintiffs as a form of restraint, etc.

304. Abusers also frequently threatened Plaintiffs that if they reported the sexual abuse to anyone, Abusers would make life difficult for them by providing false progress reports, truncating Plaintiffs' privileges, tampering with Plaintiffs' medications or participating in other nefarious activities that would essentially result in an extension of the respective Plaintiff's time at the MMA facility. Thus, Abusers controlled the duration in which individual Plaintiffs would be subjected to abuse.

305. The Abusers' acts would have caused a reasonably prudent person in the same situation as Plaintiffs to believe they were restrained.

306. Defendants, each and all of them, created, provided and fostered the toxic environment that facilitated the unlawful restraint and subsequent sexual abuse of Plaintiffs.

307. Defendants knew or should have known that the dangerous environment they created and fostered at MMA would result in the unlawful restraint of minor children.

308. Plaintiffs were aware of and were harmed by said restraint.

309. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' acts and omissions, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer damages, including but not limited to, physical, emotional, developmental, and psychological damage, including severe and unrelenting emotional distress, trauma and anxiety, all to their damages, in an amount to be proven at trial.

COUNT FOUR: ASSAULT
(Against Defendant Adam Hardin)

310. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

311. At all times material herein, Defendant Hardin intentionally caused harmful or offensive contact with Plaintiff A.S., which caused Plaintiff A.S. apprehension of such immediate harmful or offensive conduct.

312. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Hardin's actions, Plaintiff A.S. incurred damages both past and future, including medical expenses, pain, suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, and emotional distress.

COUNT FIVE: BATTERY
(Against Defendant Adam Hardin)

313. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

314. At all times material herein, Defendant Hardin intentionally caused harmful or offensive contact with Plaintiff A.S., which caused Plaintiff A.S. apprehension of such immediate harmful or offensive conduct.

315. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Hardin's actions, Plaintiff A.S. has incurred damages both past and future, including medical expenses, pain, suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, and emotional distress.

COUNT SIX: INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
(Against all Defendants)

316. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

317. At all times material herein, the conduct of the staff members at Defendant MMA, including Defendant Hardin, who committed the sexually abhorrent acts alleged herein arose to the level of "extreme" and "outrageous" conduct.

318. At all times material herein, Defendants MMA, MMERC, SYFA, VBH, SCA, SYSA, and Ripley were, or should have been, aware of the sexually abhorrent acts committed by their staff members, as evidenced by the inexhaustible number of similar acts occurring at many of their affiliate facilities across the country due to intentional business practices. As such, the conduct on behalf of Defendants MMA, MMERC, SYFA, VBH, SCA, SYSA, and Ripley was "extreme" and "outrageous."

319. At all times material herein, by and through their actions, all Defendants either intended to cause emotional distress to Plaintiffs through the intentional acts of staff members sexual abuse and/or sexual assault of Plaintiffs or so recklessly disregarded the near certainty that such distress would result from the systematic and intentional failure to properly implement procedural safeguards at Defendant MMA.

320. As a direct, proximate, and foreseeable result of Defendant's actions and omissions against Plaintiffs as alleged above, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer severe emotional distress.

COUNT SEVEN: NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
(Against all Defendants)

321. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

322. At all times material herein, Defendants acted negligently in their repeated failure to monitor, supervise, and perform sufficient well-being checks on Plaintiffs as they were subjected to horrific sexual abuse at the hands of the employee Abusers. The Defendants' actions and failures to act directly resulted in injury and emotional distress to Plaintiffs.

323. At all times material herein, Defendants negligently engaged in certain acts as alleged above, which resulted in injury and emotional distress to all Plaintiffs.

324. At all times material herein, Defendants knew or in the exercise of ordinary care should have known that the employee Abusers posed a significant risk and threat to Plaintiffs' physical health, developmental health, mental health and well-being, when Plaintiffs were placed in the Abusers' care by Defendants.

325. At all times material hereto, Defendants knew or in the exercise of ordinary care should have known that the Abusers they hired to provide care to Plaintiffs were unfit to serve in their respective positions at MMA.

326. As a direct, proximate, and foreseeable result of Defendants' actions and omissions against Plaintiffs, as alleged above, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer damages including but not limited to significant and enduring emotional distress including, humiliation, confusion, sleeplessness, intrusive thoughts, lack of trust, flashbacks, inappropriate physical behaviors and violence, and loss of self-worth.

327. As a result of Defendants' negligent conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer physical, emotional, developmental and psychological damage, including severe and unrelenting emotional distress, trauma and anxiety, all to their damages, in an amount to be proven at trial.

COUNT EIGHT: NEGLIGENT HIRING, TRAINING, SUPERVISION AND RETENTION

(Against all Defendants)

328. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

329. Defendants were at all relevant times responsible for the safety of the minor Children under their custody and control. Defendants were responsible for creating, implementing and enforcing hiring, training, supervision, and retention policies that ensured the safety of the minor children in their custody.

330. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs' abusers and rapists were agents and/or employees of Defendants. Abusers were under the direct supervision, management, agency and control of Defendants and or their agents at all times during their interactions with and assaults on Plaintiffs.

331. Plaintiffs' abusers engaged in the wrongful conduct outlined herein while acting within the course and scope of their respective employment with Defendants and/or accomplished and perpetuated the sexual abuse by virtue of their job-created authority over Plaintiffs' health, wellbeing, activities and progress.

332. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to ensure that Abusers did not sexually abuse the minor female children in their custody, including, vetting, training, and supervising Abusers to ensure they did not abuse the minor female residents in their custody.

333. Defendants also had a duty to investigate inappropriate and/or abusive behavior on the part of its employees and to discipline them appropriately, including terminating Abusers from MMA.

334. Defendants were negligent in their hiring, training, and supervision of Abusers in that they knew or should have known through the exercise of ordinary care, that the conduct of Abusers would subject Plaintiffs to an unreasonable risk of harm.

335. Abusers were given regular, direct, unsupervised access to Plaintiffs during the course and scope of their duties when Defendants knew or should have known that this lack of supervision and safety procedures presented an unreasonable risk of harm to minor children.

336. Defendants breached their duty to Plaintiffs by actively employing and maintaining Abusers in a position of power, authority, and dominion over minor children, including Plaintiffs.

337. Defendants were negligent in their retention of Abusers in that they knew, or should have known through the exercise of reasonable care, that the retention of said Abusers

would result in an unreasonable risk of harm to Plaintiffs, including subjecting Plaintiffs to horrific sexual abuse.

338. Additionally, Defendants owed a duty to train and educate employees, management and administrators and to establish policies and procedures to detect, deter, prevent, and address sexual abuse of children by facility staff.

339. Defendants were negligent in the training and instruction of its agents and employees. Defendants failed to properly train, educate, supervise and/or monitor their staff, agents, and employees with regard to the policies and procedures established to combat sexual abuse in the MMA facility.

340. In negligently hiring, training, supervising, and retaining Abusers, and in failing to establish training policies and procedures for employees and administrators, Defendants failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

341. It was reasonably foreseeable to Defendants that their failure to exercise reasonable care would result in the sexual abuse of the minor female residents in their custody, including Plaintiffs.

342. Plaintiffs would not have suffered the foreseeable harm outlined herein but for Defendants' negligent hiring, training, supervision, and retention of Abusers and the negligent training and instruction of its other agents and employees.

343. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, Plaintiffs sustained severe and permanent injuries, including but not limited to pain, suffering, and emotional and psychological trauma.

COUNT NINE: PUNITIVE DAMAGES
(Against all Defendants and as to all Claims)

344. Plaintiffs reallege all prior paragraphs of this Complaint and incorporate all other allegations as if fully set forth herein.

345. Due to the extreme negligence by Defendants and their inability to hire, train, supervise and provide appropriate staff for a vulnerable population of individuals, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer severe physical, emotional and psychological damage that will undoubtedly hinder the rest of their lives.

346. Defendants knew, or in the exercise of ordinary care, reasonably should have known that severe bodily injury or death was substantially likely to occur as a result of the negligence and acts as described above.

347. Defendants acted with an "evil hand and evil mind." "An evil mind may be found where a defendant intended to injure the plaintiff or where, although not intending to cause injury, the defendant consciously pursued a course of conduct knowing that it created a substantial risk of significant harm to others." *Swift Transp. Co. v. Carman*, 253 Ariz. 499 (2022).

348. The conduct, negligence, and carelessness of Defendants described above and herein was outrageous and showed or was committed with willfulness or with such gross negligence as to indicate a complete and reckless indifference to or conscious and wanton disregard of the safety and rights of Plaintiffs, and others, and proximately caused injury to Plaintiff, thereby justifying an award of punitive damages as to all claims in such sum as

will serve to punish Defendants and deter Defendants, and others, from like conduct in the future.

349. The bases for punitive damages are summarized below:

a. Defendants knew their staff had a history of sexually abhorrent behavior against minors and still allowed them to work in their facility;

b. Defendants had a history amongst all of their facilities across the country of physical and sexual assaults perpetrated by their staff members upon their minor residents due to their grossly insufficient policies and practices;

c. Defendants knew they had a problem with understaffing that put the safety and security of their residents at risk;

d. Defendants failed to investigate, report, or otherwise notice physical and sexual assaults occurring on behalf of their staff members; and

e. Defendants failed to take any actions against staff members known to be a risk to the facility.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment and damages against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

A. For general compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial in excess of the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court;

B. For an award of special damages according to proof;

C. For costs of suit incurred herein;

D. For punitive damages on all claims; and

E. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just.

DATED this 13th day of January, 2025.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

THE MEADOW LAW FIRM

By: */s/Richard D. Meadow*
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

BURG SIMPSON
ELDREDGE HERSH & JARDINE, P.C.

By: */s/ David K. TeSelle*
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ORIGINAL filed with Turbo-court and
on this 13th day of January, 2025 to:

Attn:

/s/ Laura M. Ramirez