

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION IN WEST'S HAWAII  
REPORTS AND PACIFIC REPORTER**

NO. CAAP-18-0000776

IN THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS  
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

LILLIAN M. JONES, M.D., Plaintiff-Appellant,  
v.

HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD, AHLANI K.  
QUIOGUE, EO, CONSTANCE I. CABRAL, EO,  
Defendants-Appellees,  
and  
JOHN DOES 1-20, Defendants

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE  
FIRST CIRCUIT (CIVIL NO. 1CC151001958)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

(Filed Nov. 7, 2022)

(By: Leonard, Presiding Judge, Hiraoka and  
McCullen, JJ.)

Defendant-Appellee Hawai'i **Medical Board** examines applicants for a license to practice medicine or surgery; it is under the administrative control of the director of the Hawai'i Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs.<sup>1</sup> Self-represented Plaintiff-Appellant Lillian M. **Jones** appeals from the **Final Judgment** in favor of the Medical Board and two of its officers, Defendants-Appellees Ahlani K. **Quiogue** and Constance I. **Cabral** (the **Officers**), entered by the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) § 453-5(a); 453-5.1; 436B-7(2); and 26-9(c).

## App. 2

Circuit Court of the First Circuit on September 11, 2018.<sup>2</sup> For the reasons explained below, we affirm the Final Judgment.

### **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Jones filed the action below on October 8, 2015. She alleged that the Medical Board provided false information about her competence as a physician to the National Practitioner Data Bank.<sup>3</sup> She filed an amended complaint on April 8, 2016. Her amended complaint alleged counts for: (1) violation of the federal Health Care Quality Improvement Act; (2) libel; (3) defamation; and (4) tortious interference with prospective business advantage.

The Medical Board filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. The motion was heard on March 8, 2017.<sup>4</sup> The circuit court granted the motion.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Honorable James H. Ashford presided.

<sup>3</sup> The National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB) is a web-based repository of reports containing information on medical malpractice payments and certain adverse actions related to health care practitioners, providers, and suppliers. Established by Congress in 1986, it is a workforce tool that prevents practitioners from moving state to state without disclosure or discovery of previous damaging performance. See About Us, NPDB National Practitioner Data Bank, <https://www.npdb.hrsa.gov/topNavigation/aboutUs.jsp> (last visited Nov. 2, 2022).

<sup>4</sup> The record on appeal does not contain a transcript of the hearing.

<sup>5</sup> The Honorable Rhonda A. Nishimura presided.

## App. 3

The Officers filed a motion for summary judgment. The motion was heard on December 20, 2017.<sup>6</sup> The circuit court granted the motion.

The Final Judgment was entered on September 11, 2018. This appeal followed. Jones contends that the circuit court erred by granting the Medical Board's motion for judgment on the pleadings and the Officers' motion for summary judgment.<sup>7</sup>

### **STANDARDS OF REVIEW**

An order granting a Hawai'i Rules of Civil Procedure (**HRCP**) Rule 12(c) motion for judgment on the pleadings is reviewed *de novo*. In re Off. of Info. Pracs. Op. Letter No. F16-01, 147 Hawai'i 286, 294, 465 P.3d 733, 741 (2020).

In a motion for judgment on the pleadings under HRCP Rule 12(c), the movant must clearly establish that no material issue of fact remains to be resolved and that they are entitled to judgment as a matter of law. In considering a motion for judgment on the pleadings, the trial court is required to view the facts presented in the pleadings and the

---

<sup>6</sup> The Honorable James H. Ashford presided.

<sup>7</sup> The opening brief does not comply with Rule 28(b) of the Hawai'i Rules of Appellate Procedure. Because Jones is self-represented, we interpret her brief liberally and address the arguments we are able to discern. See Erum v. Llego, 147 Hawai'i 368, 380-81, 465 P.3d 815, 827-28 (2020) (instructing that self-represented litigants should not automatically be foreclosed from appellate review because they fail to comply with court rules).

## App. 4

inferences to be drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.

Our task on appeal is to determine whether the circuit court's order supports its conclusion that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law and, by implication, that it appears beyond a doubt that the nonmoving party can prove no set of facts in support of its claim that would entitle it to relief under any alternative theory.

Id. (cleaned up).

