

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

JANE DOE S.M.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BHC STREAMWOOD HOSPITAL, INC. d/b/a
STREAMWOOD BEHAVIORAL
HEALTHCARE SYSTEM; UNIVERSAL
HEALTH SERVICES, INC.; and UHS OF
DELAWARE, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:25-cv-13512

**COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY
TRIAL**

Plaintiff Jane Doe S.M. brings this action against BHC Streamwood Hospital, Inc. d/b/a Streamwood Behavioral Healthcare System (“Streamwood” or “Streamwood Hospital”), Universal Health Services, Inc. (“UHS, Inc.”), and UHS of Delaware, Inc. (“UHS-D”, and collectively, “Defendants”). Plaintiff alleges the following based on personal knowledge as to her own facts and upon information and belief and the investigation of counsel as to all other matters.

INTRODUCTION

1. Each year, Streamwood, UHS, Inc., and UHS-D, one of the largest youth mental health networks in the country, assume responsibility for protecting thousands of our country’s most vulnerable members, particularly children who have experienced traumatic events and serious mental health conditions.

2. Streamwood describes itself as “the premier provider of behavioral health services” that “provide[s] hope and meet[s] the ever-changing emotional and behavioral health needs of children, adolescents, and young adults, and their families.”¹ but that has not been the case for

¹ <https://streamwoodhospital.com/> (last visited November 4, 2025).

certain patients. Nonetheless, UHS, Inc. and its subsidiaries, including Streamwood, have advertised themselves to the public, governmental agencies and non-profits, and to the parents and guardians of minor patients or prospective patients in Chicago and surrounding areas, as safe youth residential treatment facilities for children, staffed with trustworthy medical professionals.

3. Instead of fulfilling its critical responsibility to protect these vulnerable youth, Streamwood Behavioral Health System exposed some of them to abusers. Streamwood failed to enact safety measures and other policies to protect children; failed to adequately screen, hire, train, and supervise staff; and failed to fulfill its duties under state and federal law. Dozens of patients have alleged that they experienced assault and sexual abuse at Streamwood.² Federal and state-level investigations into Streamwood have substantiated numerous stories of patient sexual abuse and neglect.³

4. As a result of Defendants' misconduct, children in UHS facilities across the country, and across the state of Illinois, have been sexually, physically, or emotionally abused—often by staff.

5. Plaintiff Jane Doe S.M. was repeatedly sexually assaulted, coerced, and abused by staff and other patients during several intermittent hospitalizations at Streamwood between 2004 and 2006. When she reported her abuse to hospital staff, she was illegally placed in a seclusion room where she was subjected to chemical and physical restraints. As retaliation for reporting the

² See, e.g., <https://www.unsilenced.org/program-archive/us-programs/illinois/streamwood-behavioral-health/>; <https://ir.uhs.com/news-releases/news-release-details/universal-health-services-inc-announces-2024-fourth-quarter-and> (last visited October 29, 2025).

³ <https://oig.hhs.gov/fraud/enforcement/streamwood-behavioral-health-system-agreed-to-pay-285000-for-allegedly-violating-the-civil-monetary-penalties-law-by-employing-an-excluded-individual/> (last visited October 29, 2025); https://web.archive.org/web/20130504053806/http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2013-01-23/news/ct-met-psychiatric-hospital-probe-20130123_1_universal-health-services-inc-riveredge-justice-department (last visited October 29, 2025).

abuse, she was inexplicably transferred to the “SX” dorm for residents with a history of sexually aggressive behavior and adolescents who were significantly older than her, where she was sexually assaulted multiple times. She was 10 years old at the time. As a direct consequence of this abuse, Plaintiff was diagnosed with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and has experienced debilitating consequences that have affected her ability to work and maintain personal relationships.

6. Plaintiff is bringing this lawsuit to hold Defendants accountable for the harm they caused her and to prevent this devastating abuse from happening to any other child under their care.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because Plaintiff alleges actions arising under the laws of the United States, including 20 U.S.C. § 1681 and 34 U.S.C. § 20341.

8. This Court also has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332, because upon information and belief, Plaintiff and Defendant reside in different states, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants UHS, Inc. and UHS-D have substantial and continuous connections with the State of Illinois. Defendants UHS, Inc. and UHS-D own, operate, manage, and control Defendant Streamwood and six other behavioral health facilities in Illinois. As part of their business contracts with the states, they owned, operated, managed, promoted, and controlled the services provided by these behavioral health facilities and profit substantially from these activities. Defendant Streamwood’s principal place of business is also located in Cook County, Illinois.

10. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a)-(d) because, *inter alia*, a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in the District.

THE PARTIES

I. Plaintiff

11. Plaintiff Jane Doe S.M. is a citizen of the State of California.

12. Plaintiff was in an inpatient ward at Streamwood multiple times between 2004 and 2006, when she was 10 to 12 years old.

13. Plaintiff received educational services while at Streamwood.

II. Defendants

A. UHS, Inc.

14. Defendant UHS, Inc. is and has been a public for-profit Delaware corporation with its principal office in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania. UHS, Inc. owns, operates, manages, and controls behavioral health facilities and acute care hospitals throughout the United States, with many of these facilities located in Illinois.

15. UHS, Inc. currently owns seven behavioral health facilities in Illinois. Most are located in Cook County, Illinois.

16. UHS, Inc. operates through several subsidiaries, including but not limited to UHS-D, UHS Children Services, Inc., UHS Outpatient IL, LLC, Thousand Branches Business Support Services, LLC, UHS Outpatient LLC, all of which collectively refer to themselves as “UHS.” All references to “UHS” therefore refer to UHS, Inc. and its subsidiary and related corporate entities, including but not limited to Streamwood Behavioral Health System and UHS-D.

17. Upon information and belief, UHS, Inc., Streamwood, and UHS-D have been responsible for setting and enforcing all policies and procedures governing patient safety and treatment at UHS facilities, including Streamwood, at all relevant times.

18. UHS's policy is to acquire inpatient behavioral facilities and run them in line with UHS systems, policies, and procedures.

19. At all relevant times, these subsidiaries operated as an extension of UHS, and internally, UHS treats them as indistinguishable from itself in corporate records and statements. For instance, in reports filed by the SEC, it defines the terms "we," "our," "UHS," and the "Company" to refer to both UHS "and its subsidiaries." UHS's "principal business" is owning and operating behavioral healthcare facilities through its subsidiaries.⁴

20. Upon information and belief, UHS, Inc., Streamwood, and UHS-D or some combination of the above, have been responsible for hiring, supervision, and disciplinary decisions concerning employees at Streamwood.

21. UHS, Inc. and Streamwood regularly receive state and federal funding for their activities. A significant portion of UHS's revenues are derived from federal and state government programs including the Medicare and Medicaid programs. In 2024, 68 percent of UHS's pretax income came from supplemental Medicaid payment programs.⁵

⁴ <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/932275/000119312511086826/ds4.htm> (last visited October 29, 2025).

⁵ <https://www.wsj.com/finance/stocks/hospital-stocks-get-relieve-on-medicare-spending-for-now-e0f1b683> (last visited October 29, 2025).

22. UHS, Inc. and Streamwood also receive state and federal special education funding via school district reimbursements in Illinois when school districts refer children to Streamwood.⁶ Streamwood advertises its work with local schools to support mental health initiatives.⁷

23. According to UHS press releases in 2025, a substantial portion of UHS's revenue comes from third-party payors like Medicare and Medicaid. UHS reported: "[a] significant portion of our revenues are derived from federal and state government programs, including the Medicare and Medicaid programs."⁸

B. UHS Delaware

23. UHS Delaware (UHS-D) is the management subsidiary of Universal Health Services, Inc.

24. UHS-D is primarily responsible for managing the operations and activities of other related companies within a larger corporate structure, under the direction of UHS, Inc.

25. UHS, Inc. is a "holding company that operates through its subsidiaries," meaning that healthcare and management operations are conducted by subsidiaries.

