

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN - SOUTHERN DIVISION**

RACHAEL DENHOLLANDER;  
JANE A. DOE by next friend JANE B. DOE;  
JANE C. DOE; JANE D. DOE;  
JANE E. DOE; JANE F. DOE;  
JANE G. DOE; JANE H. DOE;  
JANE J. DOE; JANE K. DOE by next friend  
JANE L. DOE; JANE M. DOE; JANE N. DOE;  
JANE O. DOE; JANE P. DOE by next friend  
JANE Q. DOE; JANE R. DOE; JANE S. DOE  
by next friend JANE T. DOE; JANE U. DOE;  
JANE X. DOE

Case No. 1:17-cv-

HON.

**COMPLAINT AND  
JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiffs,

v.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY; THE BOARD  
OF TRUSTEES OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY;  
LAWRENCE GERARD NASSAR (individual and  
official capacity); USA GYMNASTICS, INC.;  
TWISTARS USA, INC. d/b/a GEDDERTS' TWISTARS  
GYMNASTICS CLUB USA

Defendants.

---

Stephen R. Drew (P24323)  
Adam C. Sturdivant (P72285)  
DREW, COOPER & ANDING  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
80 Ottawa Avenue NW, Suite 200  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503  
Phone: (616) 454-8300  
E-mail: sdrew@dca-lawyers.com  
E-mail: asturdivant@dca-lawyers.com

John C. Manly (CA 149080)  
Vince W. Finaldi (CA 238279)  
Alex E. Cunny (CA 291567)  
MANLY, STEWART & FINALDI  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
19100 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 800  
Irvine, California 92612  
Phone: (949) 252-9990  
E-mail: jmanly@manlystewart.com  
E-mail: vfinaldi@manlystewart.com  
E-mail: acunny@manlystewart.com  
*W.D. Michigan Admission Pending*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND .....	1 – 95
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT AND INTRODUCTION .....	1 – 6
II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE .....	6 – 8
III. PARTIES AND KEY INDIVIDUALS .....	8 – 12
IV. COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS .....	12 – 20
V. SPECIFIC FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS .....	20 – 40
A. Rachael Denhollander .....	20 – 21
B. Jane A. Doe by Next Friend Jane B. Doe .....	21 – 22
C. Jane C. Doe .....	22 – 23
D. Jane D. Doe .....	24 – 25
E. Jane E. Doe .....	25
F. Jane F. Doe .....	26 – 27
G. Jane G. Doe .....	27 – 28
H. Jane H. Doe .....	28 – 29
I. Jane J. Doe .....	29 – 30
J. Jane K. Doe by Next Friend Jane L. Doe .....	30 – 31
K. Jane M. Doe .....	31 – 32
L. Jane N. Doe .....	32 – 33
M. Jane O. Doe .....	33 – 34
N. Jane P. Doe by Next Friend Jane Q. Doe .....	34 – 35
O. Jane R. Doe .....	35 – 36
P. Jane S. Doe by Next Friend Jane T. Doe .....	36 – 37

Q.	Jane U. Doe.....	37 – 38
R.	Jane X. Doe.....	39 – 40
VI.	CLAIMS AGAINST MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY DEFENDANTS .....	40 – 63
A.	COUNT ONE – Violations of Title IX.....	40 – 44
B.	COUNT TWO – Violation of Civil Rights, 42 U.S.C. §1983 .....	44 – 48
C.	COUNT THREE – Failure to Train and Supervise, 42 U.S.C. §1983 ....	48 – 49
D.	COUNT FOUR – Gross Negligence v. MSU, Nassar .....	49 – 51
E.	COUNT FIVE– Negligence v. MSU, Nassar .....	51 – 52
F.	COUNT SIX– Vicarious Liability .....	52 – 53
G.	COUNT SEVEN – Express/Implied Agency .....	54 – 55
H.	COUNT EIGHT – Negligent Supervision .....	55 – 56
I.	COUNT NINE – Negligent Failure to Warn or Protect .....	56 – 58
J.	COUNT TEN– Negligent Failure to Train or Educate .....	58
K.	COUNT ELEVEN– Negligent Retention.....	59 – 60
L.	COUNT TWELVE - Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress .....	60 – 61
M.	COUNT THIRTEEN – Fraud and Misrepresentation .....	61 – 63
VII.	CLAIMS AGAINST USA GYMNASTICS .....	63 – 79
A.	COUNT FOURTEEN – Gross Negligence v. USAG, Nassar .....	63 – 65
B.	COUNT FIFTEEN – Negligence v. USAG, Nassar.....	66 – 68
C.	COUNT SIXTEEN – Vicarious Liability.....	68 – 69
D.	COUNT SEVENTEEN – Express/Implied Agency .....	69 – 70
E.	COUNT EIGHTEEN – Negligent Supervision .....	70 – 71
F.	COUNT NINETEEN – Negligent Failure to Warn or Protect .....	72 – 74

G.	COUNT TWENTY – Negligent Failure to Train or Educate.....	74 – 75
H.	COUNT TWENTY-ONE – Negligent Retention .....	75 - 76
I.	COUNT TWENTY-TWO – Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress .....	76 – 77
J.	COUNT TWENTY-THREE- Fraud and Misrepresentation .....	77 – 79
VIII.	CLAIMS AGAINST TWISTARS .....	79 – 89
A.	COUNT TWENTY-FOUR – Gross Negligence v. Twistars, Nassar .....	79 – 80
B.	COUNT TWENTY-FIVE – Negligence v. Twistars, Nassar.....	81 – 82
C.	COUNT TWENTY-SIX – Express/Implied Agency .....	82 – 83
D.	COUNT TWENTY-SEVEN – Negligent Supervision.....	83 – 85
E.	COUNT TWENTY-EIGHT – Negligent Failure to Warn or Protect.....	85 – 87
F.	COUNT TWENTY-NINE - Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress .....	87 – 88
G.	COUNT THIRTY– Fraud and Misrepresentation .....	88 – 89
IX.	CLAIMS AGAINST NASSAR .....	89 – 92
A.	COUNT THIRTY-ONE – Assault and Battery.....	89 – 90
B.	COUNT THIRTY-TWO– Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress .....	91 – 92
X.	DAMAGES .....	92 – 94
XI.	JURY DEMAND .....	95

**COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND**

NOW COME Plaintiffs, by and through their attorneys DREW, COOPER & ANDING, and MANLY, STEWART & FINALDI, and hereby allege and state as follows:

**I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT AND INTRODUCTION**

1. This is a civil action for declaratory, injunctive, equitable, and monetary relief for injuries sustained by Plaintiffs as a result of the acts, conduct, and omissions of Lawrence Nassar, D.O., Michigan State University (“MSU”), USA Gymnastics (“USAG”), and Twistars USA, Inc. (“Twistars”) and their respective employees, representatives, and agents, relating to sexual assault, abuse, molestation, and nonconsensual sexual touching and harassment by Defendant Nassar against Plaintiffs, all female, many of whom were minors when the sexual assaults took place.
2. Plaintiffs are or were young athletes participating in a variety of sports including gymnastics, swimming, figure skating, track and field, field hockey, basketball, and soccer.
3. Defendant Nassar came highly recommended to Plaintiffs as a renowned orthopedic sports medicine physician, purportedly well-respected in the sports medicine community, specifically in the gymnastics community as the Team Physician for the United States Gymnastics team.
4. Plaintiffs and their parents had no reason to suspect Defendant Nassar was anything other than a competent and ethical physician.
5. From approximately 1996 to 2016 Defendant Nassar worked for Michigan State University in various positions and capacities.
6. From 1986 to approximately 2015 Defendant Nassar also worked for USA Gymnastics in various positions and capacities.

7. For over 20 years, Defendant Nassar had unfettered access to young female athletes through the Sports Medicine Clinic at MSU, and through his involvement with USAG and Twistars, who referred athletes to his care.
8. To gain Plaintiffs' trust, at appointments, Defendant Nassar would give some Plaintiffs gifts such as t-shirts, pins, flags, leotards, and other items, some with USAG logos and others without.
9. From 1996 to 1999, under the guise of treatment, Defendant Nassar sexually assaulted, abused, and molested Plaintiffs Jane H. Doe, Jane M. Doe, Jane N. Doe, Jane O. Doe, and Jane X. Doe, some of whom were minors, by nonconsensual vaginal and anal digital penetration and without the use of gloves or lubricant. In some situations, he also touched and groped their breasts.
10. Plaintiffs Jane H. Doe, Jane M. Doe, Jane N. Doe, Jane O. Doe, and Jane X. Doe were seeking treatment for athletic injuries to their lower backs, hamstrings, hip, tailbone, and elbow.
11. While most of the assaults were carried out at MSU, others were carried out at Twistars.
12. The ages of the Plaintiffs assaulted during 1996 to 1999 ranged from 11 to 22 years old.
13. In 1999, Jane X. Doe, a MSU student athlete, reported to trainers and her coach who were employees of MSU concerns about Defendant Nassar's conduct and "treatment," yet MSU failed to take any action in response to her complaints.
14. In 2000, Jane T.T. Doe, another MSU student athlete reported to trainers concerns about Defendant Nassar's conduct and "treatment," yet again MSU failed to take any action in response to her complaints.
15. Many Plaintiffs were seen alone with only the individual Plaintiff and Defendant Nassar in

the room, without chaperones.

