TAVIA GALONSKI

2024 JAN 26 PM 1: 43

SUMMIT COUNTY CLERK OF COURTS

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS COUNTY OF SUMMIT

MEMBER	WILLIAMS, et al.)	CASE NO. CV 2016 09 3928
]	Plaintiffs))	JUDGE JAMES A. BROGAN (Sitting by Assignment #18JA1214)
-vs-)	
KISLING, I LLC, et al.	NESTICO & REDICK,))	<u>DECISION</u>
]	Defendants)	

The Ninth District Court of Appeals remanded this matter to this Court for the second time.

The Court of Appeals held that this Court failed to conduct a "rigorous analysis" of the requirements of Civ.R. 23(B) specifically, the predominance and superiority requirements of the Rule.

In <u>Cope v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.</u>, 82 Ohio St. 3d 426, the Ohio Supreme Court held that a class satisfies the predominance requirement when generalized evidence exists to prove or disprove an element on a simultaneous class wide basis, because such proof obviates the need to examine each class members' individual positions. The Supreme Court recognized that when a common fraud is perpetuated on a class of persons, those persons should be able to pursue an avenue of proof that is common to all members and involves standardized procedures by the defendants. See <u>Hamilton v. Ohio Savings Bank</u> (1998) 82 Ohio St. 3d 67 at 77.

and the second of the second s

In this matter, this Court will certify as Class A only those patients and clients of the

defendants who were alleged victims of the price gouging scheme who did not receive a reduction

of their medical bills or fees and were told not to use their health insurance carriers to avoid scrutiny

of these charges and fees. These charges by Ghoubrial were for trigger point injections, TENS units

and back braces.

The fact that some of the patients and clients received more of the procedures or devices

than others should not prevent them being in the same class in this lawsuit.

Judge Henzel stated in Mozingo v. 2007 Gaslight Ohio, LLC (2016) Ohio 4828 the fact that

each of the class members may have a different amount of damages does not automatically make

the class unmanageable and not "superior" to other available methods for adjudication of the

controversy.

For the purposes of this class action, the "necessity" for the medical injections and devices

will be conceded. The Plaintiff will have to prove in the action that the prices for these items would

not be covered by the standard health insurance coverages for these individuals.

The defendants have not asserted in their motion to dismiss that any of the clients or patients

have attempted to start a parallel action or to intervene in one, and it seems unlikely in light of the

relatively small individual recoverys that would be sought.

Thera Reid qualifies as a class representative because she alleged in the complaint that she

was charged unreasonable rates for trigger point injections by Dr. Ghoubrial pursuant to the price

gouging scheme alleged in the complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DOE JAMES A BROGAN

Sitting by Assignment #18JA1214

Pursuant to Art. IV, Sec. 6

Ohio Constitution

2

The Clerk of Courts shall serve all counsel/parties of record.

JAB:lcb 16-3928remand3