318140 SUS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

04-CV-02071-CMP

\_\_\_\_\_\_FILED \_\_\_\_\_ RECEIVED \_\_\_\_\_\_RECEIVED

AY SEATHE CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON BY DEPUTY

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Washington State Nurses Association,

Plaintiff,

No. CV4 2071M

Virginia Mason Medical Center,

v

Defendant.

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF PENDING ARBITRATION

Plaintiff, by way of Complaint, alleges as follows:

## I. PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1.1 Plaintiff Washington State Nurses Association ("WSNA") is a labor organization as defined by 29 USC § 152(5), with its principal office located in King County Washington.
- 1.2 Defendant Virginia Mason Medical Center ("Employer") is an employer as defined by 29 USC §152(2), and is a private not-for-profit corporation doing business in King County, Washington.

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF PENDING ARBITRATION - 1 G (General/Files/Client Files/2831/695)Complaint VM doc LAW OFFICES OF
SCHWERIN CAMPBELL BARNARD LLP
18 WEST MERCES STREET
SUITE-400
SEATTLE WASHINGTON 98119-3971
[206] 288-2828

24

25

- 1.3 This Court has jurisdiction of this matter pursuant to Section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 29 USC § 185.
- 1.4 Venue is proper in this Court because the matters giving rise to this complaint occurred within this judicial district.

#### II. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 2.1 WSNA is the sole and exclusive bargaining representative for all registered nurses employed by Virginia Mason Hospital, a division of Virginia Mason Medical Center.
- 2.2 WSNA and the Employer are parties to a collective bargaining agreement effective from May 15, 2001, through November 15, 2004.
- 2.3 The Employer and the WSNA are currently in negotiations for a successor collective bargaining agreement. Absent a new agreement, the parties may be free to take economic action when the current Agreement expires.
- 2.4 In a letter received by the WSNA on September 16, 2004, the Employer for the first time raised the possibility of "partnering" in a program, the "goal" of which would be 100% immunization. The Employer requested a meeting to discuss this possibility before the end of September.
- 2.5 Rather than wait for the proposed meeting, the Employer on September 20, 2004, announced that henceforth all staff, including nurses, would be required to submit to a flu vaccination as a mandatory "fitness for duty" condition of employment. Those with documented allergies, or as yet undefined religious objections, would be required to instead take prophylaxis medication for influenza.

21

22 23

24

25 26

2.6 The Employer announced it would terminate any nurse who was not vaccinated or taking the prophylaxis medication by January 1, 2005.

- 2.7 The following day, September 21, 2004, a representative of the WSNA demanded the Hospital cease and desist from implementing this policy and called for a meeting to address the issue. Although a meeting was arranged, the Employer did not back off on its announced implementation.
- 2.8 On September 29, 2004, the WSNA filed a grievance under the collective bargaining agreement alleging that the implementation of the mandatory vaccination policy violated numerous provisions, including the Agreement's Preamble, Article 1, Article 3.3, Article 5.1, Article 5.8, and Article 12.2. The grievance requests that the Employer cease and desist from its mandatory vaccination directive.
- 2.9 Article 1 of the Agreement provides in part that the "Hospital recognizes the Association as the sole and exclusive bargaining representative for all full-time, parttime and per diem nurses employed as registered nurses by the Hospital." As the exclusive representative the WSNA is entitled as a matter of law and the Agreement to bargain, be consulted and be heard before the Employer implements a policy forcing health risks on those they represent.
- 2.10 This obligation is reinforced by the Preamble which provides the parties "share the common purpose of providing quality health care services to the general public in an atmosphere of cooperation and mutual respect." Article 5.8, entitled "Communications" expressly provides that "[t]he Hospital recognizes and values input from its nurses on the many aspects of providing quality patient care." The Employer's

25

26

unilateral implementation of forced medical treatment without consultation or input is inconsistent with the above contract provisions and numerous other provisions of the Agreement.

- 2.11 Nor is the Agreement silent on this issue of medical procedures for murses. Article 12.2 entitled, "Health Tests," provides that at "the time of employment, the Hospital shall provide a Tuberculin skin test at no cost to the nurse." Vaccinations are nowhere listed as a permitted medical procedure. Having negotiated and memorialized a specific medical procedure, the Employer is barred from unilaterally imposing new non-negotiated procedures.
- 2.12 The Employer's action is likewise in violation of its obligation to maintain a safe and healthy workplace.
- 2.13 Although the grievance-arbitration procedure will eventually culminate in a final and binding arbitration decision, it will take from six months to a year to obtain the decision.
- 2.14 Since by the time an arbitration decision could be rendered, nurses will already have been forced to submit to vaccinations or antiviral medication, a cease and desist order by the arbitrator will be a futile act rather than a meaningful remedy. The arbitrator will no longer be able to issue a remedy which protects the substantial privacy, health and economic interests of the impacted nurses.
- 2.15 Registered nurses are medical experts who work tirelessly to protect the health of their patients and are well aware of the risks and benefits of vaccinations and prophylaxis medication. Denying them the right to make a personal decision about

25

26

whether to undergo medical treatment in light of their own private medical considerations and work experience constitutes a substantial invasion of their privacy.

- 2.16 Forced vaccinations or prophylaxis medication may also pose health risks which could not be remedied by a later arbitration decision. Flu vaccinations pose health risks to those who are allergic to one or more of the vaccination's components. Those with allergic reactions to eggs or chemical preservatives used in the vaccine may face life threatening allergic reactions.
- 2.17 The prophylaxis medication offered as an alternative carries some medical risk and significant negative side effects. The Center for Disease Control ("CDC") recommends individual patient analysis for age, medical conditions and drug interactions before any such medication is taken. Depending on which prophylaxis drug is chosen, side effects may include (1) nervousness, anxiety, insomnia, difficulty concentrating, lightheadedness, nausea and gastronomical problems, or (2) respiratory function deterioration particularly damaging to those with respiratory or cardiac disease.
- 2.18 There is no justification for proceeding with mandatory vaccinations with little or no warning and without first engaging in reasonable communications with impacted nurses. Such vaccinations are not a condition of becoming a registered nurse in Washington. The CDC recommends voluntary vaccination programs and education efforts, not forced vaccinations.
- 2.19 Although the WSNA supports and promotes voluntary vaccination programs, forcing medical treatment on pain of loss of employment impermissibly intrudes on private and personal medical decisions and may force some nurses to choose

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

While the Association believes receiving influenza vaccine is a good choice for most nurses, it is just that – a choice. The Association believes that the receipt of any medical treatment is up to the individual patient and that education – not brute force – is the best way to encourage any person to receive medical care. In addition, the Association is very concerned about the adverse consequences not only to the privacy of Virginia Mason nurses but the possibility of adverse medical consequence to nurses allergic to vaccine.

The Association is willing and eager to work with VM to develop an educational program for employees related to influenza prevention and treatment. However, the Association believes that Virginia Mason's unilaterally implemented policy violates the terms and the very purpose of our collective bargaining agreement.

2.20 To protect the jurisdiction of the arbitrator and the substantial interests of represented Nurses, the WSNA proposed to the Employer that rather than forcing nurses to receive medical treatment against their wishes, the Employer withdraw its vaccination directive pending a hearing and decision before an arbitrator. The WSNA also proposed expedited arbitration. At an October 1, 2004 meeting the Employer's representatives made vague and inconsistent statements regarding their directive, but refused to provide assurance that it would agree to delay implementation or agree to expedited arbitration.

#### III. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

- 3.1 Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations made in paragraphs 2.1 through 2.20 above.
- 3.2. The Employer's refusal to halt implementation of its mandatory vaccination program violates Section 301 of the LMRA, 29 U.S.C. § 185, and Employer's obligations under the parties' collective bargaining agreement. WSNA has

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF PENDING ARBITRATION - 6
G (General/Files/Client Files/2821/695)Complaint VM doe

26

properly challenged Employer's actions by filing a grievance and demanding arbitration under the collective bargaining agreement. As a result, this dispute must properly be resolved in arbitration.

- 3.3. The foregoing actions by the Employer will, unless promptly enjoined, cause the WSNA and the nurses it represents irreparable harm and will frustrate the arbitral process initiated by the Association to protect its members from forced medical treatment. Immediate injunctive relief is appropriate and necessary to maintain the status quo to permit the arbitrator to consider and act upon the dispute.
- 3.4. Unless promptly enjoined, the Employer will not cease and desist from its unlawful course of action.
- 3.5. An injunction maintaining the status quo will not cause measurable harm to the Employer as it will not disturb its present industry standard voluntary vaccination program. Indeed the Employer has acknowledged (1) that a majority of its employees are voluntarily vaccinated in numbers far above the national average, (2) it knows of no instance of a patient being infected by a staff member.
  - 3.6. The Union has complied with all obligations imposed by law in connection with this dispute including making reasonable efforts to settle this dispute without first seeking judicial intervention.

### IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court award it the following relief:

24

25

26