16. At other times, Defendant Nassar would position himself in a manner in which parents or chaperones in the room could not see his conduct.
17. Because MSU took no action to investigate the 1999 or 2000 complaints and took no corrective action, from 2000 to 2016, under the guise of treatment, Plaintiffs Denhollander, Jane A. Doe, Jane C. Doe, Jane D. Doe, Jane E. Doe, Jane F. Doe, Jane G. Doe, Jane J. Doe, Jane K. Doe, Jane L. Doe, Jane M. Doe, Jane N. Doe, Jane O. Doe, Jane P. Doe, Jane R. Doe, Jane S. Doe, Jane U. Doe, and Jane X. Doe, many of whom were minors, were also sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar by nonconsensual vaginal and anal digital penetration, nonconsensual sexual touching of the vaginal area without the use of gloves or lubricant and by nonconsensual touching and groping of their breasts.
18. While most victims were assaulted at MSU, other victims were assaulted at Twistars.
19. The ages of the Plaintiffs assaulted from 2000 to 2016 ranged from 9 to 29 years old.
20. Additional complaints regarding Defendant Nassar's conduct surfaced in 2014. A victim reported she had an appointment with Defendant Nassar to address hip pain and was sexually abused and molested by Defendant Nassar when he cupped her buttocks, massaged her breast and vaginal area, and became sexually aroused.<sup>1</sup>
21. Upon information and belief, Defendant MSU investigated the 2014 complaints through their Office of Institutional Equity, and although the victim reported to Defendant MSU certain facts, some were omitted from the investigative report including but not limited to

---

<sup>1</sup> See, At MSU: Assault, harassment and secrecy. Matt Mencarini, December 15, 2016. Available at <http://www.lansingstatejournal.com/story/news/local/2016/12/15/michigan-state-sexual-assault-harassment-larry-nassar/94993582/>. (Last accessed January 5, 2017.)

the following:

- A. Defendant Nassar was sexually aroused while touching her;
  - B. The appointment with Defendant Nassar did not end until she physically removed his hands from her body.
22. Three months after initiating the investigation, in July 2014, the victim's complaints were dismissed and Defendant MSU determined she didn't understand the "nuanced difference" between sexual assault and an appropriate medical procedure and deemed Defendant Nassar's conduct "medically appropriate" and "Not of a sexual nature."<sup>2</sup>
23. Following the investigation, upon information and belief Defendant Nassar became subject to new institutional guidelines, one of which – it is believed – was that Defendant Nassar was not to examine or treat patients alone.<sup>3</sup>
24. Defendant Nassar continued to treat patients alone.
25. Following the investigation, between approximately 2014 and 2016, Plaintiffs Jane A. Doe, Jane K. Doe, and Jane S. Doe were sexually assaulted by Defendant Nassar.
26. Through his position with MSU, his notoriety, and support by USAG and Twistars, Defendant Nassar used his position of authority as a medical professional to abuse Plaintiffs without any reasonable supervision by MSU or USAG.
27. Defendant Nassar carried out these acts without fully explaining the "treatment" or obtaining consent of Plaintiffs or their parents.
28. All of Defendant Nassar's acts were conducted under the guise of providing medical care at his office at Michigan State University or at Twistars.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*



29. The failure to give proper notice or to obtain consent for the purported “treatment” from Plaintiffs or their parents robbed them of the opportunity to reject the “treatment.”
30. Defendant Nassar used his position of trust and confidence in an abusive manner causing Plaintiffs to suffer a variety of injuries including shock, humiliation, emotional distress and related physical manifestations thereof, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, and loss of enjoyment of life.
31. In September 2016, a story was published regarding a complaint filed with Defendant MSU’s Police Department titled “Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of Abuse,” which included Plaintiff Denhollander’s allegations against Defendant Nassar.
32. Following the September 2016 publication, other victims began coming forward after recognizing that they were victims of sexual abuse at a time when most of them were minors.
33. Plaintiffs have been forced to relive the trauma of the sexual assaults.
34. In summer 2015, USA Gymnastics relieved Defendant Nassar of his duties after becoming aware of concerns about his actions, yet USAG failed to inform Michigan State University of the circumstances regarding his dismissal.
35. As early as 1999, representatives of Michigan State University were made aware of Defendant Nassar’s conduct, yet failed to appropriately respond to allegations, resulting in the sexual assault, abuse, and molestation of Plaintiffs through approximately 2016.
36. Michigan State University’s deliberate indifference before, during, and after the sexual assault, abuse, and molestation of Plaintiffs was in violation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. §1681 *et seq.*, 42 U.S. C. §1983, as well as other Federal and State laws.

37. MSU and USAG's failure to properly supervise Defendant Nassar and their negligence in retaining Defendant Nassar was in violation of Michigan common law.
38. In late November 2016, Defendant Nassar was arrested and charged in Ingham County, Michigan on three charges of first-degree criminal sexual conduct with a person under 13.<sup>4</sup>
39. In mid-December 2016, Defendant Nassar was indicted, arrested, and charged in Federal Court in Grand Rapids, Michigan on charges of possession of child pornography and receipt/attempted receipt of child pornography.
40. The acts, conduct, and omissions of Defendants Michigan State University, USA Gymnastics, and Twistars, and their policies, customs, and practices with respect to investigating sexual assault allegations severely compromised the safety and health of Plaintiffs and an unknown number of individuals, and have resulted in repeated instances of sexual assault, abuse, and molestation of Plaintiffs by Defendant Nassar, which has been devastating for Plaintiffs and their families.
41. This action arises from Defendants' blatant disregard for Plaintiffs' federal and state rights, and Defendants' deliberately indifferent and unreasonable response to physician-on-patient/physician-on-student sexual assault, abuse, and molestation.

## II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

42. This action is brought pursuant to Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. §1681, *et seq.*, as more fully set forth herein.
43. This is also an action to redress the deprivation of Plaintiffs' constitutional rights under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983.
44. Subject matter jurisdiction is founded upon 28 U.S.C. §1331 which gives district courts

---

<sup>4</sup> State of Michigan, Ingham County Circuit Court Case No. 1603031.

jurisdiction over all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws and treaties of the United States.

45. Subject matter jurisdiction is also founded upon 28 U.S.C. §1343 which gives district courts original jurisdiction over any civil actions authorized by law to be brought by any person to redress the deprivation, under color of any State Law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States or by any Act of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and any civil action to recover damages or to secure equitable relief under any Act of Congress providing for the protection of civil rights.
46. Plaintiff further invokes the supplemental jurisdiction of this Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) to hear and decide claims arising under state law that are so related to the claims within the original jurisdiction of this Court that they form part of the same case or controversy.
47. The claims are cognizable under the United States Constitution, 42 U.S.C. §1983, 20 U.S.C. §1681 *et seq.*, and under Michigan Law.
48. The events giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in Ingham County, Michigan which sits in the Southern Division of the Western District of Michigan.
49. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (b)(2), in that this is the judicial district in which the events giving rise to the claim occurred.
50. Because Michigan State University is a public university organized and existing under the laws of the State of Michigan, and Michigan statutory law requires parties to file a Notice

of Intention to File Claim in order to maintain any action against the state, in satisfaction of M.C.L. §600.6431 Plaintiffs filed Notices of Intent to File Claim with the Michigan Court of Claims on November 29, 2016 (Exhibit 1), December 21, 2016 (Exhibit 2), and January 9, 2017 (Exhibit 3).