An order granting summary judgment is also reviewed de novo. Nozawa v. Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3, 142 Hawai'i 331, 338, 418 P.3d 1187, 1194 (2018). Summary judgment is appropriate if the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law. Id. at 342, 418 P.3d at 1198. A fact is material if proof of that fact would have the effect of establishing or refuting one of the essential elements of a cause of action or defense asserted by the parties. Id.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **I. The Medical Board's Motion**

The Medical Board made three legal arguments: (1) there is no private cause of action for alleged violation of the Health Care Quality Improvement Act;

## App. 5

(2) Jones's tort claims are barred by sovereign immunity; and (3) Jones's libel and defamations claims are precluded by a judgment in a previous lawsuit.

### **A. The Health Care Quality Improvement Act did not create a private cause of action.**

The federal Health Care Quality Improvement Act:

was enacted in 1986 to improve the quality of medical care by restricting the ability of physicians who have been found to be incompetent from repeating this malpractice by moving from state to state without discovery of such finding. Toward this end, the Act establishes a national reporting system "to follow bad doctors from place to place," and provides immunity from damages for persons participating in professional review activities. Under the national reporting system, insurance companies are required to report medical malpractice payments to the Secretary of Health and Human Services; boards of medical examiners are required to report sanctions imposed against physicians; and health care entities are required to report adverse professional review information. The Act also imposes a duty on hospitals to obtain information reported about any physician who applies for hospital privileges or employment, and to update such information every two years after hospital privileges are granted.

## App. 6

Imperial v. Suburban Hosp. Ass'n, 37 F.3d 1026, 1028 (4th Cir. 1994) (citations omitted). The Health Care Quality Improvement Act did not create a private right of action for persons who are the subjects of required reports. See, e.g., Held v. Decatur Mem'l Hosp., 16 F. Supp. 2d 975, 977 (C.D. Ill. 1998) (citing Bok v. Mut. Assurance, Inc., 119 F.3d 927, 929, reh. denied, 132 F.3d 1462 (11th Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 523 U.S. 1118, 118 S.Ct. 1796, 140 L. Ed. 2d 937 (1998), and other cases). Jones cites no case holding to the contrary, and we have found none. The circuit court correctly ruled, as a matter of law, that "there is no private cause of action available to [Jones] under" the Health Care Quality Improvement Act.

On appeal, Jones argues that a private cause of action should be implied because:

Under [Health Care Quality Improvement Act] 42 U.S.C. §[]11111(a) when a professional review body meets the four statutory requirements prescribed in 42 U.S.C.A. §[]11112(a) (West 2005), it is immune from damages.

Jones's argument lacks merit for three reasons.

The Hawai'i Supreme court has stated:

In determining whether a private remedy is implicit in a statute not expressly providing one, several factors are relevant. First, is the plaintiff one of the class for whose especial benefit the statute was enacted; that is, does

the statute create a right in favor of the plaintiff?

Flores v. Logan, 151 Hawai'i 357, 368, 513 P.3d 423, 434 (2022) (cleaned up). Doctors who are the subjects of reports to the National Practitioner Data Bank are not within the class of persons the Health Care Quality Improvement Act was enacted to benefit. See Imperial, 37 F.3d at 1028 (noting that “the Act establishes a national reporting system ‘to follow bad doctors from place to place[.]’”).

Second, 42 U.S.C. §§ 11111 and 11112 provide qualified immunity to professional review bodies “[t]o assure that hospitals and doctors cooperate with the system and engage in meaningful professional review[.]” Imperial, 37 F.3d at 1028. 42 U.S.C. § 11101 (1986) provides that persons participating in professional review activities that meet the standards imposed by 42 U.S.C. § 11112 “shall not be liable in damages ***under any law of the United States or of any State*** (or political subdivision thereof)” with respect to the person’s participation in such activities. (Emphasis added.) The Health Care Quality Improvement Act provides mandated reporters with qualified immunity from liability ***under other federal or state laws***; it does not create a new private cause of action.

Third, 42 U.S.C. § 11101 does not apply to the Medical Board. It applies only to a “professional review body” and its members, staff, persons under a contract or other formal agreement with it, and persons who participate with or assist it.