26. Upon information and belief, UHS-D's registered agent in Illinois is Illinois Corporation Service Company, 801 Adlai Stevenson Drive, Springfield, Illinois.

⁶ *Home/hospital instructions for students*, Illinois State Board of Education Center for Safe and Healthy Climate Wellness Department, https://www.isbe.net/Documents/Home-Hospital_QA.pdf (last visited October 29, 2025).

⁷ <https://www.facebook.com/StreamwoodBHS/posts/we-are-dedicated-to-supporting-mental-health-initiatives-in-schools-because-earl/1447377959908401/> (last visited October 29, 2025).

⁸ <https://ir.uhs.com/news-releases/news-release-details/universal-health-services-inc-announces-2024-fourth-quarter-and> (last visited October 29, 2025).

C. Streamwood Behavioral Health System

27. Defendant Streamwood is a residential treatment facility that provides services to children (between 3 and 11 years old) and adolescents (between 12 and 17 years old). The facility also provides services to adults with behavioral and emotional problems.

28. At all relevant times, Streamwood operated programs that provided mental health services to children and adolescents. These programs treat minors with intellectual disabilities, behavioral and emotional disorders, depression, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, as well as those who exhibit symptoms of physical and sexual abuse, who suffer from suicidal ideation, and who struggle with substance abuse problems.

29. Streamwood is a subsidiary of Defendant Universal Health Services, Inc.; however, Streamwood oversees the day-to-day operations of the centers associated with the Streamwood Behavioral Health System.

30. Streamwood's registered agent is the Illinois Corporation Service Company located at 801 Adlai Stevenson Drive, Springfield, Illinois.

31. Streamwood's principal business address is 1400 Irving Park Rd., Streamwood, IL 60107.

32. Streamwood's day-to-day activities are overseen by its Chief Executive Officer and a local leadership team consisting of medical officers, clinical directors, and program directors, among others.

33. Streamwood's Associate Hospital Administrator serves as a member of the Executive Leadership team and is responsible for overseeing management of hundreds of employees and their core responsibilities relating to patient safety, risk management, compliance, and strategic growth.

34. At all relevant times, executives and members of the leadership team at Streamwood were agents, servants, and employees of UHS, Inc., UHS-D, or a combination thereof.

35. At all relevant times, Streamwood followed and still follows policies and procedures created, controlled, and or enforced by UHS, Inc. and UHS-D. One such policy is the requirement to file “unusual incident reports” with UHS, Inc. when sexual abuse is suspected or witnessed.

36. Streamwood employees consider themselves to be employees of UHS and publicly portray themselves as such. For example, Streamwood’s CEO, Ronald Weglarz, identifies his employer on LinkedIn as “Streamwood Behavioral Healthcare System, Universal Health Services.”⁹

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

37. As “one of the largest” providers of hospital and healthcare services with “approximately 99,300 employees,” UHS Inc. provides mental health care support to thousands of Americans via its 331 Behavioral Health Inpatient Facilities.¹⁰ Streamwood is one of ten Acute Mental Inpatient (AMI) facilities in the area and provides significant health services to the surrounding area. Parents send their children to UHS facilities to receive therapeutic, urgent mental health services, including support for trauma, behavioral health disorders, depression, and substance abuse based upon their reach and expertise.

⁹ <https://www.linkedin.com/in/ronald-j-weglarz-aab9ba43/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

¹⁰ Universal Health Services, <https://uhs.com/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

38. Streamwood advertises to parents that their “child[ren] will be provided individual, group, family, and expressive therapy during their hospitalization designed to help [them] stabilize and safely return to [their parents’] care.”¹¹

39. Streamwood accepts special education funding from local schools who refer students for inpatient care. It promises parents that “[their] child’s education is important to [Streamwood].” Students have “school time where they are with a certified educator helping them keep up with school work that [Streamwood] can obtain from their home school.” If the school does not provide homework, children are provided “age appropriate school work.”¹² The facility also runs a “Therapeutic Day School” to “students struggling with intellectual, emotional, and learning disabilities,”¹³ which receives federal special education funding.

40. UHS describes itself as “[o]ne of the nation’s largest and most respected hospital companies”¹⁴ and advertises its ability to “provide compassionate care to [its] patients and their loved ones.”¹⁵ UHS states that it is “committed to doing its part to improve mental healthcare in communities across the U.S. and to advance suicide prevention at both the national and local levels.”¹⁶

41. UHS also markets its hospitals as “safe place[s]” for healing and recovery.¹⁷

¹¹ <https://streamwoodhospital.com/resources/faqs/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

¹² *Id.*

¹³ <https://streamwoodhospital.com/therapeutic-day-school/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

¹⁴ Universal Health Services, <https://uhs.com/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

¹⁵ *Universal Health Services (UHS) Receives 2024 Press Ganey Human Experience Guardian of Excellence Award*, Universal Health Services (Jan. 7, 2025), <https://uhs.com/news/universal-health-services-receives-2024-press-ganey-human-experience-guardian-excellence-award/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

¹⁶ <https://uhs.com/news/uhs-works-with-communities-to-help-reduce-national-suicide-rates/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

¹⁷ *Voices of Hope – Delivering Superior Quality Patient Care*, Universal Health Services (March 6, 2019), <https://uhs.com/news/voices-of-hope-delivering-superior-quality-patient->

42. Streamwood’s commercials describe it as a place of “help and hope” where staff provide “understanding, compassion, and specialty care when your family needs it most.” The hospital advertises that “better days are ahead” and that Streamwood can help patients “get there.”¹⁸

43. Parents, such as Plaintiff’s mother, in consultation with their children’s schools, send their children to Streamwood because it holds itself out as an effective inpatient mental health treatment program and a place that will safeguard their vulnerable children.

44. Yet the experience for certain patients has been anything but therapeutic. Numerous patients have filed lawsuits against UHS for alleged abuse, with many patients alleging that staff penalized patients who reported their sexual abuse. Some of these complaints date back to the early 1990s.

45. In May 2016, Streamwood agreed to pay \$285,000 in civil penalties for employing an individual that it knew or should have known was excluded from participation in Federal health care programs.¹⁹

46. In 2023, Streamwood once again paid \$180,002 for employing another excluded individual, indicating a pattern of compliance failures.²⁰

[care/#:~:text=A%20safe%20place%20for%20me,my%20diagnosis:%20bipolar%20disorder.%E2%80%9D](#) (last visited October 30, 2025).

¹⁸ <https://streamwoodhospital.com/about-us/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

¹⁹ <https://oig.hhs.gov/fraud/enforcement/streamwood-behavioral-health-system-agreed-to-pay-285000-for-allegedly-violating-the-civil-monetary-penalties-law-by-employing-an-excluded-individual/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

²⁰ <https://oig.hhs.gov/fraud/enforcement/streamwood-behavioral-health-hospital-agreed-to-pay-180000-for-allegedly-violating-the-civil-monetary-penalties-law-by-employing-individuals-excluded-from-illinois-medicaid/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

47. Upon information and belief, Streamwood has also been cited by the Illinois Department of Public Health for multiple safety and compliance issues and required substantial governmental monitoring before it complied with safety standards.

48. Streamwood itself has been the subject of multiple lawsuits and investigations alleging sexual assault.²¹

49. Additionally, in May 2017, a behavioral health technician once employed at Streamwood was charged with sexually abusing a 12-year-old patient with autism and other developmental disorders at the facility. According to prosecutors, he woke the patient in the middle of the night and sexually abused her.²²

50. Yet abuse continues to occur. Streamwood's culture of indifference to the safety and well-being of its patients has caused patients such as Plaintiff to suffer. This culture persists, as many patients or their family members have publicly posted about abuse, neglect, and other serious problems they experienced or witnessed at Streamwood on online forums, such as Google and YELP reviews.

51. At all relevant times, these public postings provided notice to Streamwood and UHS of the serious and systemic abuse at Streamwood.