### **III. PARTIES AND KEY INDIVIDUALS**

51. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
52. With the exception of Plaintiff Rachael Denhollander, the names of the Plaintiffs have been withheld from this Complaint to protect their identities as some are currently minor children, or were minor children at the time the sexual abuse occurred.<sup>5</sup>
53. Plaintiff Rachael Denhollander is a female and is a resident of Kentucky, but resided in Michigan at all relevant times as indicated below. Plaintiff Denhollander was a minor at the times she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
54. Plaintiff Jane A. Doe is a minor female and is a resident of Michigan.
55. Plaintiff Jane B. Doe is an adult female, the mother of Plaintiff Jane A. Doe, and is a resident of Michigan.
56. Plaintiff Jane C. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Michigan.
57. Plaintiff Jane D. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Illinois, but resided in Michigan at all relevant times as indicated below. Plaintiff Jane D. Doe was a minor at the times she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
58. Plaintiff Jane E. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Michigan. Plaintiff Jane E. Doe

---

<sup>5</sup> Plaintiffs will seek an Order of the Court regarding disclosure of Plaintiffs' identities and all conditions for disclosure.

was a minor at the time she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.

59. Plaintiff Jane F. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Washington, but resided in Michigan at all relevant times as indicated below. Plaintiff Jane F. Doe was a minor at the time she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
60. Plaintiff Jane G. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of California, but resided in Michigan at all relevant times as indicated below. Plaintiff Jane G. Doe was a minor at the time she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
61. Plaintiff Jane H. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Arizona, but resided in Michigan at all relevant times as indicated below. Plaintiff Jane H. Doe was a minor at the time she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
62. Plaintiff Jane J. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Michigan. Plaintiff Jane J. Doe was a minor at the time she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
63. Plaintiff Jane K. Doe is a minor female and is a resident of Michigan.
64. Plaintiff Jane L. Doe is an adult female, the mother of Plaintiff Jane K. Doe, and is a resident of Michigan.
65. Plaintiff Jane M. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Illinois, but resided in Michigan at all relevant times as indicated below. Plaintiff Jane M. Doe was a minor at the time she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
66. Plaintiff Jane N. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of California, but resided in Michigan at all relevant times as indicated below.
67. Plaintiff Jane O. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Michigan. Plaintiff Jane O. Doe

was a minor at the time she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.

68. Plaintiff Jane P. Doe is a minor female and is a resident of Michigan.
69. Plaintiff Jane Q. Doe is an adult female, the mother of Plaintiff Jane P. Doe, and a resident of Michigan.
70. Plaintiff Jane R. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Michigan. Plaintiff Jane R. Doe was a minor at the time she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
71. Plaintiff Jane S. Doe is a minor female and is a resident of Michigan.
72. Plaintiff Jane T. Doe is an adult female, the mother of Plaintiff Jane S. Doe, and a resident of Michigan.
73. Plaintiff Jane U. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of Michigan. Plaintiff Jane U. Doe was a minor at the times she was sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
74. Plaintiff Jane X. Doe is an adult female and is a resident of North Carolina but resided in Michigan at all relevant times as indicated below.
75. Defendant Lawrence “Larry” Nassar, is a Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine, and is a resident of Michigan.
76. Defendant Michigan State University (hereinafter, “Defendant MSU”) was at all relevant times and continues to be a public university organized and existing under the laws of the state of Michigan.
77. Defendant Michigan State University receives federal financial assistance and is therefore subject to Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. §1681(a).

78. Defendant The Board of Trustees of Michigan State University (hereinafter, “Defendant MSU Trustees”) is the governing body for Michigan State University.
79. Defendant MSU and Defendant MSU Trustees are hereinafter collectively referred to as the MSU Defendants.
80. Lou Anna K. Simon is the current President of Defendant MSU, appointed in approximately January 2005. Prior to her appointment as President, Defendant Simon held several administrative roles including assistant provost for general academic administration, associate provost, and provost and vice president for academic affairs during her career with MSU.
81. M. Peter McPherson is the immediate Past President of Defendant MSU, and served as President from approximately 1993 – 2004.
82. William D. Strampel, D.O. is the Dean of the College of Osteopathic Medicine at Michigan State University serving as Dean since approximately April 2002 and as Acting Dean between December 2001 and April 2002.
83. Jeffrey R. Kovan, D.O. is or was the Director of Division of Sports Medicine at Michigan State University.
84. Defendant United States of America Gymnastics (hereinafter “Defendant USAG”) was and continues to be an organization incorporated in Indiana, authorized to conduct business and conducting business throughout the United States, including but not limited to Michigan.
85. Steve Penny is the current president of Defendant USAG, named in approximately April 2005, who is currently responsible for the overall management and strategic planning of Defendant USAG.
86. Robert Colarossi is the past president of Defendant USAG and held the position from

approximately 1998 to 2005, and during that time was responsible for the overall management and strategic planning of Defendant USAG.

87. Defendant Twistars USA, Inc. d/b/a Geddert's Twistars Gymnastics Club USA (hereinafter, "Defendant Twistars") was and continues to be an organization incorporated in Michigan.

88. John Geddert is the owner and operator of Twistars USA, Inc. d/b/a Geddert's Twistars Gymnastics Club USA.

#### **IV. COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

89. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.

90. At all relevant times, Defendant Nassar maintained an office at MSU in East Lansing, Michigan.

91. At all relevant times, Defendants MSU, MSU Trustees, and Nassar were acting under color of law, to wit, under color of statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usages of the State of Michigan and/or Defendant Michigan State University.

92. At all relevant times, including the years of 1996 to 2016, Defendant Nassar was acting in the scope of his employment or agency with Defendant MSU.

93. At all relevant times, including the years of 1996 to 2015, Defendant Nassar was acting in the scope of his employment or agency with Defendant USAG.

94. At all relevant times, including the years of 1996 to 2016, Defendant Nassar was acting in the scope of his agency with Defendant Twistars.

95. Defendant Nassar graduated from Michigan State University with a Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine degree in approximately 1993.



96. Defendant Nassar was employed by and/or an agent of Defendant USAG from approximately 1986 to 2015, serving in various positions including but not limited to:
- A. Certified Athletic Trainer;
  - B. Osteopathic Physician;
  - C. National Medical Director;
  - D. National Team Physician, USA Gymnastics;
  - E. National Team Physician, USA Gymnastics Women's Artistic Gymnastics National Team.
97. Defendant Nassar was employed by Defendant MSU from approximately 1996 to 2016 in various positions including but not limited to:
- A. Associate Professor, Defendant MSU's Division of Sports Medicine, Department of Radiology, College of Osteopathic Medicine;
  - B. Team Physician, Defendant MSU's Men's and Women's Gymnastics Team;
  - C. Team Physician, Defendant MSU's Men's and Women's Track and Field Teams;
  - D. Team Physician, Defendant MSU's Men's and Women's Crew Team;
  - E. Team Physician, Defendant MSU's Intercollegiate Athletics;
  - F. Medical Consultant, Defendant MSU's Wharton Center for the Performing Arts;
  - G. Advisor, Student Osteopathic Association of Sports Medicine.
98. Defendant Twistars is a gymnastics facility with which Defendant Nassar affiliated from its inception in or around 1996.
99. John Geddert, owner and operator of Twistars USA, Inc. d/b/a Geddert's Twistars Gymnastics Club USA served as the USA World and Olympic Women's Gymnastics Team Head Coach.

100. Mr. Geddert regularly recommended Defendant Nassar to members of Defendant Twistars as a reputable physician.
101. For a period of time, Defendant Twistars displayed a photo of Defendant Nassar at its facility.
102. As an agent of Defendant Twistars, Defendant Nassar regularly provided services and treatment to Defendant Twistars' members and Defendant USAG's members on Defendant Twistars' premises.
103. As a physician of Osteopathic Medicine, Defendant Nassar's medical care and treatment should have consisted largely of osteopathic adjustments and kinesiology treatment to patients, including students and student-athletes of Defendant MSU.
104. Defendant Nassar is not and has never been a medical doctor of obstetrics or gynecology.
105. While employed by Defendants MSU and USAG, Defendant Nassar practiced medicine at Defendant MSU's Sports Medicine Clinic, a facility at MSU.
106. During his employment, agency, and representation with the MSU Defendants, Defendant USAG, and Defendant Twistars, Defendant Nassar sexually assaulted, abused, and molested Plaintiffs by engaging in nonconsensual sexual touching, assault, and harassment including but not limited to digital vaginal and anal penetration.
107. The State of Michigan's Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Occupational Health Standards regarding Bloodborne Infectious Diseases mandates use of gloves when exposed to potentially infectious material, including vaginal secretions.<sup>6</sup>
108. In 1997, a parent of a gymnast at Defendant Twistars' facility complained to Mr. Geddert

---

<sup>6</sup> See, Michigan Administrative Code, R. 325.70001, et seq., Available at [http://www.michigan.gov/documents/CIS\\_WSH\\_part554\\_35632\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/CIS_WSH_part554_35632_7.pdf). Last accessed, January 5, 2017.

regarding Dr. Nassar's conduct, yet the concerns and allegations went unaddressed.

