CV-2016-09-3928 MICHAEL, KATHRYN 02/26/2024 15:06:05 PM CROS Page 1 of 9
CA-31007 Appeals, Court of 02/26/2024 15:06:05 PM CROS Page 1 of 9

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS SUMMIT COUNTY, OHIO

MEMBER WILLIAMS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

KISLING, NESTICO & REDICK, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV-2016-09-3928

Judge James A. Brogan

Notice of Cross-Appeal

Plaintiffs hereby give notice that they are cross-appealing to the Ninth District Court of Appeals, Summit County, Ohio, from the Decision of the Summit County Court of Common Pleas that was entered on January 26, 2024, a copy of which is attached along with the attached docketing statement and incorporated by reference herein.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>/s/ Peter Pattakos</u>

Peter Pattakos (0082884)
Zoran Balac (0100501)
Gregory Gipson (0089340)
THE PATTAKOS LAW FIRM LLC
101 Ghent Rd., Fairlawn, Ohio 44333
P: 330.836.8533 | F: 330.836.8536
peter@pattakoslaw.com
zbalac@pattakoslaw.com
ggipson@pattakoslaw.com

Joshua R. Cohen (0032368)
Ellen Kramer (0055552)
COHEN ROSENTHAL & KRAMER LLP
The Hoyt Block Building, Suite 400
Cleveland, Ohio 44113
Phone: 216.781.7956 | Fax: 216.781.8061
jcohen@crklaw.com
ekramer@crklaw.com

CV-2016-09-3928 MICHAEL, KATHRYN 02/26/2024 15:06:05 PM CROS Page 2 of 9
CA-31007 Appeals, Court of 02/26/2024 15:06:05 PM CROS Page 2 of 9

Certificate of Service

The foregoing document was filed on February 26, 2024, using the Court's e-filing system, which will serve copies on all necessary parties.

/s/ Peter Pattakos Attorney for Plaintiffs MICHAEL, KATHRYN

Appeals, Court of

02/26/2024 15:06:05 PM

CROS

Page 3 of 9
Page 3 of 9

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIONINTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

Docketing Statement

Appeal No. CA-31007, CA-31008

A time-stamped copy of the final judgment being appealed must be attached to this statement.

A time-stamped copy of the final judgment being appealed <u>must</u> be attached to this statement.				
	Trial Court Name Summit C	County Court of Common Pleas		
Trial Court Caption	MEMBER WILLIAMS (Name of first plaintiff)	Trial Court Case Number <u>CV-2016-09-3928</u>		
	v.	Trial Court Judge James A. Brogan		
	KISLING, NESTICO & REDICK, LLC (Name of first defendant)	Date of judgment appealedJanuary 26, 2024 Was the time to appeal extended by App.R. 4(B)? YesX_ No		
THIS APPEA	CALENDAR DE LESHOULD BE ASSIGNED TO:	DESIGNATION		
	rated Calendar. See Loc.R. 11.1.	lying termination of parental rights). See App.R. 11.2.		
		EECORD caph that applies.		
	ERK OF COURTS: Please immediately a marked accurately describes the complete re	ssemble and transmit the record in this case. I certify that ecord to be filed:		
	<u>e</u>	al papers, exhibits, a certified copy of the docket and were filed in the trial court prior to final judgment.		
the docket and reporter appoi	l journal entries, and a full or partial trans	nd exhibits filed in the trial court, a certified copy of script of proceedings prepared for this appeal by a court a praecipe that I also filed with this court. If only a R. 9(B).		
of the docket a		nd exhibits filed in the trial court and a certified copy e evidence or proceedings pursuant to App.R. 9(C) or 0).		
of the docket a by the trial co	and journal entries, and both a transcript of	nd exhibits filed in the trial court and a certified copy of proceedings prepared by a court reporter appointed be pursuant to App.R. 9(C) or (D). If only a partial .		
•	o rely upon a transcript of proceedings fi pplement the record in this appeal with the	led in an earlier appeal, you must seek permission from ne transcript filed in the earlier appeal.		