- a. Internet Review Example 1: I'm finally getting some justice! There is a lawsuit against a group of mental health facilities called UHS. They are being sued for egregious things which I'm sure we can insinuate what they are. I experienced

²¹ See, e.g., *Marquez et al. v. BHC Streamwood Hospital*, No. 1:2020cv04267 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 12, 2021); <https://ir.uhs.com/news-releases/news-release-details/universal-health-services-inc-announces-2024-fourth-quarter-and> (last visited Oct. 17, 2025) (alleging knowledge of multiple lawsuits). (last visited October 30, 2025).

²² <https://www.dailyherald.com/20170519/news/former-streamwood-behavioral-health-worker-charged-with-abusing-girl/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

abuse at Streamwood and Lake Hospital. It gave me severe PTSD and totally ruined my life. Does anyone else have similar stories?²³

- b. Internet Review Example 2: Not impressed at all with this facility. My husband was transferred here and we had no say. I read other reviews online and sadly it's exactly like others are saying. We have had SOME nice staff but theres one nurse there who's terrible! My husband said they are treated like dogs. Also, NO soap given in bathroom to wash hands with after using bathroom. Ok for the shower but not after using restroom? Very confusing and unsanitary.
- Also, was told my husband would speak with Dr and therapist every day. He's only seen therapist once and Dr twice, it's been 4 days. Husband went in voluntarily and is treated like a prisoner. SO sad to hear him say they are allowed to go outside but the "rooftop" is caged in...Just really really sad. My husband got yelled at for waving thru a window at me when I dropped of pictures my kids colored for him...Way to make these patients feel even lower than they do by being treated this way. :(²⁴
- If you have the choice, don't choose this facility. I'm not sure how playing cards, coloring pictures, and listening to music will help these people...if we needed a babysitter I would have kept him home. He needed professional help and just isn't getting it.

²³ Post by Prize-Transition9838 on Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/troubledteens/comments/1kfrlir/was_anyone_else_at_streamwood_or_lake_behavioral/ (last visited October 30, 2025).

²⁴ Danielle S. Review, <https://www.yelp.com/biz/streamwood-behavioral-healthcare-system-streamwood#reviews> (last visited October 30, 2025).

c. Internet Review Example 3: my friend [REDACTED] was there recently and the staff was rude. Unprofessional and not certified. They called them hogs because they was asking for female products, didn't supply them with the things she needed. shower in her room didn't work. Overall she was displeased with the way they treated her and others.²⁵

d. Internet Review Example 4: Sadly, this place is like a prison for any and all problems which a cell cannot fix or at least what the system has caused it to become.

There are several behavioral places that truly try to help those who struggle in life with poor impulses or mental issues and for that WE Thank You. But when a behavioral facility brings more troubles on then diagnosed then there is a problem with the facility.

Placing drug dealers with children in the same room is just asking for these precious kids to learn every parents worst nightmare. Angry, disgusted, disappointed and down right frustrated with the whole system. Please consider any other location if at all possible before sending your loved ones to this place.²⁶

Internet Review Example 5: A staff seriously hit me here. I went to tell another staff and the staff I told said I deserved it. Also the staff would routinely tell the

²⁵ Theretha B. Review, <https://www.yelp.com/biz/streamwood-behavioral-healthcare-system-streamwood?rr=1#reviews> (last visited October 30, 2025).

²⁶ M.W. Review, <https://www.yelp.com/biz/streamwood-behavioral-healthcare-system-streamwood?rr=1#reviews> (last visited October 30, 2025).

kids to attack me. Which the kids usually did. I was attacked 5 times by other patients. This place needs to get shut down.²⁷

52. In addition to complaints by patients, parents, and/or guardians, conditions at Streamwood were so bad that Streamwood (and UHS as a whole) became the subject of several federal, state, and local investigations, including in 2009, when state officials asked healthcare experts to intervene and investigate the facility.

53. In or around 2009, the University of Illinois at Chicago's ("UIC") Mental Health Policy Team was tasked with conducting a quality-of-care review of Streamwood on behalf of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services ("DCFS"). The report summarizing UIC's findings contained several alarming findings, including that the institution used unsafe combinations of drugs as "chemical restraints" to control children's behavior.²⁸

54. In 2009, the Illinois Human Rights Authority (HRA) found that Streamwood failed to properly document care, administered medication over parental objection, and inadequately addressed patient deterioration and suicidal ideation.

55. In 2015 and 2016, another HRA investigation found improper use of restraints on a minor, failure to protect patients from threats, and violations of communication and medication-monitoring rights.

56. UHS has faced additional legal scrutiny from both state governments and the federal governments for decades.

²⁷ Anonymous A. Review, <https://www.yelp.com/biz/streamwood-behavioral-healthcare-system-streamwood?start=10&rr=1#reviews> (last visited October 30, 2025).

²⁸ <https://www.chicagotribune.com/2009/12/10/uic-study-alleges-an-overuse-of-drugs-on-juveniles-at-understaffed-streamwood-psychiatric-hospital/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

57. In 2008, the U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”) investigated Riveredge Hospital, another UHS youth residential treatment in Cook County, Illinois, for fraudulent billing practices under Medicare and Medicaid. Specifically, the DOJ alleged that UHS’s psychiatric hospitals illegally admitted as many patients to their facilities for as long as possible, even if the patients did not need continued treatment or were not receiving adequate care.²⁹ Riveredge Hospital was also the subject of an 86-page report documenting abusive practices by the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services.³⁰

58. Per a different UIC report about Hartgrove Behavioral Health System, another UHS-run hospital in the Chicago area, UHS’s business model encourages “deliberate and chronic understaffing” to curb costs.³¹

59. In 2012, UHS settled False Claims Act allegations with the State of California for \$4.25 million. The allegations included that employees at the facility were not appropriately credentialed and that children were “‘warehouse[d]’ as opposed to receiving adequate care.”³²

60. A separate Florida Department of Justice investigation revealed dozens of examples of sexual abuse in Florida-based UHS facilities, with investigations into some facilities finding that over 10 percent of patients had been sexually abused.³³

²⁹ Christina Jewett, *Psychiatric Hospital Pledged Change, But Some Problems Persist*, PROPUBLICA (Feb. 26, 2009), <https://www.propublica.org/article/psychiatric-hospital-pledged-change-but-some-problems-persist>; <https://www.justice.gov/archives/opa/pr/sixteen-hospitals-pay-1569-million-resolve-false-claims-act-allegations-involving-medically> (last visited October 30, 2025).

³⁰ https://s3.amazonaws.com/propublica/assets/docs/riveredge_report_090330.pdf (last visited October 30, 2025).

³¹ <https://www.chicagotribune.com/2009/12/10/uic-study-alleges-an-overuse-of-drugs-on-juveniles-at-understaffed-streamwood-psychiatric-hospital/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

³² <https://www.fightforkids.org/universal-health-service> (last visited October 30, 2025).

³³ <https://www.fightforkids.org/universal-health-service> (last visited October 30, 2025).

61. In 2014, David Jackson from the Chicago Tribune was a Pulitzer finalist for an investigative series about UHS and other residential facilities in Illinois. According to the series, government inspectors found “serious problems” at 8.4% of UHS hospitals in 2014, compared to a nationwide figure of 3%.³⁴

62. Around July 2019, UHS, Inc. reached an agreement in principle with the DOJ’s Civil Division and several states’ attorney general offices to resolve the civil aspects of this investigation for \$127 million. On July 6, 2020, UHS, Inc. entered a settlement agreement with the federal government.