109. In or around 1999 the MSU Defendants were also put on notice of Defendant Nassar's conduct by Jane X. Doe, an MSU student athlete, after she complained to MSU employees, including trainers and her head coach, that Defendant Nassar touched her vaginal area although she was seeking treatment for an injured hamstring.
110. Despite her complaints to MSU representatives, Jane X. Doe's concerns and allegations went unaddressed.
111. In approximately 2000, a female student athlete (hereinafter Jane T.T. Doe),<sup>7</sup> a member of Defendant MSU's Women's Softball Team, was sexually assaulted and abused during "treatment" by Defendant Nassar and reported Defendant Nassar's conduct to Defendant MSU's employees, including trainers.
112. Jane T.T. Doe's allegations regarding the sexual assault include the following statements:

Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that NASSAR had engaged in unlawful sexually-related conduct in the past, and/ or was continuing to engage in such conduct. Defendants had a duty to disclose these facts to Plaintiff, her parents and others, but negligently and/or intentionally suppressed, concealed or failed to disclose this information. The duty to disclose this information arose by the special, trusting, confidential, fiduciary relationship between Defendants and Plaintiff. Specifically, the Defendant MSU knew that NASSAR was performing intravaginal adjustments with his bare, ungloved hand and in isolation with young females, based on the following:

- a. The Plaintiff, approximately 18 years old at the time, had a visit with NASSAR where he touched her vagina, in order to purportedly heal back pain she was having, under the guise of legitimate medical treatment. The Plaintiff complained to a trainer on her softball team who responded by saying that NASSAR was a world renowned doctor, and that it was legitimate medical treatment. The Plaintiff continued with the purported treatment;
- b. As the purported treatments continued, NASSAR became more bold,

---

<sup>7</sup> Referenced as Jane T.T. Doe in Exhibit 2.

having the Plaintiff remove her pants, and then inserting his bare, ungloved and unlubricated hand into her vagina. The Plaintiff, again, reported to Defendant MSU training staff, this time a higher ranking trainer. This trainer told the Plaintiff that the treatment sounded unusual and that the Plaintiff needed to speak to an even higher level trainer in the Department, who ended up being one of three individuals who supervised the entire department at Defendant MSU;

- c. When the Plaintiff went to see this individual, the Plaintiff was told by that individual that what happened to the Plaintiff was not sexual abuse, that NASSAR was a world renowned doctor, and that the Plaintiff was not to discuss what happened with NASSAR and was to continue seeing him for purported treatment. The Plaintiff continued to see NASSAR for treatment;
- d. Finally, in or around 2001, the Plaintiff refused to continue to see NASSAR for these abusive and invasive procedures. Defendant MSU then pressured and coerced the Plaintiff to declare herself medically inactive. The Plaintiff was shunned from the Defendant MSU sports program, and left Defendant MSU to return home to California.<sup>8</sup>

113. Despite her complaints to MSU employees, agents, and representatives, Jane T.T. Doe's concerns and allegations went unaddressed in violation of reporting policies and procedures and Title IX and in a manner that was reckless, deliberately indifferent, and grossly negligent.

114. Because MSU took no action to investigate the 1999 or 2000 complaints and took no corrective action, from 2000 to 2016, under the guise of treatment, Plaintiffs Denhollander, Jane A. Doe, Jane C. Doe, Jane D. Doe, Jane E. Doe, Jane F. Doe, Jane G. Doe, Jane J. Doe, Jane K. Doe, Jane L. Doe, Jane M. Doe, Jane N. Doe, Jane O. Doe, Jane P. Doe, Jane R. Doe, Jane S. Doe, Jane U. Doe, and Jane X. Doe, many of whom were minors, were also sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar by vaginal and anal digital penetration, without the use of gloves or lubricant and by touching and groping their

---

<sup>8</sup> See, Case No. BC644417, filed with the Superior California Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, December 21, 2016, ¶26.

breasts.

115. In 2014, following receipt of an unrelated complaint regarding a sexual assault on Defendant MSU's campus, between 2014 and 2015 the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights (hereinafter "OCR") conducted an investigation regarding the complainant's allegations, another complaint regarding sexual assault and retaliation from 2011, and Defendant MSU's response to said complaints, and their general policies, practices, and customs pertaining to their responsibilities under Title IX.<sup>9</sup>
116. The OCR concluded their investigation in 2015 and presented Defendant MSU with a twenty-one page agreement containing measures and requirements to resolve the 2011 and 2014 complaints and to bring Defendant MSU in compliance with Title IX.<sup>10</sup>
117. While the OCR was conducting their investigation, additional complaints regarding Defendant Nassar's conduct surfaced in 2014. The victim reported she had an appointment with Defendant Nassar to address hip pain and was sexually abused and molested by Defendant Nassar when he cupped her buttocks, massaged her breast and vaginal area, and he became sexually aroused.<sup>11</sup>
118. Upon information and belief, Defendant MSU investigated the 2014 complaints through their Office of Institutional Equity.

---

<sup>9</sup> See, Letter from U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights to Michigan State University, September 1, 2015, OCR Docket #15-11-2098, #15-14-2113. Available at <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/press-releases/michigan-state-letter.pdf>, last accessed January 4, 2017.

<sup>10</sup> See, Resolution Agreement, August 28, 2015, OCR Document #15-11-2098, #15-14-2133. Available at <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/press-releases/michigan-state-agreement.pdf>. Last accessed January 5, 2017.

<sup>11</sup> See, At MSU: Assault, harassment and secrecy. Matt Mencarini, December 15, 2016. Available at <http://www.lansingstatejournal.com/story/news/local/2016/12/15/michigan-state-sexual-assault-harassment-larry-nassar/94993582/>. Last accessed January 5, 2017.

119. However, the victim reported to Defendant MSU facts which were omitted or withheld from the investigative report including but not limited to the following
- A. Defendant Nassar was sexually aroused while touching her;
  - B. The appointment with Defendant Nassar did not end until she physically removed his hands from her body.
120. Three months after initiating the investigation, in July 2014, the victim's complaints were dismissed and Defendant MSU determined she didn't understand the "nuanced difference" between sexual assault and an appropriate medical procedure and deemed Defendant Nassar's conduct "medically appropriate" and "Not of a sexual nature."<sup>12</sup>
121. Following the investigation, upon information and belief, Defendant Nassar became subject to new institutional guidelines, one of which – it is believed – was that Defendant Nassar was not to examine or treat patients alone.<sup>13</sup>
122. After receiving allegations of "athlete concerns," in approximately summer 2015, Defendant USAG relieved Defendant Nassar of his duties.<sup>14</sup>
123. At no time did Defendant USAG inform Defendants MSU, MSU Trustees, or other MSU representatives of the concerns that led to Defendant Nassar being relieved from his duties with Defendant USAG.
124. From July 2014 to September 2016, despite complaints about Nassar's conduct, Defendant MSU continued to permit Defendant Nassar unfettered access to female athletes without adequate oversight or supervision to ensure he was complying with the new guidelines.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *See*, Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of abuse, Mark Alesia, Marisa Kwiatkowski, Tim Evans, September 12, 2016. Available at, <http://www.indystar.com/story/news/2016/09/12/former-usa-gymnastics-doctor-accused-abuse/89995734/>. Last accessed, January 5, 2017.

125. Plaintiffs were made aware of Defendant Nassar's widespread sexual abuse on or around September 12, 2016 or shortly thereafter through related media coverage.<sup>15</sup>
126. Defendant Nassar's employment ended with Defendant MSU on approximately September 20, 2016 only after the MSU Defendants became aware that:
- A. Defendants Nassar and USAG were sued by a former Olympian who alleged she was sexually assaulted by Defendant Nassar;<sup>16</sup> and,
  - B. A former patient of Defendant Nassar, Plaintiff Rachel Denhollander, filed a criminal complaint with the Michigan State University Police Department alleging Defendant Nassar sexually assaulted her when she was 15 years old and seeking treatment for back pain as a result of gymnastics. Plaintiff Denhollander's allegations of sexual assault by Defendant Nassar included but were not limited to:
    - A. Massaging her genitals;
    - B. Penetrating her vagina and anus with his finger and thumb; and,
    - C. Unhooking her bra and massaging her breasts.<sup>17</sup>
127. In late November 2016, Defendant Nassar was arrested and charged in Ingham County, Michigan on three charges of first-degree criminal sexual conduct with a person under 13, and was later released on \$1 million bond.<sup>18</sup>
128. In mid-December 2016, Defendant Nassar was indicted, arrested, and charged in Federal

---

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*

<sup>16</sup> *See*, Case No. 34-2016-00200075, filed with the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Sacramento, September 8, 2016. A copy of the Complaint is available at <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/3106054-JANE-JD-COMPLAINT-Signed.html>. Last accessed, January 5, 2017.