A time-stamped copy of the final judgment being appealed <u>must</u> be attached to this statement. If the order appealed is not final and appealable under R.C. 2505.02, the Court must dismiss the appeal.

CV-2016-09-3928

CA-31007

MICHAEL, KATHRYN

CROS CROS Page 4 of 9

Appeals, Court of

Page 4 of 9

Please provide the following information for all parties to the proceedings in the trial court. A party who files a notice of appeal is an appellant. A party who would be adversely affected if the judgment below is

reversed should be designated as an appellee. All other parties to the action below should retain their trial court designation (plaintiff, defendant, third-party plaintiff, third-party defendant, petitioner, respondent, etc.). See Local Rule 3. If a party was not represented by counsel in the proceedings below, please provide the address and phone number of the party. If there are additional parties and/or attorneys, please copy this page, complete the information for the additional parties, and attach it to this statement. Appellant must attach a copy of any order that resolved a claim against any of the parties.

Party's name Member Williams	Party's name_ Thera Reid		
Party's designation Appellee/Cross-Appellant	Party's designation Appellee/Cross-Appellant		
Attorney's name Peter Pattakos, Zoran Balac & Gregory Gipson	Attorney's name Peter Pattakos, Zoran Balac & Gregory Gipson		
Attorney's registration number <u>0082884, 0100501, 0089340</u>	Attorney's registration number <u>0082884, 0100501, 0089340</u>		
Address of counsel or party The Pattakos Law Firm LLC	Address of counsel or party The Pattakos Law Firm LLC		
101 Ghent Rd., Fairlawn, OH 44333	101 Ghent Rd., Fairlawn, OH 44333		
Phone 330-836-8533 Fax 330-836-8536	Phone 330-836-8533 Fax 330-836-8536		
Emailpeter@pattakoslaw.com; zbalac@pattakoslaw.comggipson@pattakoslaw.com	Email _peter@pattakoslaw.com; zbalac@pattakoslaw.com ggipson@pattakoslaw.com		
Party's name Monique Norris	Party's nameRichard Harbour		
Party's designation Appellee/Cross-Appellant	Party's designation Appellee/Cross-Appellant		
Attorney's name Peter Pattakos, Zoran Balac & Gregory Gipson	Attorney's name_Peter Pattakos, Zoran Balac & Gregory Gipson		
Attorney's registration number <u>0082884, 0100501, 0089340</u>	Attorney's registration number <u>0082884, 0100501, 0089340</u>		
Address of counsel or party The Pattakos Law Firm LLC	Address of counsel or party The Pattakos Law Firm LLC		
101 Ghent Rd., Fairlawn, OH 44333	101 Ghent Rd., Fairlawn, OH 44333		
Phone 330-836-8533 Fax 330-836-8536	Phone 330-836-8533 Fax 330-836-8536		
Email <u>peter@pattakoslaw.com; zbalac@pattakoslaw.com</u> ggipson@pattakoslaw.com	Email <u>peter@pattakoslaw.com; zbalac@pattakoslaw.com</u> ggipson@pattakoslaw.com		
Party's name Kisling, Nestico & Redick LLC	Party's name_ Alberto R. Nestico		
Party's designation Appellant/Cross-Appellee	Party's designation Appellant/Cross-Appellee		
Attorney's name R. Eric Kennedy & Daniel P. Goetz	Attorney's name R. Eric Kennedy & Daniel P. Goetz		
Attorney's registration number 0006174, 0065549	Attorney's registration number 0006174, 0065549		
Address of counsel or party Weisman, Kennedy & Berris Co., LPA	Address of counsel or party Weisman, Kennedy & Berris Co., LPA		
101 Prospect Ave, 1600 Midland Bldg, Cleveland, OH 44115	_ 101 Prospect Ave, 1600 Midland Bldg, Cleveland, OH 44115		
Phone216-781-1111	Phone 216-781-1111 Fax 216-781-6747		
Emailekennedy@weismanlaw.com; dgoetz@weismanlaw.com	Email _ekennedy@weismanlaw.com; dgoetz@weismanlaw.com		