63. The settlement agreement reached with the DOJ was the culmination of a decade-long investigation into UHS, Inc., UHS-D, and other UHS facilities, including Streamwood. The DOJ contended that the UHS corporate system:

- a. Submitted or caused to be submitted false claims for inpatient behavioral health services provided to government agencies;
- b. Admitted patients who were not eligible for inpatient or residential treatment;
- c. Failed to properly discharge patients when they no longer needed inpatient or residential treatment;
- d. Billed for services not rendered;
- e. Failed to adequately train or supervise staff, as well as failed to provide adequate staffing levels;
- f. Improperly used physical or chemical restraints and seclusion; and
- g. Failed to provide inpatient acute or residential care in accordance with state and federal regulations, including (but not limited to) inadequate assessments and

³⁴ *Id.*

treatment plans, inadequate discharge, and failure to provide required forms of therapy.³⁵

64. A Senate Finance Committee Report investigated allegations of abuse and neglect at Residential Treatment Facilities (RTFs), including UHS facilities, finding that they are frequently “warehouses of neglect.”³⁶ The report found that children suffer routine sexual abuse inside RTFs, including many UHS facilities, and that the risk of harm to children is “endemic to the operating model” of RTFs due to the incentives to optimize revenues and profit margins at the expense of patient care.³⁷

65. For children who were abused at Streamwood, it was almost impossible to get help or stop the abuse. Some children who did report the abuse allege that they were disbelieved, or worse, retaliated against, exacerbating and amplifying the trauma of the actual abuse. Children, including Plaintiff, were punished for reporting abuse.

66. Between 2006 and 2016, facilities owned or operated by UHS were either cited or investigated for inadequate staffing violations approximately ninety (90) different times.

67. At all relevant times, Defendants knew that failure to provide adequate staffing and supervision increased the threat of violence to patients such as Plaintiff.

68. Despite Defendant’s awareness of systematic sexual and physical abuse of children in its care, UHS has failed to enact appropriate uniform national and system-wide protocols and

³⁵ <https://www.justice.gov/usao-edpa/pr/universal-health-services-inc-pay-117-million-settle-false-claims-act-allegations#:~:text=UHS%20will%20pay%20the%20United,and%20chemical%20restraints%20and%20seclusion> (last visited October 30, 2025).

³⁶ *Warehouses of Neglect: How Taxpayers are Funding Systemic Abuse in Youth Residential Treatment Facilities*, Senate Committee on Finance, https://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/rtf_report_warehouses_of_neglect.pdf (last visited October 30, 2025).

³⁷ *Id.* (last visited October 30, 2025).

policies to ensure the safety of its youth. It is alleged that Streamwood acted with extreme disregard for the wellbeing of children in its programs by failing to properly screen, hire, and train employees, failing to report known abuse of youth in Streamwood facilities, and ignoring and covering up complaints alleged against it regarding child abuse.

69. UHS and Streamwood's lack of and/or failure to enforce adequate policies and procedures for the prevention of, and proper response to, abuse of its patients, exacerbates and amplifies the trauma of the actual abuse due to institutional betrayal.

70. The term "Institutional Betrayal" refers to wrongdoings perpetrated by an institution upon individuals dependent on that institution, including failure to prevent or respond supportively to wrongdoings by individuals (e.g., physical, emotional, and sexual abuse) committed within the context of the institution.³⁸

71. The failures, acts, and egregious omissions by staff at Streamwood created a highly dangerous risk of physical, emotional, and sexual abuse for any child placed at Streamwood. The alleged pervasive culture of abuse allowed perpetrators access and opportunity to abuse highly vulnerable children and young adults and gave them impunity to act without the risk of detection or punishment.

72. Children like Plaintiff arrive at Streamwood seeking treatment, healing, and belonging. Streamwood has abused the trust that these families have placed in it by allowing this alleged culture of abuse, exploitation, and trauma—one that led to severe emotional consequences for Plaintiff.

³⁸ Jennifer J. Freyd, *Institutional Betrayal and Institutional Courage*, <https://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/institutionalbetrayal/> (last visited October 30, 2025); *see also* Carly Parnitzke Smith & Jennifer J. Freyd, *Institutional Betrayal*, 69 AM. PSYCH. ASSOC. 575 (2014) (available at: <https://pages.uoregon.edu/dynamic/jjf/articles/sf2014.pdf> (last visited October 30, 2025)).

Plaintiff Was Repeatedly Abused at Streamwood

73. Plaintiff was first admitted to Streamwood in or around 2004, at the age of 10.

74. Plaintiff's placement followed serious emotional distress, including family abandonment, failures by child protective services, struggles in school, and suicidal ideation.

75. While at Streamwood, Plaintiff was diagnosed with bipolar disorder.

76. Plaintiff's bipolar disorder substantially limited the "major life activities" of caring for herself, concentrating, sleeping, and learning. These functional limitations were of such severity that she was hospitalized on multiple occasions.

77. Plaintiff was intermittently hospitalized between 2004 and 2006, including multiple admissions to Streamwood.

78. During these hospitalizations, Plaintiff experienced several episodes of abuse.

79. During her first one-month stay, Plaintiff was molested by her roommate two times, both via digital penetration.

80. Plaintiff reported the assault, but rather than receiving protection, she was placed in a seclusion room and chemically and physically restrained throughout the entire experience. Plaintiff believes that this treatment was retaliatory.

81. Despite being placed in seclusion, Plaintiff was threatened and subsequently attacked by a 17-year-old whom staff knew to be violent.

82. Plaintiff reported both the threat of the attack and the attack itself to staff members.

83. The 17-year-old was not punished. Instead, Plaintiff was forced to remain in isolation.

84. At all times during her time in isolation, Plaintiff was subjected to unnecessary chemical restraints, motivated by retaliation rather than for *bona fide* medical reasons.

85. Subsequently, and because of her complaints, Plaintiff, who was 10, was transferred to a different housing unit for significantly older adolescents (16 to 17 years old). This unit was referred to by staff as the “SX Dorm” and was designated for residents with a history of sexually aggressive behavior.

86. Plaintiff was never provided an explanation for her placement in the SX Dorm and reported feeling “extremely unsafe” to staff members.

87. While on the SX Dorm, Plaintiff witnessed patients engaging in group sex and was pressured to participate, which she refused.

88. Plaintiff also experienced three separate incidents of unwanted sexual contact by a female staff member during the nights she stayed in the SX Dorm. Each assault involved forced oral intercourse and digital penetration.

89. When Plaintiff reported the above misconduct, she was once again placed in seclusion for approximately three to five days, during which she was kept in physical and chemical restraints, as well as exposed to constant noise, which was intended to deprive her of sleep.

90. Plaintiff’s mother contacted the facility during this time but could not secure her release.

91. During subsequent stays at Streamwood, Plaintiff exhibited symptoms of severe trauma, including avoidance of sleep, isolation, and hypervigilance.

92. As a direct result of her treatment at Streamwood, Plaintiff was diagnosed with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), for which she has needed long-term mental health counseling.

93. Plaintiff continues to experience chronic anxiety, sleep disturbances, nightmares, and hypervigilance. Her condition has deteriorated to the point that she can no longer work due to debilitating panic attacks.

94. Plaintiff's trauma has also impacted her personal relationships and quality of life. She experiences emotional breakdowns, difficulty engaging in physical intimacy, and an inability to maintain daily routines or professional stability.

VICARIOUS LIABILITY

95. Streamwood is vicariously liable for the tortious conduct described herein by employing staff who mistreated and abused Plaintiff.

96. When Plaintiff was physically and emotionally mistreated by Streamwood staff members, these staff members were acting within their scope of employment by Streamwood and UHS because they were entrusted to provide treatment yet employed medically improper, harmful techniques against Plaintiff.

97. Streamwood staff members used their positions as employees of Streamwood/UHS to enable mistreatment, including abuse, of Plaintiff, such that Streamwood and UHS are vicariously liable for their conduct.

98. Staff members at Streamwood are charged with the care of children with emotional and/or intellectual disabilities and entrusted to keep them safe. But for their employment at Streamwood, staff members would not have been in unsupervised situations with young and vulnerable victims such as Plaintiff. Additionally, the responsibilities associated with staff members' employment enabled them to exert excessive and abusive authorities over victims, including Plaintiff.

99. Staff members took advantage of the authority associated with their responsibilities at Streamwood to place Plaintiff in abusive and compromising situations.