<sup>17</sup> *See*, Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of abuse, Mark Alesia, Marisa Kwiatkowski, Tim Evans, September 12, 2016. Available at, <http://www.indystar.com/story/news/2016/09/12/former-usa-gymnastics-doctor-accused-abuse/89995734/>. Last accessed, January 5, 2017.

<sup>18</sup> State of Michigan, Ingham County Circuit Court Case No. 1603031.

Court in Grand Rapids, Michigan on charges of possession of child pornography and receipt/attempted receipt of child pornography.

129. According to the federal indictment,<sup>19</sup> Defendant Nassar:
- A. Knowingly received and attempted to receive child pornography between approximately September 18, 2004 and December 1, 2004;
  - B. Knowingly possessed thousands of images of child pornography between approximately February 6, 2003 and September 20, 2016 including images involving a minor who had not attained 12 years of age.
130. To the best of Plaintiffs' knowledge, Defendant Nassar is in federal custody pending the child pornography criminal charges.

## **V. SPECIFIC FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

### **A. RACHAEL DENHOLLANDER**

131. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
132. Plaintiff Rachael Denhollander<sup>20</sup> treated with Dr. Nassar at his office at MSU in 2000.
133. In 2000, Plaintiff Denhollander was a minor, 15 years old.
134. Plaintiff Denhollander presented to Dr. Nassar with complaints of injuries to her wrists and back suffered through gymnastics.
135. On approximately five separate occasions, at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Denhollander's vagina and anus with his finger and thumb without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant under the guise of performing

---

<sup>19</sup> 1:16-cr-00242 PageID.1-4.

<sup>20</sup> Referred to as Jane D.R. Doe in Exhibit 2.



“treatment.”

136. Defendant Nassar also massaged Plaintiff Denhollander’s genitals.
137. Defendant Nassar also touched Plaintiff Denhollander’s breasts without permission by unhooking her bra and massaging one of her breasts.
138. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as “treatment” as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Denhollander.
139. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration or to touch Plaintiff Denhollander’s vagina, anus, or breasts.
140. Plaintiff Denhollander did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for issues related to obstetrics or gynecology (hereinafter “OB/GYN”).
141. Plaintiff Denhollander believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar’s pleasure and self-gratification.
142. After reviewing a media report regarding Defendant USAG’s failure to report sexual abuse,<sup>21</sup> in or around late August 2016 or early September 2016, Plaintiff Denhollander made a complaint with Defendant MSU’s Police Department.

**B. JANE A. DOE BY NEXT FRIEND JANE B. DOE**

143. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
144. Plaintiff Jane A. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar at his office at MSU from approximately 2011 to 2014.

---

<sup>21</sup> A blind eye to sex abuse: How USA Gymnastics failed to report cases, Marisa Kwiatkowski, Mark Alesia, Tim Evans, August 4, 2016. Available at <http://www.indystar.com/story/news/investigations/2016/08/04/usa-gymnastics-sex-abuse-protected-coaches/85829732/>. Last accessed January 5, 2017.

145. From 2011 to 2014, Plaintiff Jane A. Doe was a minor, approximately 12 to 15 years old.
146. Plaintiff Jane A. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of back pain as a result of gymnastics.
147. In 2014 at an appointment at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane A. Doe's vagina multiple times without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant.
148. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiffs Jane A. Doe or Jane B. Doe.
149. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane A. Doe, Jane B. Doe, or Jane A. Doe's father.
150. Plaintiff's medical records regarding her visits with Dr. Nassar are completely devoid of any reference to any type of intra-vaginal procedure.
151. Plaintiff Jane A. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
152. Following the September 12, 2016 publication of a story regarding a complaint filed with Defendant MSU's Police Department titled "Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of Abuse," (included as part of Exhibits 1, 2 and 3) Plaintiff Jane A. Doe made a complaint to MSU's Office of Institutional Equity.
153. Plaintiffs Jane A. Doe and Jane B. Doe believe the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**C. JANE C. DOE**

154. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
155. Plaintiff Jane C. Doe was a student athlete at the University of Michigan from

approximately 1998 to 2001.

156. Plaintiff treated with Dr. Nassar in 2001, 2011, and 2012 at his office at MSU.
157. Plaintiff Jane C. Doe presented to Dr. Nassar with complaints of back pain suffered through her participation in field hockey.
158. On approximately four separate occasions, at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane C. Doe's vagina without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant and put an excessive amount of pressure on her labia and vaginal area without gloves or lubricant.
159. Defendant Nassar would put his hands under Plaintiff Jane C. Doe's underwear and push her underwear to the side to digitally penetrate Plaintiff Jane C. Doe's vagina.
160. Defendant Nassar also touched her breasts without permission.
161. Defendant Nassar would put his hands under Plaintiff Jane C. Doe's sports bra to touch her breasts.
162. In 2011, another medical professional was in the room and asked Dr. Nassar where his hand was while he was digitally penetrating Plaintiff Jane C. Doe. Dr. Nassar allegedly said something the Plaintiff did not understand, dismissed the medical professional from the room and continued to digitally penetrate Plaintiff Jane C. Doe.
163. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane C. Doe.
164. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration or to touch Plaintiff Jane C. Doe's vagina or breasts.
165. Plaintiff Jane C. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
166. Plaintiff Jane C. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse,

and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**D. JANE D. DOE**

167. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
168. Plaintiff Jane D. Doe treated with Dr. Nassar between approximately 2004 and 2007 at his office at MSU.
169. From 2004 to 2007, Plaintiff Jane D. Doe was a minor, approximately 12 to 15 years old.
170. Plaintiff Jane D. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of lower back pain as a result of old and new fractures suffered as a result of gymnastics.
171. On approximately eight separate occasions at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane D. Doe's vagina and anus without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant for several minutes at a time. The assaults would sometimes last up to 30 minutes.
172. Defendant Nassar would put his hands under Plaintiff Jane D. Doe's spandex shorts to digitally penetrate Plaintiff Jane D. Doe's vagina and anus.
173. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane D. Doe.
174. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane D. Doe or from Jane D. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
175. Plaintiff Jane D. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
176. Plaintiff Jane D. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.
177. As a result of the sexual assault, abuse, and molestation Plaintiff Jane D. Doe suffered

severe urinary tract infections, vaginal bleeding, and bleeding while urinating.

**E. JANE E. DOE**

178. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
179. Plaintiff Jane E. Doe treated with Dr. Nassar between approximately 2006 and 2007 at his office at MSU.
180. From 2006 to 2007, Plaintiff Jane E. Doe was a minor, approximately 14 years old.
181. Plaintiff Jane E. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of back pain caused by fractures suffered as a result of gymnastics.
182. On approximately six separate occasions at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane E. Doe's vagina without prior notice and without gloves for several minutes at a time.
183. Defendant Nassar required Plaintiff Jane E. Doe to change into breakaway shorts with Velcro on the side, began massaging her back, and then put his hand under the shorts to digitally penetrate her vagina.
184. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane E. Doe.
185. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane E. Doe or from Jane E. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
186. Plaintiff Jane E. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
187. Plaintiff Jane E. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**F. JANE F. DOE**

188. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
189. Plaintiff Jane F. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar between in approximately 2004 at his office at MSU.
190. In 2004, Defendant Jane F. Doe was a minor, approximately 16 and 17 years old.
191. Plaintiff Jane F. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of back pain caused by her participation on basketball and soccer teams.
192. On one occasion at a medical appointment at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar touched Plaintiff Jane F. Doe's vagina and/or vaginal area without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant for several minutes at a time.
193. Defendant Nassar also requested and required Plaintiff to re-dress while he was in the room.
194. Defendant Nassar also grabbed Plaintiff Jane F. Doe's breast with his bare hand for several minutes at a time.
195. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane F. Doe.
196. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent to touch Plaintiff Jane F. Doe's vagina, vaginal area, or breasts from Jane F. Doe or Jane F. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
197. Plaintiff Jane F. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
198. Plaintiff Jane F. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

- 199. Plaintiff Jane F. Doe reported Defendant Nassar's conduct to her parents and to local law enforcement, Meridian Township Police in 2004.
- 200. Plaintiff did not return for additional treatment following her complaints.