## App. 8

The term "professional review body" means a health care entity and the governing body or any committee of a health care entity which conducts professional review activity, and includes any committee of the medical staff of such an entity when assisting the governing body in a professional review activity.

42 U.S.C. § 11151(11) (1986).

The term "health care entity" means, in relevant part:

- (i) a hospital that is licensed to provide health care services by the State in which it is located,
- (ii) an entity (including a health maintenance organization or group medical practice) that provides health care services and that follows a formal peer review process for the purpose of furthering quality health care (as determined under regulations of the Secretary), and
- (iii) . . . a professional society (or committee thereof) of physicians or other licensed health care practitioners that follows a formal peer review process for the purpose of furthering quality health care (as determined under regulations of the Secretary).

42 U.S.C. § 11151(4)(A) (1986). The Medical Board is not a "professional review body" as defined by the Health Care Quality Improvement Act.

**B. Jones's tort claims are barred by sovereign immunity.**

By the State Tort Liability Act, Hawaii Revised Statutes (**HRS**) Chapter 662, the State generally waived its sovereign immunity for the torts of its employees. HRS § 662-2 (2016). However, the waiver does not apply to:

Any claim arising out of assault, battery, false imprisonment, false arrest, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, *libel*, slander, misrepresentation, deceit, or *interference with contract rights*[.]

HRS § 662-15(4) (2016) (emphasis added). The exception also applies to claims for defamation. Mitsuba Publ'g Co. v. State, 1 Haw. App. 517, 517, 620 P.2d 771, 772 (1980).

Jones's opening brief presents no discernible argument that the circuit court erred by applying HRS § 662-15(4). The point is waived. Hawai'i Rules of Appellate Procedure (**HRAP**) Rule 28(b)(7); Hawaii Ventures, LLC v. Otaka, Inc., 114 Hawai'i 438, 478, 164 P.3d 696, 736 (2007) ("an appellate court is not obliged to address matters for which the appellant has failed to present discernible arguments."). Even if an argument had been presented, the statutory language is clear. The circuit court did not err by ruling as a matter of law that Jones's claims for libel, defamation, and intentional interference with prospective business advantage were "barred by sovereign immunity, which is

retained by [the Medical Board] under [HRS] § 662-15(4)."

**C. We need not decide whether issue preclusion barred Jones's claims for libel and defamation.**

Jones contends that the circuit court erred by ruling that her libel and defamations claims were precluded by a judgment in a previous lawsuit.<sup>8</sup> The circuit court's order stated:

Although *the Court does not rely on this basis in issuing its ruling*, [Jones's] libel, defamation, and intentional interference with prospective business relations claims are also barred by collateral estoppel arising out of the operation of the Final Judgment entered in favor of Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board and against [Jones] in Civil No. 10-1-2238-10 KTN.

(Emphasis added.) As explained above, Jones's tort claims against the Medical Board were barred by sovereign immunity. We need not decide whether the doctrines of claim or issue preclusion also applied to those claims.

**II. The Officers' Motion**

After the circuit court entered the order granting the Medical Board's motion for judgment on the

---

<sup>8</sup> Jones v. Hawaii Board of Medical Examiners, JIMS no. 1CC101002238.

pleadings, the Officers moved for summary judgment based on Medeiros v. Kondo, 55 Haw. 499, 522 P.2d 1269 (1974). In Medeiros the supreme court declined to adopt a rule that nonjudicial government officers<sup>9</sup> were absolutely immune to suits for damages arising out of the performance of their public function. Id. at 500-01, 522 P.2d at 1270. Instead, the court adopted a rule of qualified immunity, placing upon the “plaintiff the burden of adducing clear and convincing proof that defendant was motivated by malice and not by an otherwise proper purpose.” Id. at 504, 522 P.2d at 1272.

#### **A. Constance I. Cabral.**

Cabral submitted a declaration stating: “At no time relevant to this case have I held any malice toward the Plaintiff Lillian M. Jones.” Jones submitted no evidence to controvert Cabral’s testimony. Jones offered a copy of the Medical Board’s report to the National Practitioner Data Bank, but Cabral’s name does not appear on the report and there is no evidence in the record about what role, if any, Cabral had in preparing or submitting the report. The circuit court did not err in granting summary judgment to Cabral.