A-31007	Appeals, Court of	02/26/2024 15:06:05	PM CROS Page 5 of 9		
		T			
Party's name	e Robert Redick	P	arty's nameSam Ghoubrial, M.D.		
Party's desig	gnation Appellee/Cross-Appe	ellant P	arty's designation Appellee/Cross-Appellant		
Attorney's n	ame R. Eric Kennedy & Dar	niel P. Goetz	attorney's name Bradley J. Barmen		
Attorney's re	egistration number <u>0006174, (</u>	0065549 A	Attorney's registration number 0076515		
Address of c	Address of counsel or party Weisman, Kennedy & Berris Co., LPA		Address of counsel or party <u>Lewis Brisbois</u>		
101 Prospec	ct Ave, 1600 Midland Bldg, Cl	eveland, OH 44115	1375 E. 9th Street, Suite 2250, Cleveland, OH 44114		
Phone 330	-836-8533 Fax 3	30-836-8536 P	hone 216-344-9422 Fax 216-344-9421		

Email <u>brad.barmen@lewisbrisbois.com</u>

02/26/2024 15:06:05 PM

CROS

Page 5 of 9

MICHAEL, KATHRYN

Email _ekennedy@weismanlaw.com; dgoetz@weismanlaw.com

CV-2016-09-3928

CV-2016-09-3928 CA-31007 Was a stay reques	MICHAEL, KATHRYN Appeals, Court of sted in the trial court?	02/26/2024 15:06:05 P GENERAL INFO 22/26/2024 15:06:05 P Yes X			age 6 of 9 age 6 of 9
	as requested, how dic			Denied	Pending
If this case has pr	reviously been before	this Court, list prior	r appellate case num	ber(s): 29630, 29636,	30602, 30604, 31031
List case names a	and numbers of cases	pending in this cour	t that involve the same	me transaction or	controversy
involved in this a	ppeal:				
Probable issues fo	of all fees coll other participa on purported "	lected by Defendants in cases wh ants in Defendants' cash kickback "discounts" offered by Defendant	account for evidence demonstrationere KNR clients were treated by k scheme; and (2) whether the tricts to the clients' they defrauded, went nature of Defendants' scheme	Defendants Ghoubrial, Flore al court erred in otherwise limits which at most offset the fraue	os, and miting the class based
			Felony Guilty/No conte	est plea	
Charges					
Sentence					
Type of Appeal:	Defendant'	's Appeal as of Righ		ate's Appeal as of ate's Appeal by L	_
		CIVIL C	ASE		
Type of action in	trial court?				
	t dispose of all claims determination that the				s <u>x</u> No
	previously participate on conference assist in		-		Maybe
App App	e expedited as being of p.R. 11.2(B) or (C) app.R. 11.2(D) appeals (peal under determinate ction contests as prov	ppeals (abortion with (dependent, abused, tion of local fiscal er	hout parental consen neglected, unruly, o mergency brought by	t, adoption, and por delinquent child	arental rights)
	AT THE ABOVE INFO ATTACHED A COPY				
		_/s/ <i>Peter Pa</i> Signature o	attakos f Counsel (or party if no	 of represented by cou	nsel)

CROS CROS Page 7 of 9
Page 7 of 9

TAVIA GALONSKI

2024 JAN 26 PM 1: 43

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
COUNTY OF SUMMIT

SUMMIT COUNTY CLERK OF COURTS

MEMBER WILLIAMS, et al.) CASE NO. CV 2016 09 3928
Plaintiffs	JUDGE JAMES A. BROGAN(Sitting by Assignment #18JA1214)
-VS-)
KISLING, NESTICO & REDICK, LLC, et al.) <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 first of the second section with the second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section of the second section is a section of the second section of the second section is a second section of the second section of the second section is a second section of the second section of the second section of the section of the

CROS

Page 8 of 9 c

CV-2016-09-3928 CA-31007

CROS

Page 8 of 9

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.

Sitting by Assignment #18JA1214

Pursuant to Art. IV, Sec. 6

Ohio Constitution

CROS CROS Page 9 of 9 Page 9 of 9

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

JAB:lcb 16-3928remand3