100. Staff members' abuse of Plaintiff constitutes assaults or batteries, as detailed further below.

101. Streamwood and UHS endorsed, encouraged, and ratified its staff members' abusive conduct toward Plaintiff by failing to discipline, take corrective action, and/or report child abuse. As noted by the UIC report, UHS has sanctioned this alleged culture of abusive behavior by its staff and threatened people who report misconduct.

102. These tortious acts were also foreseeable, as Streamwood was on notice that incidents of sexual, physical and emotional abuse were rampant within its facility and other UHS facilities.

103. In addition to the long, repeated history of abuse by staff members and other patients, Streamwood knew that its patients, including Plaintiff, were particularly susceptible to mistreatment as youth with disabilities and critical mental health needs. Streamwood/UHS knew, or reasonably should have known, that by failing to implement appropriate procedures, policies, and safeguards, it was highly foreseeable that staff would continue to abuse vulnerable children in its treatment programs, including Plaintiff.

104. UHS, Inc. and UHS-D, at all relevant times, have asserted authority and direction over Streamwood, such that Streamwood was an agent of UHS.

105. Throughout state and federal investigations into its facilities, UHS has regularly acted on behalf of its facilities.

106. As a direct and proximate result of UHS/Streamwood's employees' abuse toward Plaintiff, she has suffered physical harms and has suffered and will continue to suffer physical and emotional pain and distress. UHC is vicariously liable for the intentional harms described herein.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

Violation of 42 U.S.C. 12182 Disability Discrimination in Public Accommodations (Against all Defendants)

107. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

108. Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (Public Accommodations) provides that "[n]o individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation."

109. Under Title III of the ADA, services and accommodations "shall be afforded to an individual with a disability in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of the individual."

110. Plaintiff is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA.

a. Plaintiff had mental impairments, including bipolar disorder, that substantially limited her ability to perform major life activities. She was limited in her abilities to care for herself, learn, concentrate, and sleep.

b. Plaintiff had a record of having disabilities, including bipolar disorder, for which she received diagnoses at Streamwood.

c. Plaintiff was "regarded as" having a functional limitation that substantially limited one or more major life activities by staff members, as evidenced by the use of

chemical restraints against her and her continued hospitalization at Streamwood, a behavioral health facility for children with disabilities.

111. Plaintiff was qualified to receive services in an integrated setting but was instead placed in seclusion. There was no medical or safety justification for Plaintiff's seclusion, and there was no, non-retaliatory justification for Plaintiff's placement in seclusion.

112. Plaintiff was deprived of vital educational services while placed in seclusion.

113. The "unjustified institutional isolation of persons with disabilities is a form of discrimination" under the ADA. *Olmstead v. L.C. by Zimring*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999).

114. Plaintiff therefore requests reasonable attorney's fees as provided by 42 U.S.C. §12205.

COUNT II

Violation of 29 U.S.C. § 794 Violation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act's "Integration Mandate" (Against all Defendants)

115. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

116. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prohibits disability discrimination in federally funded programs or activities, which broadly includes any program or activity that receives federal financial assistance.

117. Section 504 "incorporates the standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act," including definitions of disability and concepts of discrimination. *See, e.g., Kelly v. New York State Off. of Mental Health*, 200 F. Supp. 3d 378, 390 (E.D.N.Y. 2016).

118. A plaintiff may show disability discrimination against "persons with mental disabilities" under Section 504 by claiming that they were unnecessarily institutionalized or served in a more restrictive setting than warranted. *Davis v. Shah*, 821 F.3d 231, 260 (2d Cir. 2016).

119. Plaintiff is an individual with a disability, as defined by Section 504.

120. Plaintiff had mental impairments, including bipolar disorder, that substantially limited her ability to perform major life activities. Plaintiff was limited in her abilities to care for herself, learn, concentrate, and sleep.

121. Plaintiff had a record of disabilities, including a diagnosis of bipolar disorder.

122. Plaintiff was “regarded as” having a disability, as evidenced by the use of chemical restraints against her, as well as her continued hospitalization at Streamwood, a behavioral health facility for children with mental disabilities.

123. Plaintiff was qualified to receive support in an integrated setting but instead was placed in seclusion or isolation. There was no, non-retaliatory justification for Plaintiff’s placement in seclusion.

124. Plaintiff was deprived of vital educational services while in seclusion.

125. Plaintiff therefore requests compensatory damages and attorney’s fees, as allowed by Section 504.

COUNT III

Violation of 775 ILCS 5/Illinois Human Rights Act Disability Discrimination (Against all Defendants)

126. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

127. The Illinois Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability, defined as “a determinable physical or mental characteristic of a person, including, but not limited to . . . [a] functional disorder and which characteristic. . . . is unrelated to a person’s ability to utilize and benefit from a place of public accommodation.” 774 ILCS/5/1-101.

128. The statutory definition of disability has been construed by the Joint Rules of the Department and the Human Rights Commission as “not confined to only those physical and mental

conditions that are grave or extreme in nature.” *Kreczko v. Triangle Package Mach. Co.*, No. 1-15-1762, 2016 Ill. App. LEXIS 259 (May 3, 2016).

129. Plaintiff was and is an individual with a disability as defined by the IHRA.

a. Plaintiff had a mental impairment, bipolar disorder, that inhibited her ability to perform major life activities. She was limited in education, her ability to function independently, among other major life activities.

b. Plaintiff has a record of having disabilities, including bipolar disorder and other mental health conditions for which she received diagnoses at Streamwood.

c. Plaintiff was “perceived” as having a functional limitation that substantially limited one or more major life activities by staff members.

130. Plaintiff was qualified to receive services in an integrated setting but was instead discriminated against and placed in seclusion. There was no medical or safety justification for Plaintiff’s seclusion, and the seclusion had adverse consequences for Plaintiff’s mental health and well-being.

131. In line with 775 ILCS 5/10-101(C), Plaintiff requests actual and punitive damages and any other relief as the court may deem appropriate.

COUNT IV

**Violation of Title IX (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681, *et seq.*)
Sexual Harassment
(Against all Defendants)**

132. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

133. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (“Title IX”), 20 U.S.C. § 1681(a), states: “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. . . .”

134. Title IX is implemented through the U.S. Department of Education (“DOE”) regulations, which apply to “every recipient [of Federal financial assistance] and to all sex discrimination occurring under a recipient’s education program or activity in the United States,” 34 C.F.R. § 106.11, and which cover sexual harassment—including sexual assault—by school employees, students, and third parties.

135. Federal DOE regulations further provide that recipients of federal financial assistance shall investigate complaints of noncompliance with those regulations, 34 C.F.R. § 106.8(a), which include sexual assault, sexual abuse, and sexual harassment.

136. DOE regulations further require that recipients of federal financial assistance shall “adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of student and employee complaints of harassment.” 34 C.F.R. § 106.8(b).

137. Plaintiff is a “person” under Title IX.

138. Education is a pivotal part of the services Streamwood provides to patients and residents, placing students at Streamwood squarely under the protections of Title IX.

a. Streamwood's programs and facilities consist of educational programs, including providing educational services through its Therapeutic Day School.³⁹

b. Streamwood receives federal and state special education funding from referring districts that reimburse it for its provision of educational services and behavioral interventions.

c. Streamwood partners with local schools to provide mental health initiatives.⁴⁰

139. Upon information and belief, Streamwood receives federal financial assistance for its education programs via both Medicaid reimbursement for educational services provided and special education funding for institutional placement and therefore is subject to the provisions of Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681, *et seq.*, and its implementing regulations at 34 C.F.R. §§ 106.1, *et seq.*

140. Under Title IX, Streamwood was required to promptly investigate and address allegations, reports, and complaints of sexual harassment, assault, and abuse of youth in its programs.

141. While Plaintiff was abused at Streamwood, Streamwood had actual knowledge of both prior and ongoing sexual abuse, harassment, and assault of youth in its facilities. Plaintiff herself reported the abusive behavior and was repeatedly punished.