**G. JANE G. DOE**

- 201. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
- 202. Plaintiff Jane G. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar from approximately 1999 to 2003 at his office at MSU.
- 203. From 1999 to 2003, Plaintiff Jane G. Doe was a minor, approximately 14 to 17 years old.
- 204. Plaintiff Jane G. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of low back pain caused by gymnastics.
- 205. On several occasions between 1999 and 2003, at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane G. Doe's vagina and anus without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant.
- 206. On at least one occasion at a USAG sanctioned event which took place at Defendant Twistars USA Inc.'s facility, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane G. Doe's vagina without gloves or lubricant.
- 207. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane G. Doe.
- 208. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane G. Doe or from Jane G. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
- 209. Plaintiff Jane G. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
- 210. Plaintiff Jane G. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse,

and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**H. JANE H. DOE**

211. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
212. Plaintiff Jane H. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar in 1998.
213. In 1998, Plaintiff Jane H. Doe was a minor, 16 years old.
214. Plaintiff Jane H. Doe presented to Defendant with complaints of pain from a torn hamstring and fractured ischium caused by gymnastics.
215. On one occasion at a medical appointment at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane H. Doe's anus without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant for several minutes.
216. At the appointment, Plaintiff was not permitted to sign in at the front desk and was brought to an examination by Defendant Nassar.
217. During the sexual assault, at 16 years old, only Plaintiff Jane H. Doe and Defendant Nassar were in the examination room. There was no chaperone.
218. Defendant Nassar explained his conduct as a "new procedure" which involved vaginal penetration to Plaintiff Jane H. Doe.
219. Defendant Nassar did not discuss anal penetration with Plaintiff Jane H. Doe.
220. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for anal penetration from Plaintiff Jane H. Doe or for vaginal or anal digital penetration from Plaintiff Jane H. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
221. Plaintiff Jane H. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
222. Following the September 12, 2016 publication of a story regarding a complaint filed with



Defendant MSU's Police Department titled "Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of Abuse," (included as part of Exhibits 1, 2 and 3) Plaintiff Jane H. Doe made a complaint to Defendant MSU's Police Department.

223. Plaintiff Jane H. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**I. JANE J. DOE**

224. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
225. Plaintiff Jane J. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar in 2005 and 2006 at his office at MSU and at Defendant Twistars' facility.
226. In 2005 and 2006 Plaintiff Jane J. Doe was a minor, approximately 16 years old to 17 years old.
227. Plaintiff Jane J. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of back pain caused by gymnastics.
228. On at least two separate occasions during appointments at his office at MSU and on at least one occasion at Defendant Twistars' facility at a USAG sanctioned event, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane J. Doe's vagina and anus without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant.
229. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane J. Doe.
230. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane J. Doe or from Jane J. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
231. Plaintiff Jane J. Doe requested her medical records, however Defendant MSU could not

locate a paper chart documenting all of her appointments with Defendant Nassar. The records Defendant MSU did produce were completely devoid of any reference to any type of intra-vaginal procedure.

- 232. Plaintiff Jane J. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
- 233. Plaintiff Jane J. Doe was also sexually assaulted by Defendant Nassar in the same manner described above at Twistars Gymnastics Club.
- 234. As a result of Defendant Nassar's sexual assault, abuse, and molestation, Plaintiff Jane J. Doe developed a bacterial infection.
- 235. Following the September 12, 2016 publication of a story regarding a complaint filed with Defendant MSU's Police Department titled "Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of Abuse," (included as part of Exhibits 1, 2, and 3) Plaintiff Jane J. Doe made a complaint to Defendant MSU's Police Department.
- 236. Plaintiff Jane J. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**J. JANE K. DOE BY NEXT FRIEND JANE L. DOE**

- 237. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
- 238. Plaintiff Jane K. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar at his office at MSU in approximately 2014 and 2016.
- 239. In 2014 and 2016, Plaintiff Jane K. Doe was a minor, approximately 13 years old and 14 years old.
- 240. Plaintiff presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of hamstring pain as a result of gymnastics.

241. On more than one occasion, approximately two or three times at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane K. Doe's vagina without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant, from 10 to 15 minutes at a time.
242. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane K. Doe, Jane L. Doe, or Jane K. Doe's father.
243. Plaintiff Jane K. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
244. At an appointment in approximately April 2016, during an examination he pulled Jane K. Doe's shorts to the side and viewed her vagina and vaginal area.
245. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiffs Jane K. Doe or Jane L. Doe.
246. It is believed some of the aforementioned sexual assaults occurred after the MSU Defendants were notified in 2014 of allegations of sexual abuse by Dr. Nassar during "treatments" with athletes.
247. Following the September 12, 2016 publication of a story regarding a complaint filed with Defendant MSU's Police Department titled "Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of Abuse," (included as part of Exhibits 1, 2 and 3) Plaintiff Jane K. Doe made a complaint with Defendant MSU's Police Department.
248. Plaintiffs Jane K. Doe and Jane L. Doe believe the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**K. JANE M. DOE**

249. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
250. Plaintiff Jane M. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar from approximately 1999 to 2002.

- 251. From 1999 to 2000, Plaintiff Jane M. Doe was a minor, approximately 14 to 16 years old.
- 252. Plaintiff Jane M. Doe presented to Defendant with complaints of low back pain caused by gymnastics.
- 253. On more than one occasion at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane M. Doe's vagina without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant.
- 254. Defendant Nassar would also touch Plaintiff Jane M. Doe's vaginal area through her clothes.
- 255. Defendant Nassar would ask Plaintiff Jane M. Doe to wear baggy shorts and put his hands under Plaintiff Jane M. Doe's shorts to digitally penetrate her vagina or touch her vaginal area.
- 256. Defendant Nassar would also put his hand under Plaintiff Jane M. Doe's shirt under the guise of "checking her sternum" and would touch her breasts.
- 257. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane M. Doe.
- 258. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane M. Doe or from Jane M. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
- 259. Plaintiff Jane M. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
- 260. Plaintiff Jane M. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**L. JANE N. DOE**

- 261. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.

- 262. Plaintiff Jane N. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar in approximately 2002.
- 263. Plaintiff Jane N. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of back pain caused by gymnastics.
- 264. On more than one occasion at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane N. Doe's vagina without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant for several minutes at a time.
- 265. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane N. Doe.
- 266. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane N. Doe.
- 267. Plaintiff Jane N. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
- 268. Following the September 12, 2016 publication of a story regarding a complaint filed with Defendant MSU's Police Department titled "Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of Abuse," (included as part of Exhibits 1, 2 and 3) Plaintiff Jane N. Doe made a complaint to Defendant MSU's Police Department.
- 269. Plaintiff Jane N. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**M. JANE O. DOE**

- 270. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
- 271. Plaintiff Jane O. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar from approximately 1999 to 2002.
- 272. From 1999 to 2002, Plaintiff Jane O. Doe was a minor, approximately 11 to 13.
- 273. Plaintiff Jane H. Doe presented to Defendant with complaints of injury to her hip, back,

knees, ankles, wrists and ribs caused by figure skating.

274. On more than one occasion at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar moved his hands under Plaintiff Jane O. Doe's underwear and digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane O. Doe's vagina without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant for up to 15 minutes at a time.
275. Defendant Nassar also touched Plaintiff's breast without permission on more than one occasion with his bare hand, once asking her if she had ever had a breast exam.
276. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane O. Doe.
277. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane O. Doe or from Jane O. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
278. Plaintiff Jane O. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
279. Plaintiff Jane O. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**N. JANE P. DOE BY NEXT FRIEND JANE Q. DOE**

280. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
281. Plaintiff Jane P. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar at his office at MSU in 2011.
282. In 2011, Plaintiff Jane P. Doe was a minor, 11 years old.
283. Plaintiff Jane P. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of injuries to her back as a result of gymnastics.
284. On approximately five to six separate occasions at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane P. Doe's vagina and anus without prior

notice and without gloves or lubricant.