---

<sup>9</sup> Hawai‘i recognizes absolute immunity for judicial officers, State v. Taylor, 49 Haw. 624, 631, 425 P.2d 1014, 1019 (1967), and for legislators exercising their legislative functions, Greer v. Baker, 137 Hawai‘i 249, 255, 369 P.3d 832, 838 (2016) (citing Haw. Const. art. III, § 7).

**B. Ahlani K. Quiogue.**

Quiogue submitted a declaration stating: "At no time relevant to this case have I held any malice toward the Plaintiff Lillian M. Jones." The burden then shifted to Jones to "demonstrate specific facts, as opposed to general allegations, that present a genuine issue worthy of trial." Nozawa, 142 Hawai'i at 342, 418 P.3d at 1198 (citations omitted).

The Medical Board's report indicates that Quiogue was the person who transmitted it to the National Practitioner Data Bank. The report stated:

ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2006, THE HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD (FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS) ("BOARD") DENIED DR. JONES'S APPLICATION BASED ON HER CONDUCT AT THE PEDIATRIC CONTINUITY CARE CLINIC ON APRIL 1, 2004, THE ENSUING ACTION(S) TAKEN AGAINST HER BY THE HAWAII RESIDENCY PROGRAMS, INC., TRIPLE BOARD RESIDENCY TRAINING PROGRAM, AND THE VIOLATIONS OF THE CONDITIONS OR LIMITATIONS UPON WHICH A LIMITED OR TEMPORARY LICENSE IS ISSUED. ON JULY 31, 2007 DR. JONES SUBMITTED A REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION TO THE BOARD. ON AUGUST 10, 2007 THE BOARD [sic] VOTED TO AFFIRM ITS DECISION TO DENY HER APPLICATION. A HEARING WAS CONVENED ON JANUARY 23, 2008. THE HEARINGS OFFICER CONCLUDED

App. 13

THAT DR. JONES' ACTIONS IN THE APRIL 1, 2004 INCIDENT AMOUNTED TO PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT, HAZARDOUS NEGLIGENCE, INCOMPETENCE, AND CONSTITUTED A SUFFICIENT BASIS FOR THE DENIALS OF HER LICENSE APPLICATION. THE HEARINGS OFFICER RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD AFFIRM ITS DENIAL OF DR. JONES' APPLICATION FOR A MEDICAL LICENSE. PURSUANT TO THE FINAL ORDER APPROVED BY THE BOARD ON AUGUST 8, 2008, THE BOARD ADOPTED THE HEARINGS OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION AS ITS FINAL ORDER AND AFFIRMED ITS DENIAL OF DR. JONES' APPLICATION FOR A MEDICAL LICENSE.

As noted above, a plaintiff maintaining a tort claim against a public official who is entitled to qualified immunity has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, that the public official "was motivated by malice and not by an otherwise proper purpose." Medeiros, 55 Haw. at 504, 522 P.2d at 1272. Here, regardless of the propriety of the Medical Board's decision, Quiogue's submission of that decision to the National Practitioner Data Bank does not constitute evidence that Quiogue was motivated by malice. Nor is there any other evidence in the record that Quiogue was motivated by malice. Thus, the circuit court did not err in granting summary judgment to Quiogue.

**CONCLUSION**

Based upon the foregoing, the “Final Judgment in Favor of Defendants Hawai‘i Medical Board, Ahlani K. Quiogue, EO, and Constance I. Cabral, EO, and Against Plaintiff Lillian M. Jones” entered by the circuit court on September 11, 2018, is affirmed.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai‘i, November 7, 2022.

On the briefs:

Lillian M. Jones, Self-represented Plaintiff- Appellant.	/s/ Katherine G. Leonard Presiding Judge
Bryan C. Yee, Shari J. Wong, Mana Moriarty, Deputy Attorneys General, State of Hawai‘i, for Defendants-Appellees.	/s/ Keith K. Hiraoka Associate Judge
	/s/ Sonja M.P. McCullen Associate Judge

---

App. 15

RUSSELL A. SUZUKI 2084  
Attorney General of Hawai'i

BRYAN C. YEE 4050  
SHARI WONG 5384  
MANA MORIARTY 9227

Deputy Attorneys General  
Department of the Attorney  
General, State of Hawai'i  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813  
Telephone: (808) 586-1180  
Facsimile: (808) 586-1205