142. Based on these ongoing incidents of sexual abuse and assault and Streamwood's knowledge of its own failure to have, implement, and/or enforce proper policies to prevent and/or respond to incidents of sexual abuse and assault, Streamwood had actual knowledge of the

³⁹ <https://streamwoodhospital.com/therapeutic-day-school/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

⁴⁰ <https://www.facebook.com/StreamwoodBHS/posts/we-are-dedicated-to-supporting-mental-health-initiatives-in-schools-because-earl/1447377959908401/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

substantial, increased, above-societal baseline risk that Plaintiff would be sexually abused, harassed, or assaulted.

143. With this knowledge, Streamwood had the authority—and obligation—to address the heightened risk of sexual abuse in its programs, and had the authority to take corrective measures, including by:

- a. Implementing and enforcing best-practice policies and procedures for the prevention of, and proper response to, incidents of sexual abuse and harassment at its facilities;
- b. Addressing children and families' prior reports of sexual abuse and encouraging youth to openly report sexual advances by staff members;
- c. Thoroughly investigating and terminating the employment of staff members with known complaints of prior sexual abuse and harassment of youth;
- d. Increasing the quality of staff supervision, particularly during vulnerable nighttime hours, and not allowing staff members to take youth on unsupervised outings where sexual abuse occurred;
- e. Maintaining appropriate numbers of staff to ensure that there were no blind spots where abuse could go undetected; and
- f. Improving Streamwood's physical facilities to increase visibility such that no concealed areas remained where abuse could occur undetected, such as Plaintiff's roommate assaulting her.

144. Streamwood's failure to address the substantial risk of sexual abuse in its programs and facilities, given prior and ongoing investigations about sexual abuse, and its failure to set

appropriate sex discrimination policy, was clearly unreasonable considering the known circumstances.

145. Streamwood furthermore deprived Plaintiff of educational opportunities by placing her in seclusion when she reported sexual assault instead of allowing her to participate in educational services.

146. The sexual harassment, abuse, and assault experienced by Plaintiff at Streamwood constitutes sex discrimination under Title IX. As explained in Title IX guidance issued by the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, sexual harassment, abuse, and assault of students is a form of sex discrimination covered by Title IX.

147. Streamwood was on actual notice of the conduct as described above but nonetheless failed to carry out its duties to investigate and take corrective action under Title IX. Streamwood was on notice due to an ongoing investigation that its policies were inadequate to prevent sexual abuse.

148. UHS and Streamwood not only failed to act to prevent assault—they retaliated against Plaintiff by placing her in seclusion.

149. Streamwood and UHS are, and have been, deliberately indifferent to the substantial risk of sexual abuse, assault, and molestation posed to all youth who enter its programs and treatment centers. After being subject to multiple federal and state investigations, Defendant ignored the sexual abuse occurring under its watch and allowed it to continue.

150. Streamwood is responsible for setting and approving all national, organization-wide policies and protocols for Streamwood programs and operations, including sex discrimination policies.

151. Streamwood failed to promptly investigate and address allegations, reports, and complaints of sexual harassment, assault, and abuse of youth in its programs—and indeed, attempted to cover them up. As a result of this deliberate indifference, Plaintiff was subjected to severe sexual abuse and faced a heightened risk of sexual abuse while a resident.

152. The heightened risk of sexual harassment, abuse, and assault experienced by Plaintiff at Streamwood was so severe, pervasive and objectively offensive that it effectively barred her access to educational opportunities and benefits, including a safe educational environment, full access to treatment programs, and appropriate medical care while at Streamwood. This is because abuse—and the constant risk and fear of it—physiologically rewires the brain in a way that impairs learning, development, communication, and growth.

153. Plaintiff, who was school-aged at the time of her abuse, relied on Streamwood to receive her education. Being subjected to pervasive, repeated abuse, and a sustained threat of sexual assault denied Plaintiff the ability to benefit from those educational opportunities. The severe anxiety, trauma, fear, and suffering inflicted by Streamwood hindered Plaintiff's ability to meaningfully participate in its classes and educational programs.

154. As a direct and proximate result of Streamwood's actions and/or inactions, Plaintiff experienced damages.

155. Streamwood was deliberately indifferent to a sexually hostile culture with a heightened risk of sexual harassment within its programs and facilities by, among other things:

- a. Failing to address children and families' reports of sexual abuse and/or discouraging youth from reporting such abuse;
- b. Failing to promptly and adequately investigate, remedy, and respond to complaints about sexual abuse at Streamwood;

c. Refusing to participate willingly in the UIC investigation into sexual assault and general treatment conditions at Streamwood;

d. Failing to adequately supervise staff members, particularly during vulnerable nighttime hours;

e. Failing to maintain appropriate numbers of staff to ensure that there were no blind spots where abuse could go undetected.

156. Streamwood's creation of and deliberate indifference to a sexually hostile culture increased the risk that Plaintiff would be sexually harassed. By failing to set appropriate sex discrimination policies, this risk of sexual harassment was increased even further. Because Streamwood failed to take corrective measures to curb the pattern and practice of sexual abuse towards its patients at Streamwood, instead allowing this conduct to thrive, Plaintiff suffered emotional distress, great pain of mind and body, shock, embarrassment, humiliation, loss of self-esteem, and physical manifestations of this emotional distress.

157. Plaintiff suffered sexual abuse that was so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it denied her access to educational opportunities.

158. In addition to compensatory damages, which are the direct and proximate result of Streamwood's actions and/or inactions, Plaintiff requests the award of attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b).

COUNT V

Negligence (Against all Defendants)

159. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

160. Streamwood owed Plaintiff a duty to provide a safe environment with adequate protection, supervision, and care while in its custody.

161. Streamwood acted with a lack of care toward Plaintiff through its acts and omissions, including: allowing and authorizing a culture of abuse at Streamwood; failing to train and educate staff regarding the identification of abuse; failing to adequately train staff regarding best practices when working with youth with advanced mental health needs; failing to adequately supervise staff members to proactively identify and curtail signs of abuse; failing to maintain Streamwood staffing levels and facilities so as to eliminate “blind spots” where abuse could easily occur without detection; failing to instruct supervisors regarding circumstances indicating a high risk of abuse; failing to monitor Plaintiff’s wellbeing while in Streamwood programming so as to detect incidents of abuse; failing to take adequate and appropriate measures after learning about repeated known incidents of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse within Streamwood programs; and failing to prevent serious and lasting psychological, physical, and emotional harm to youth in Streamwood programs.

162. Moreover, Streamwood’s attempts to “cover up” or prevent the reporting of abuse exacerbated and amplified the trauma of the actual abuse due to institutional betrayal.

163. By failing to exercise ordinary care through its acts and omissions, Streamwood foreseeably caused physical and emotional harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT VI

Negligent Hiring (Against Defendants UHS and Streamwood)

164. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

165. Streamwood is required to make an appropriate investigation of all employees staffed at its facilities. This duty requires that potential applicants are thoroughly and appropriately screened to ensure that they will provide safe care for the vulnerable children in Streamwood’s programs.

166. Streamwood knew or should have known that the employment of staff members who employed Plaintiff posed a risk or hazard to youth in its treatment programs. With a thorough background check and investigation of applicants' prior work history, personal, and professional references, and potential "red flags," Streamwood would have known that these employees were not suitable for the duty of caring for children.

167. It was unreasonable for Streamwood to hire employees whom Streamwood should have known, based on reasonable pre-hiring screening, were unsuitable to work in a behavioral health center for children and adolescents with cognitive differences and advanced mental health needs.

168. Streamwood, upon information and belief, struggles to find adequate staffing due to low wages and pressure to fill beds even while staff levels are inadequate.

169. As detailed above, Plaintiff was harmed by multiple Streamwood staff members, including sexual abuse, misconduct, physical assault, and forcible seclusion.

170. Because of Streamwood's negligent hiring practices, Plaintiff was foreseeably harmed by these employees. Had Streamwood shown due care in the screening of its employees, Streamwood staff members would not have been given the access and opportunity to physically, sexually, or emotionally abuse Plaintiff.

Count VII

Negligent Retention **(Against Defendants UHS and Streamwood)**

171. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

172. Streamwood became aware or reasonably should have become aware that its employees were engaged in acts of physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse of patients and residents, and yet it failed to investigate, discharge, or reassign these employees.

173. Streamwood reasonably should have known that, among other things, its staff: inappropriately restrained residents; inappropriately strip-searched residents; inappropriately placed residents in seclusion rooms; inappropriately and excessively medicated residents; withheld basic necessities from residents as punishment; groomed residents for sexual abuse; forced residents to perform sexual acts; sexually assaulted residents; physically assaulted residents; enabled physical assaults between residents; ignored residents' pleas for help; and retaliated against residents for reporting abuse.

174. With reasonable supervision and protocols in place, Streamwood would have known about each of these incidents. Even though Streamwood reasonably should have known about this abuse, it allowed the abuse to occur and retained the employees responsible for these heinous acts without taking corrective action.

175. Streamwood reasonably should have known about the abuse of Plaintiff, especially incidents that happened in public areas like classrooms; however, Streamwood negligently retained the employees responsible for the abuse. Because of Streamwood's breach of its duty to take action to prevent reasonably foreseeable harm by its employees, Plaintiff was grievously harmed.

Count VIII

Negligent Supervision **(Against Defendants UHS and Streamwood)**

176. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

177. Streamwood owed a duty to exercise reasonable care in its operation of programs for youth with developmental or intellectual disabilities, behavioral needs, and mental health concerns, to avoid harm to the vulnerable youth in its custody. Streamwood possessed a special

relationship with Plaintiff, as Streamwood was entrusted with the duty of care and custody over her, a minor at the time.

178. Streamwood knew or should have known that the lack of supervision of staff members who abused Plaintiff posed a risk or hazard to the youth in its treatment programs.

179. Plaintiff could not have been reasonably expected to protect herself. No child is reasonably able to protect himself or herself from sexual, physical, and emotional assaults and abuses by staff who are tasked with their care. This is even more true for youth in Streamwood's programs, who come to Streamwood because of their need for advanced behavioral or mental health support. In many instances, mental health conditions and prior trauma may inhibit a child's ability to know or appreciate the nature of their relationships with others and understand appropriate versus inappropriate interactions with teachers or staff members.

180. Streamwood reasonably should have known that its staff were coercing residents into performing sexual acts, sexually abusing residents, and allowing resident-on-resident abuse.

181. Streamwood failed to exercise ordinary care to prevent intentional harms by its employees acting outside the scope of their employment. Streamwood and UHS were aware that employees routinely committed acts of sexual, physical, and emotional abuse towards Streamwood patients, students, and residents. This gave Streamwood reason to know that abuse of its residents and patients was commonplace and that Streamwood needed to implement procedures and practices to prevent intentional harms by Streamwood staff.

182. Streamwood knew that it had the ability to control the conduct of its staff. UHS threatened repercussions for staff who reported abuse. Moreover, Streamwood is in an employer-employee relationship in which Streamwood sets standards, protocols, and policies for its staff, exercises a supervisory role over staff, and has the capacity to fire and reassign its employees.

183. Despite knowing of a pattern and practice of abuse in Streamwood programs, Streamwood failed to enact and implement appropriate policies and protocols, including, for example: sufficient staffing levels such that staff members were not alone with children, enacting supervision protocols to ensure that staff were following proper procedures, eliminating blind spots in Streamwood facilities where abuse occurred undetected, and taking immediate action to investigate, reassign, and/or terminate employment for staff who engaged in abusive behavior toward patients and residents.

184. Because of Streamwood's negligent supervision in which Streamwood and UHS breached their duty to exercise reasonable care to prevent outrageous and tragic harms to youth in their care, Plaintiff was grievously injured.

COUNT IX

Gross Negligence (Against all Defendants)

185. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

186. Streamwood owed Plaintiff a duty to provide a safe environment with adequate protection, supervision, and care while in its custody.

187. Streamwood acted with a lack of care toward Plaintiff by demonstrating a conscious disregard or indifference toward her safety and wellbeing and significantly departing from how a reasonably careful person would act under the circumstances.

188. At all relevant times, Streamwood owed a duty to Plaintiff to implement practices and policies to, among other things:

- a. Prevent sexual, emotional, and physical abuse by its staff;
- b. Prohibit and prevent romantic or sexual relationships between youth and Streamwood staff;

- c. Prohibit and prevent grooming and other sexually exploitative behavior by Streamwood staff;
- d. Require the prompt reporting of any allegations or suspicions of sexual, physical, or emotional abuse of youth in Streamwood programs by staff or peers;
- e. Require (and not impede) the independent investigation of all reports of sexual, physical, or emotional abuse of youth in Streamwood programs;
- f. Protect Plaintiff from abuse and foreseeable risks;
- g. Provide a safe environment for children with disabilities and mental health needs free from sexual abuse, harassment, and physical harm.

189. Streamwood's duty arose from taking responsibility for the care and custody of youth attending its programs.

190. Streamwood acted recklessly and indifferently as the entity responsible for the care and custody of children with disabilities and advanced mental health needs who sought out Streamwood for treatment, growth, and education, including Plaintiff.

191. Streamwood knew or should have known that by failing to take appropriate measures with respect to the lack of appropriate training, supervision, and oversight of its facilities and employees who work closely with children and young adults with advanced mental health needs, Streamwood created an unreasonable risk of harm to Plaintiff so great that it was highly probable that harm would result.

192. As one of the country's largest behavioral healthcare providers, Streamwood is or should be acutely aware of the delicate nature of working with youth and the likelihood of abuse and harm resulting from the failure to closely monitor, train, and supervise its staff. Streamwood

thus owed its resident youth a duty to protect them from foreseeable risk of staff who take advantage of this power differential for improper purposes.

193. The power differential here was extreme. Youth with disabilities are easily targeted because they are more likely to be perceived as weak or vulnerable and are seen as less likely to report abuse. Especially in a group home or residential treatment setting, abuse can be more easily hidden, and children may have limited access to police, advocates, family members, or social services representatives who can intervene.

194. By recklessly failing to keep Plaintiff safe while in its care and custody, Streamwood exhibited a willful disregard for necessary precautions to reasonably protect her.

195. As a direct and proximate result of Streamwood's reckless indifference to Plaintiff, she has suffered and continues to suffer from emotional pain and suffering, mental and emotional distress and suffering, physical manifestations of this distress, anxiety, fright, grief, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life. Plaintiff was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing her activities of daily living due to the gross negligence of Streamwood.

Count X

Negligent Misrepresentations **(Against all Defendants)**

196. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

197. In the course of its business, Streamwood and UHS present themselves as maintaining a gold standard in the field of behavioral treatment for youth with mental health needs. UHS describes itself as “one of the nation’s largest and most providers of hospital and healthcare services in the nation”⁴¹ and advertises its “focus[] on quality and compassion.”⁴² UHS states that

⁴¹ Universal Health Services, <https://uhs.com/> (last visited October 30, 2025).

⁴² *Id.*

it is “committed to doing its part to improve mental healthcare in communities across the U.S. and to advance suicide prevention at both the national and local levels.”⁴³

198. Streamwood also advertises its capacity to continue providing students’ educational needs while they are under its care.

199. Through its advertising, Streamwood represented to Plaintiff’s mother that compassionate practices and protocols were in place at its facility to ensure the safety of children placed in its care. What Streamwood failed to mention, however, is the repeated pattern of abuse and exploitation of young people who enter its programs.

200. Streamwood’s advertising and website misrepresent material facts regarding the quality of its programs, as Streamwood deprives students like Plaintiff of crucial educational opportunities and negligently supervises and manages its facilities in such a way that children such as Plaintiff routinely suffer sexual, physical, and emotional abuse while under its watch.

201. Plaintiff’s mother relied on Streamwood’s representations about the quality of its programs in choosing Streamwood for treatment.

202. Streamwood knew or should have known that the representations about the quality of its programs—especially regarding the safety and security of its patients, students, and residents—would be relied upon by individuals and families.

203. Plaintiff was harmed because of Streamwood’s negligent misrepresentations about the safety and security of its programs. Her guardian reasonably relied on Streamwood’s representations of safety and security and were thereby harmed when they unknowingly placed Plaintiff in Streamwood’s custody.

⁴³ <https://uhs.com/news/uhs-works-with-communities-to-help-reduce-national-suicide-rates/#:~:text=Home%20Stories%20UHS%20works%20with,Alliance's%20Executive%20Committee%20since%202014> (last visited October 30, 2025).

Count XI

Illinois Gender Violence Act
(Against Defendants UHS and Streamwood)

204. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

205. A corporation may be subject to liability under the Illinois Gender Violence Act for the actions committed by its agents and employees. 740 ILCS 82.

206. At all relevant times, Plaintiff's abusers were employees of Defendants Streamwood, UHS, Inc., and UHS-D.

207. A person or entity perpetrates gender-related violence under Illinois law by "personally committing the gender-related violence or personally encouraging or assisting the act or acts of gender-related violence." 740 ILCS 82/10.

208. If a company knows or should have known that an employee is a risk to patients but takes no action, they may be personally liable under the Illinois Gender Act. *Gasic v. Marquette Mgmt.*, 2019 IL App (3d) 170756 (Ill. Ct. App. 2019).

209. At all relevant times, Defendants encouraged or assisted gender-based violence against Plaintiff by taking the following actions, each of which emboldened sexual abusers to view UHS facilities as a safe haven them:

- a. Providing facilities for employees to sexually abuse vulnerable patients;
- b. Making public statements to the media, state, and federal governments defending their employees who were accused of sexual abuse, representing sexual abuse as a rare occurrence;
- c. Undermining investigations into the extent of sexual misconduct perpetuated by employees by threatening employees who spoke out and seeking to hide evidence from UIC investigators;

d. Creating, promoting, and following policies that expressly directed employees to fill more beds, even when UHS knew that doing so would exacerbate existing problems with sexual abuse by staff members.

210. As a direct result of Streamwood's actions and omissions, individuals such as the staff members who abused Plaintiff were emboldened. By creating an environment in which sexual abuse went unchecked, Streamwood encouraged or assisted the acts of gender-related violence.

211. Plaintiff's injuries were directly and proximately caused by Streamwood's acts that encouraged abusers, such as hers. She has suffered and continues to suffer severe emotional and physical harm.

212. Plaintiff seeks punitive damages and attorneys' fees and costs in accordance with 740 ILCS 82/15.

Count XII

Assault and Battery Through Vicarious Liability **(Against all Defendants)**

213. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

214. Streamwood staff members, who are charged with patients' safety and wellbeing, used their power and authority in their roles to abuse Plaintiff.

215. While Plaintiff resided at Streamwood Hospital, she was repeatedly sexually assaulted, coerced, and abused by both staff members and patients. When she reported her abuse to hospital staff, she was illegally placed in seclusion by staff members as retaliation. In addition, staff members retaliated against Plaintiff by placing her in the SX dormitory, where she was sexually assaulted multiple times.

216. Plaintiff did not and could not consent to these grievous harms and abuses.

217. These acts were intentional, unwanted, and offensive physical contacts and/or non-consensual sexual acts towards a minor which constitute assault and battery for which Streamwood is vicariously liable.

218. Civil battery in Illinois occurs when “contact by a defendant that is unauthorized. . . where defendant has done some affirmative act intended to cause the unpermitted conduct.” *Battle v. Chicago Police Officers, et al.*, 1:11-cv-01138 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 30, 2012).

219. Streamwood is vicariously liable for assault and battery perpetrated on Plaintiff by its staff because ensuring that Plaintiff was not sexually abused or coerced into sexual activities falls within the scope of the staff members’ employment.

220. Further, Streamwood is vicariously liable for assault and battery perpetrated on Plaintiff by its staff because Streamwood employed the staff, who were acting within the scope of employment.

221. As a result of the assault and battery against Plaintiff, for which Streamwood is vicariously liable, Plaintiff has suffered emotional and physical harms that continue to affect her life today and will continue to cause Plaintiff pain and suffering for the rest of her life.

Count XIII

Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress **(Against all Defendants)**

222. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

223. Streamwood’s negligent acts and omissions constitute the negligent infliction of emotional distress.

224. Streamwood acted negligently toward Plaintiff, as described above.

225. This negligent conduct created an unreasonable risk of physical harm, which caused Plaintiff to fear for her safety each time she was admitted to Streamwood.

226. Plaintiff suffered emotional distress because of Streamwood's negligent conduct. This resulted in physical consequences and/or long-continued emotional disturbance, as described above.

227. Streamwood's conduct was the foreseeable cause of these damages.

228. Moreover, Streamwood's lack of and/or failure to enforce adequate policies and procedures for the prevention of, and proper response to, abuse of its patients exacerbates and amplifies the trauma of the actual abuse due to institutional betrayal.

Count XIV

Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress **(Against all Defendants)**

229. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

230. Streamwood's actions and inactions were outrageous and extreme, shocking, atrocious, and intolerable. Its conduct goes beyond the possible bounds of decency, and Streamwood acted with the reckless disregard of the possibility Plaintiff would suffer emotional distress as a result.

231. Streamwood's conduct was a substantial factor in causing severe emotional and psychological distress to Plaintiff. The distress from being forced into sexual activity by employees of Streamwood acting in their official capacity was of such an intensity that no reasonable person should be expected to endure it.

232. Moreover, Streamwood's lack of and/or failure to enforce adequate policies and procedures for the prevention of, and proper response to, abuse of its patients exacerbates and amplifies the trauma of the actual abuse due to institutional betrayal.

233. By sanctioning a culture of systematic physical, emotional, and sexual abuse at Streamwood facilities, Streamwood caused Plaintiff to suffer, among other things, appalling and

deplorable acts of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, and the resulting pain, suffering, humiliation, grief, shame, disgust, anxiety, nervousness, shock, distrust, and loss of enjoyment of life. Plaintiff will continue to suffer from these enduring harms and will incur more expenses for psychological treatments and counseling.

Count XV

Breach of Fiduciary Duty
(Against All Defendants)

234. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if set forth in full herein.

235. Streamwood, a service provider for children and adolescents suffering from acute mental health needs, owes a fiduciary duty to act in the best interest of the youth it serves. When a child is placed at Streamwood or any UHS facility, Streamwood assumes the fiduciary duty to ensure that the child receives appropriate care and is safe from foreseeable harms.

236. By sanctioning a culture of physical, emotional, and sexual abuse in its facility, allowing youth to be systematically abused, inadequately training and supervising Direct Support Professionals, failing to maintain safe staffing levels, and failing to monitor Plaintiff's wellbeing so as to detect signs of abuse, among other failures, acts, and omissions as previously described, Streamwood has breached its fiduciary duty towards Plaintiff.

237. Plaintiff has suffered emotionally, physically, and financially as the result of this breach of fiduciary duty.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court enter a judgment on her behalf and against UHS and Streamwood, and further grant the following relief:

- A. Award Plaintiff compensatory damages, punitive damages, pain and suffering, and any other relief to which they are entitled under the law;

- B. Award Plaintiff prejudgment interest, costs and attorneys' fees; and
- C. Award to the Plaintiff such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury as to all matters so triable.

Dated: November 4, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

FEGAN SCOTT LLC

By: /s/ Elizabeth A. Fegan

Elizabeth A. Fegan

FEGAN SCOTT LLC

150 S. Wacker Dr., 24th Floor

Chicago, IL 60606

Phone: 312.741.1019

Fax: 312.264.0100

beth@feganscott.com

Joseph G. Sauder (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

Joseph B. Kenney (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

Heather A. Swadley (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

SAUDER SCHELKOPF LLC

1109 Lancaster Avenue

Berwyn, PA 19312

Telephone: (888) 711-9975

Facsimile: (610) 421-1326

jgs@sstriallawyers.com

jbk@sstriallawyers.com

has@sstriallawyers.com