- 285. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as “treatment” as a medical procedure to Plaintiffs Jane P. Doe or Jane Q. Doe.
- 286. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane P. Doe, Jane Q. Doe, or Jane P. Doe’s father.
- 287. Plaintiff Jane P. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
- 288. Plaintiffs Jane P. Doe and Jane Q. Doe believe the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar’s pleasure and self-gratification.
- 289. Following the September 12, 2016 publication of a story regarding a complaint filed with Defendant MSU’s Police Department titled “Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of Abuse,” (included as part of Exhibits 1, 2 and 3) Plaintiff Jane Q. Doe made a complaint to Defendant MSU’s Police Department.

**O. JANE R. DOE**

- 290. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
- 291. Plaintiff Jane R. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar from approximately 2007 to 2008.
- 292. From 2007 to 2008, Plaintiff Jane R. Doe was a minor, approximately 14 to 15 years old.
- 293. Plaintiff Jane R. Doe presented to Defendant with complaints of back pain caused by swimming.
- 294. On several occasions at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane R. Doe’s vagina without prior notice and without gloves and other than one occasion, without lubricant, for several minutes at a time.
- 295. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as “treatment” as a medical

procedure to Plaintiff Jane R. Doe.

- 296. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane R. Doe or from Jane R. Doe's parents even though she was a minor at the time.
- 297. Plaintiff Jane R. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
- 298. Following the September 12, 2016 publication of a story regarding a complaint filed with Defendant MSU's Police Department titled "Former USA Gymnastics doctor accused of Abuse," (included as part of Exhibits 1, 2 and 3) Plaintiff Jane R. Doe made a complaint to Defendant MSU's Police Department.
- 299. Plaintiff Jane R. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**P. JANE S. DOE BY NEXT FRIEND JANE T. DOE**

- 300. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
- 301. Plaintiff Jane S. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar at his office at MSU from approximately 2009 to 2014.
- 302. From 2009 to 2014, Plaintiff Jane S. Doe was a minor, approximately 9 to 14 years old.
- 303. Plaintiff Jane S. Doe presented to Defendant Nassar with complaints of back pain and heel pain as a result of gymnastics.
- 304. On more than one occasion at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane S. Doe's vagina without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant.
- 305. Plaintiff Jane S. Doe was also sexually assaulted by Defendant Nassar in the same manner described above at Twistars USA, Inc. in or around 2009.



- 306. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as “treatment” as a medical procedure to Plaintiffs Jane S. Doe or Jane T. Doe.
- 307. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane S. Doe, Jane T. Doe, or Jane S. Doe’s father.
- 308. Plaintiff Jane S. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
- 309. It is believed some of the aforementioned sexual assaults occurred after the MSU Defendants were notified in 2014 of allegations of sexual abuse by Dr. Nassar during “treatments” with athletes.
- 310. Plaintiffs Jane S. Doe and Jane T. Doe believe the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar’s pleasure and self-gratification.

**Q. JANE U. DOE**

- 311. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
- 312. Plaintiff Jane U. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar from approximately 2002 to 2011.
- 313. From 2002 to 2011, Plaintiff Jane U. Doe was a minor, approximately 9 to 17 years old.
- 314. Plaintiff Jane U. Doe presented to Defendant with complaints of hip, tailbone, elbow pain caused by gymnastics.
- 315. On several occasions at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane U. Doe’s vagina without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant.
- 316. Plaintiff Jane U. Doe would undress to her underwear with a towel and Defendant Nassar would put his hand in her underwear and digitally penetrate Plaintiff Jane U. Doe’s vagina.
- 317. Plaintiff Jane U. Doe believes she had approximately 50 appointments with Dr. Nassar

between 2002 to 2011.

318. Defendant Nassar told Plaintiff Jane U. Doe he performed the same “treatment” on Olympic athletes.
319. Defendant Nassar also touched Plaintiff Jane U. Doe’s breasts without permission, on some occasions touching her over her sports bra, at other times under her sports bra, and at other times telling her to take her sports bra off.
320. On one occasion, Defendant Nassar made inappropriate comments regarding his former girlfriends while digitally penetrating Plaintiff Jane U. Doe.
321. On one occasion Plaintiff Jane U. Doe was assaulted at Defendant Nassar’s home in his basement.
322. Defendant Nassar also touched Plaintiff Jane U. Doe’s breasts indicating he was attempting to manipulate Plaintiff Jane U. Doe’s ribs, although she had no pain or injury to her rib area.
323. During some sexual assaults at MSU, only Plaintiff Jane U. Doe and Defendant Nassar were in the examination room. There was no chaperone.
324. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as “treatment” as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane U. Doe.
325. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane U. Doe or from Jane U. Doe’s parents even though she was a minor at the time.
326. Plaintiff Jane U. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
327. Plaintiff Jane U. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar’s pleasure and self-gratification.

**R. JANE X. DOE**

328. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
329. Plaintiff Jane X. Doe treated with Defendant Nassar in 1999 as a student athlete at Michigan State University.
330. Plaintiff Jane X. Doe presented to Defendant with complaints of pain in her hamstring caused by track and field and cross-country.
331. Plaintiff Jane X. Doe was referred to Dr. Nassar by MSU trainers and training staff.
332. On more than one occasion at appointments at his office at MSU, Defendant Nassar digitally penetrated Plaintiff Jane X. Doe's vagina without prior notice and without gloves or lubricant.
333. Defendant Nassar used his hand to stimulate Plaintiff Jane X. Doe's vagina before digitally penetrating her vagina.
334. In approximately 1999, Plaintiff Jane X. Doe complained to MSU trainers and an MSU Coach who were employees, representatives, and agents of MSU and who had a duty to report allegations of sexual assault and abuse about Defendant Nassar's conduct and was told that he was an "Olympic doctor" and that Defendant Nassar "knew what he was doing."
335. It is believed no investigation was initiated given Jane X. Doe's complaints to MSU representatives nor was any corrective action taken, exposing Jane X. Doe and others to continued assaults.
336. Defendant Nassar did not explain his conduct disguised as "treatment" as a medical procedure to Plaintiff Jane X. Doe.

337. Defendant Nassar did not give prior notice or obtain consent for digital penetration from Jane X. Doe.
338. Plaintiff Jane X. Doe did not treat or intend to treat with Dr. Nassar for OB/GYN issues.
339. Plaintiff Jane X. Doe believes the conduct by Defendant Nassar was sexual assault, abuse, and molestation and for Defendant Nassar's pleasure and self-gratification.

**VI. CLAIMS AGAINST MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY DEFENDANTS**

**A. COUNT ONE**

**VIOLATIONS OF TITLE IX**  
**20 U.S.C. §1681(a), et seq.**  
**DEFENDANTS MSU, MSU TRUSTEES**

340. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
341. Title IX's statutory language states, "No *person* in the United States shall on the basis of sex, be ... subject to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance ..."<sup>22</sup>
342. Plaintiffs are "persons" under the Title IX statutory language.
343. Defendant MSU receives federal financial assistance for its education program and is therefore subject to the provisions of Title IX of the Education Act of 1972, 20 U.S.C. §1681(a), *et seq.*
344. Defendant MSU is required under Title IX to investigate allegations of sexual assault, sexual abuse, and sexual harassment.

---

<sup>22</sup> U.S. Dept. of Ed., Office of Civil Rights, Dear Colleague Letter: Sexual Violence, April 4, 2011, n. 11 ("Title IX also protects third parties from sexual harassment or violence in a school's education programs and activities."). Available at <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201104.pdf>. Last accessed, January 5, 2017.

345. The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights has explained that Title IX covers all programs of a school, and extends to sexual harassment and assault by employees, students and third parties.<sup>23</sup>
346. Defendant Nassar's actions and conduct were carried out under one of Defendant MSU programs, which provides medical treatment to students, athletes, and the public.
347. Defendant Nassar's conduct and actions toward Plaintiffs, that being nonconsensual digital vaginal and anal penetration, touching of Plaintiffs vaginal area, and touching of Plaintiffs breasts constitutes sex discrimination under Title IX.
348. As early as 1999 and/or 2000, an "appropriate person" at Defendant MSU had actual knowledge of the sexual assault, abuse, and molestation committed by Defendant Nassar.
349. Specifically, the MSU Defendants were notified about Defendant Nassar's sexual abuse and molestation by Jane X. Doe in or around 1999 and by Jane T.T. Doe in 2000 on more than one occasion.
350. The MSU Defendants failed to carry out their duties to investigate and take corrective action under Title IX following Jane X. Doe and Jane T.T. Doe's complaints of sexual assault, abuse, and molestation in or around 1999 and/or 2000.
351. The MSU Defendants were notified again in 2014 of Defendant Nassar's conduct when a victim reported she had an appointment with Defendant Nassar to address hip pain and was sexually abused and molested by Defendant Nassar when he cupped her buttocks, massaged her breast and vaginal area, and he became sexually aroused.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Cite OCR guidance that says this.

<sup>24</sup> See, At MSU: Assault, harassment and secrecy. Matt Mencarini, December 15, 2016. Available at <http://www.lansingstatejournal.com/story/news/local/2016/12/15/michigan-state-sexual-assault-harassment-larry-nassar/94993582/>. Last accessed January 5, 2017.

352. The victim reported to Defendant MSU facts which were omitted or withheld from the investigative report including but not limited to the following:
- A. Defendant Nassar was sexually aroused while touching her;
  - B. The appointment with Defendant Nassar did not end until she physically removed his hands from her body.
353. Three months after initiating an investigation, in July 2014, the victim's complaints were dismissed and Defendant MSU determined she didn't understand the "nuanced difference" between sexual assault and an appropriate medical procedure and deemed Defendant Nassar's conduct "medically appropriate" and "Not of a sexual nature."<sup>25</sup>
354. Following the investigation, upon information and belief, Defendant Nassar became subject to new institutional guidelines, one of which – it is believed – was that Defendant Nassar was not to examine or treat patients alone.<sup>26</sup>
355. The MSU Defendants failed to adequately supervise or otherwise ensure Defendant Nassar complied with the newly imposed institutional guidelines even though the MSU Defendants had actual knowledge Nassar posed a substantial risk of additional sexual abuse of females to whom he had unfettered access.
356. After the 2014 complaints Defendant Nassar continued to sexually assault, abuse, and molest individuals, including but not limited to Plaintiff Jane A. Doe and Plaintiff Jane K. Doe.
357. The MSU Defendants acted with deliberate indifference to known acts of sexual assault, abuse, and molestation on its premises by:

---

<sup>25</sup> *Id.*

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*

- A. failing to investigate and address Jane X. Doe and Jane T.T. Doe's allegations as required by Title IX;
  - B. failing to adequately investigate and address the 2014 complaint regarding Defendant Nassar's conduct; and,
  - C. failing to institute corrective measures to prevent Defendant Nassar from violating and sexually abusing other students and individuals, including minors.
358. The MSU Defendants acted with deliberate indifference as its lack of response to the allegations of sexual assault, abuse, and molestation was clearly unreasonable in light of the known circumstances, Defendant Nassar's actions with female athletes, and his access to young girls and young women.
359. The MSU Defendants' deliberate indifference was confirmed by the Department of Education's investigation into Defendant MSU's handling of sexual assault and relationship violence allegations which revealed:
- A. A sexually hostile environment existed and affected numerous students and staff on Defendant MSU's campus;
  - B. That the University's failure to address complaints of sexual harassment, including sexual violence in a prompt and equitable manner caused and may have contributed to a continuation of the sexually hostile environment.<sup>27</sup>
360. The MSU Defendants' responses were clearly unreasonable as Defendant Nassar continued to sexually assault female athletes and other individuals until he was discharged from the

---

<sup>27</sup> See, Letter from U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights to Michigan State University, September 1, 2015, OCR Docket #15-11-2098, #15-14-2113. Available at <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/press-releases/michigan-state-letter.pdf>, last accessed January 4, 2017.

University in 2016.

361. Between the dates of approximately 1996 and 2016, the MSU Defendants acted in a deliberate, grossly negligent, and/or reckless manner when they failed to reasonably respond to Defendant Nassar's sexual assaults and sex-based harassment of Plaintiffs on and off school premises.
362. The MSU Defendants' failure to promptly and appropriately investigate and remedy and respond to the sexual assaults after they received notice subjected Plaintiffs to further harassment and a sexually hostile environment, effectively denying them all access to educational opportunities at MSU, including medical care.
363. As a direct and/or proximate result of the MSU Defendants' actions and/or inactions, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, fright, grief, humiliation, and enjoyment of life, were prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs' daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life, and have sustained and continue to sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity.

**B. COUNT TWO**

**VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS**

**42 U.S.C. § 1983**

**ALL PLAINTIFFS AGAINST THE MSU DEFENDANTS, DEFENDANT NASSAR**

364. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs.
365. Plaintiffs, as females, are members of a protected class under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.



366. Plaintiffs enjoy the constitutionally protected Due Process right to be free from the invasion of bodily integrity through sexual assault, abuse, or molestation.
367. At all relevant times, Defendants MSU, MSU Trustees, and Nassar were acting under color of law, to wit, under color of statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usages of the State of Michigan and/or Defendant Michigan State University.
368. The acts as alleged above amount to a violation of these clearly established constitutionally protected rights, of which reasonable persons in the MSU Defendants' positions should have known.
369. The MSU Defendants have the ultimate responsibility and authority to train and supervise its employees, agents, and/or representatives, in the appropriate manner of detecting, reporting, and preventing sexual abuse, assault, and molestation and as a matter of acts, custom, policy, and/or practice, failed to do so with deliberate indifference.
370. As a matter of custom, policy, and and/or practice, the MSU Defendants had and have the ultimate responsibility and authority to investigate complaints against their employees, agents, and representatives from all individuals including, but not limited to students, visitors, faculty, staff, or other employees, agents, and/or representatives, and failed to do so with deliberate indifference.
371. The MSU Defendants had a duty to prevent sexual assault, abuse, and molestation on their campus and premises, that duty arising under the above-referenced constitutional rights, as well as established rights pursuant to Title IX.
372. Defendant MSU's internal policies provide that "[a]ll University employees ... are expected to promptly report sexual misconduct or relationship violence that they observe or learn about and that involves a member of the University community (faculty, staff or student) or occurred

at a University event or on University property." They state further: "[t]he employee must report all relevant details about the alleged relationship violence or sexual misconduct that occurred on campus or at a campus-sponsored event. .. "

373. Defendant MSU's aforementioned internal policies were violated in or around 1999 when Jane X. Doe reported sexual assault, abuse, and molestation by Defendant Nassar to MSU representatives including trainers and a coach and no action was taken to address her complaints.
374. Defendant MSU's aforementioned internal policies were violated in 2000 when Jane T.T. Doe reported sexual assault, abuse, and molestation by Defendant Nassar to MSU representatives including trainers and no action was taken to address her complaints.
375. The MSU Defendants' failure to address Jane X. Doe and Jane T.T. Doe's complaints led to an unknown number of individuals being victimized, sexually assaulted, abused, and molested by Defendant Nassar.
376. Additionally, the MSU Defendant's failure to properly address the 2014 complaint regarding Defendant Nassar's conduct also led to others being victimized, sexually assaulted, abused and molested by Defendant Nassar.
377. Ultimately, Defendants failed to adequately and properly investigate the complaints of Plaintiffs or other similarly-situated individuals including but not limited to failing to:
  - A. perform a thorough investigation into improper conduct by Defendant Nassar with Plaintiffs after receiving complaints in 1999 and 2000;
  - B. thoroughly review and investigate all policies, practices, procedures and training materials related to the circumstances surrounding the conduct of Defendant Nassar;

- C. recognize sexual assault when reported in 2014 and permitting University officials to deem sexual assault as “medically appropriate” and “not of a sexual nature;” and,
- D. ensure all institutional guidelines issued following the 2014 investigation into Defendant Nassar’s conduct were satisfied.

378. As indicated in the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights report,<sup>28</sup> the MSU Defendants had a culture that permitted a sexually hostile environment to exist affecting numerous individuals on Defendant MSU’s campus, including Plaintiffs.
379. Also indicated in the report was Defendant MSU’s custom, practice, and/or policy of failing to address complaints of sexual harassment, including sexual violence in a prompt and equitable manner which caused and may have contributed to a continuation of the sexually hostile environment.
380. By failing to prevent the aforementioned sexual assault, abuse, and molestation upon Plaintiffs, and by failing to appropriately respond to reports of Defendant Nassar’s sexual assault, abuse, and molestation in a manner that was so clearly unreasonable it amounted to deliberate indifference, the MSU Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983.
381. The MSU Defendants are also liable to Plaintiffs under 42 U.S.C. §1983 for maintaining customs, policies, practices which deprived Plaintiffs of rights secured by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. §1983.
382. The MSU Defendants tolerated, authorized and/or permitted a custom, policy, practice or

---

<sup>28</sup> See, Letter from U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights to Michigan State University, September 1, 2015, OCR Docket #15-11-2098, #15-14-2113. Available at <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/press-releases/michigan-state-letter.pdf>, last accessed January 4, 2017.