Attorneys for Defendants HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD,  
AHLANI K. QUIOGUE, EO, and CONSTANCE I.  
CABRAL, EO

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT  
STATE OF HAWAII

LILLIAN M. JONES, M.D., ) CIVIL NO. 15-1-001958  
Plaintiff, ) (Other Non-Vehicle Tort)  
vs. ) FINAL JUDGMENT  
HAWAII MEDICAL ) IN FAVOR OF  
BOARD, AHLANI K. ) DEFENDANTS  
QUIOGUE, EO, ) HAWAII MEDICAL  
CONSTANCE I. ) BOARD, AHLANI K.  
CABRAL, EO, AND ) QUIOGUE, EO, AND  
JOHN DOES 1-20, ) CONSTANCE I.  
Defendants. ) CABRAL, EO, AND  
 ) AGAINST PLAINTIFF  
 ) LILLIAN M. JONES  
 ) Trial Date: None  
 ) Judge: Honorable  
 ) James H. Ashford

**FINAL JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANTS**  
**HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD, AHLANI K.**  
**QUIOGUE, EO, AND CONSTANCE I. CABRAL, EO,**  
**AND AGAINST PLAINTIFF LILLIAN M. JONES**

(Filed Sep. 11, 2018)

Final judgment is entered in favor of Defendants Hawai'i Medical Board, Ahlani K. Quiogue, EO, and Constance I. Cabral, EO, and against Plaintiff Lillian M. Jones on all claims asserted in the First Amended Complaint, filed April 8, 2016, pursuant to the:

- (1) Order Granting Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment, filed April 19, 2017; and
- (2) Order Granting Defendants Ahlani K. Quiogue, EO, and Constance I. Cabral, EO's Motion for Summary Judgment, filed December 29, 2017.

Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's Counterclaim Against Plaintiff Lillian M. Jones, filed June 7, 2016, was dismissed without prejudice pursuant to the Stipulation and Order for Partial Dismissal Without Prejudice of Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's Counterclaim Against Plaintiff Lillian M. Jones, filed August 20, 2018. There are no further claims or parties in this case.

Any remaining claims are dismissed with prejudice. This final judgment is issued in accordance with Rule 58 of the Hawai'i Rules of Civil Procedure.

App. 17

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, SEP 10 2018.

/s/ [Illegible]  
JUDGE OF THE ABOVE-  
ENTITLED COURT

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

/s/ Lillian M. Jones  
LILLIAN M. JONES  
Plaintiff *Pro Se*

---

*Jones v. Hawaii Medical Board, et al.*, Civil No. 15-1-001958, Circuit Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawai'i; FINAL JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANTS HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD, AHLANI K. QUIOGUE, EO, AND CONSTANCE I. CABRAL, EO, AND AGAINST PLAINTIFF LILLIAN M. JONES

---

App. 18

DOUGLAS S. CHIN	6465
Attorney General of Hawai'i	
BRYAN C. YEE	4050
SHARI WONG	5384
MANA MORIARTY	9227
Deputy Attorneys General	
Department of the Attorney	
General, State of Hawai'i	
425 Queen Street	
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813	
Telephone: (808) 586-1180	
Facsimile: (808) 586-1205	

Attorneys for Defendants HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD,  
AHLANI K. QUIOGUE, EO, and CONSTANCE I.  
CABRAL, EO

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT  
STATE OF HAWAII

LILLIAN M. JONES, M.D., ) CIVIL NO. 15-1-001958 RAN  
Plaintiff, ) (Other Non-Vehicle Tort)  
vs. ) ORDER GRANTING DE-  
HAWAII MEDICAL ) FENDANTS AHLANI K.  
BOARD, AHLANI K. ) QUIOGUE, EO, AND  
QUIOGUE, EO, ) CONSTANCE I. CABRAL,  
CONSTANCE I. ) EO'S MOTION FOR SUM-  
CABRAL, EO, AND ) MARY JUDGMENT, FILED  
JOHN DOES 1-20, ) ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2017  
Defendants. ) Hearing  
                  ) Date: December 20, 2017  
                  ) Time: 8:30 a.m.  
                  ) