

RECEIVED 9/11/17

JUL 31 2015

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF Florence  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE  
SC Court of Appeals

CASE NO. 2014 CP-21-1923

Larry D. Outler  
DATE FILED: 7/27/15  
CCJP & GS  
FLORENCE COUNTY, SC

James Yarnal, et al

PLAINTIFF(S)

DEFENDANT(S)

Submitted by:

Attorney for :  Plaintiff  Defendant  
or  
 Self-Represented Litigant

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

- JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.  See Page 2 for additional information.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):**  Rule 12(b), SCRPC;  Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit);  Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled);  Other \_\_\_\_\_
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):**  Rule 40(j), SCRPC;  Bankruptcy;  Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award;  Other \_\_\_\_\_
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**  
 Affirmed;  Reversed;  Remanded;  Other \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:  See attached order (formal order to follow)  Statement of Judgment by the Court: \_\_\_\_\_

ORDER INFORMATION

This order  ends  does not end the case.  
Additional Information for the Clerk : \_\_\_\_\_

INFORMATION FOR THE JUDGMENT INDEX

Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below:

Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)
		\$
		\$
		\$

If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order:

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk. Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.

Circuit Court Judge \_\_\_\_\_ Judge Code \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
 COUNTY OF FLORENCE )  
 )  
 Larry D. Outler, Fed. No. 71590-083, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 vs. )  
 )  
 James Yarnal, Mark Barnard, and )  
 Ramesh A. Bharadwaj, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
 TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
 C/A NO.: 2014-CP-21-1923

FILED  
 2015 MAY 25 PM 12:56  
 CLERK REEL 10  
 COURT & GS  
 FLORENCE COUNTY, S.C.


**ORDER**

THIS MATTER comes before me on Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6), *South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure*, entered by James Yarnal, M.D., Mark Barnard, M.D., and Ramesh A. Bharadwaj, M.D.

This matter was called for hearing on Monday, April 6, 2015, with due notice to the Plaintiff, Larry D. Outler, and the Defendant physicians, through counsel. J. Boone Aiken, III, of the law firm of AIKEN BRIDGES, of the Florence County Bar was present representing all Defendants. Mr. Outler participated in the hearing via telephone conference which had been arranged through the Florence County Clerk of Court's office.

The *pro se* Plaintiff, Larry D. Outler, filed a Motion to File Suit in Civil Court with accompanying "Discussion of Facts," Summons and Complaint on July 11, 2014.

On August 29, 2014, the Defendants through counsel entered a Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss.

CERTIFIED: A TRUE COPY  
  
 CLERK OF COURT C.P. & G.S.  
 FLORENCE COUNTY, S.C.

On September 9, 2014, the Plaintiff filed a Motion to Petition for an Extension of Time in which to file a response and on October 27, 2014, the Plaintiff filed a Motion in Response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

The position of the Defendants is, first, the Plaintiff seems to be alleging an action for medical malpractice and as such the Plaintiff has failed to comply with the pre-litigation requirements for a medical malpractice action. *South Carolina Code. Ann.* § 15-36-100 and §15-79-125 require the Plaintiff to file a Notice of Intent to File Suit as a prerequisite to filing the action, along with an affidavit of an expert witness who meets certain statutory requirements. The Defendants argued for a dismissal pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1), lack of jurisdiction over the person, and Rule 12(b)(6), *SCRPC*, for failure to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. The Plaintiff failed to file a Notice of Intent to File Suit and an expert affidavit as required by the referenced statutes.

Second, in addition to apparently presenting a case of alleged medical malpractice, the Plaintiff has further attempted to state a cause of action against the Defendant physicians, alleging that the Defendant physicians intentionally disclosed protected and confidential medical information concerning a medical condition suffered by Plaintiff to person(s) not authorized by law to receive such information. The Defendant physicians have specifically denied any and all such allegations and have also argued that subject matter jurisdiction is lacking with this Court as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act ("HIPAA") does not contain any express language conferring any rights upon a specific class of individuals if privacy regulations are violated.

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, Pub.L. No. 104-191, 110 Stat. 1936 (1996) codified primarily in Titles 18, 26 and 42 of the United States Code, serves as the basis for the development of privacy regulations and generally provides for confidentiality of medical records. As set forth in Alexander v. Sandoval, 532 U.S. 275, 286, 121 S.Ct. 1511, 149 L.Ed.2d 517 (2001), "private rights of action to enforce federal law must be created by Congress." The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals stated in Banks v. Dallas Hous. Auth., 271 F.3d 605, 608 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001), "HIPAA has no express provision creating a private cause of action and therefore we must determine if such is implied within the statute," and this Court concluded that there is no private cause of action under HIPAA.

Every district court that has considered whether Congress intended for private enforcement of HIPAA has concluded that the statute does not support a private right of action, Agee v. United States, 72 Fed.Cl. 284 (2006); Walker v. Gerald, No. 05-6649, 2006 WL1997635 (E.D.La. June 27, 2006); Poli v. Mountain Valleys Health Ctrs., Inc., No. 2:05-2015-GEB-KJM, 2006 WL 83378 (E.D.Cal. Jan.11, 2006); Cassidy v. Nicolo, No. 03-CV-6603-CJS, 2005 WL 3334523 (W.D.N.Y. Dec. 7, 2005); Johnson v. Quander, 370 F.Supp.2d 79 (D.D.C. 2005); Univ. of Colo. Hosp., 340 F.Supp.2d 1142 (D.Colo.2004); \*572 O'Donnell v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wyo., 173 F.Supp.2d 1176 (D.Wyo.2001); Means v. Ind. Life & Accident Ins. Co., 963 F.Supp. 1131 (M.D.Ala. 1997); Wright v. Combined Ins. Co. of Am., 959 F.Supp. 356 (N.D. Miss. 1997).


While HIPAA does provide both civil and criminal penalties for improper disclosures of medical information, the enforcement of the statute belongs to the

Secretary of Health and Human Services, Alexander v. Sandoval, 532 U.S. 275, 286, 121 S.Ct. 1511, 149 L.Ed.2d 517 (2001).

In response to the arguments of the Defendant physicians, Mr. Outler was allowed to read his entire ten-page Motion in response to Defendants' Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss.

After having carefully considered this matter, the Court concludes that the Motion to Dismiss entered by the Defendant physicians should be granted. Because HIPAA does not give rise to a private cause of action, no subject matter jurisdiction exists with regard to this case. Further, this matter must be dismissed as the *pro se* Plaintiff failed to follow the pre-litigation requirements for a medical malpractice action as set forth in *S.C. Code Ann.* § 15-36-100 and §15-79-125.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is granted.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael G. Nettles, Chief Administrative  
Judge of the Twelfth Judicial Circuit


Date: 5-19-, 2015

Florence, South Carolina

FILED  
MAY 26 11:25:56  
COMM. REPLY  
CCOF 2-03-15  
FLORENCE COURT-HS

⇔71590-083⇔

Larry Outler  
71590083  
Federal Correctional Complex  
p.o. box 1000-Medium  
Petersburg, VA 23804  
United States



**RECEIVED**

JUL 31 2015

SC Court of Appeals

⇔71590-083⇔

The South Carolina  
Court OF Appeals  
PO BOX 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211  
United States

LEGAL MAIL

PETERSBURG 1804

DATE:

The enclosed letter was processed through special mailing procedures for forwarding to you. The letter has neither been opened nor inspected. If the writer raises a question or problem over which this office has jurisdiction, you may wish to return the material for further information or clarification. If the writer encloses correspondence for forwarding to another address, please return the enclosure to the above address.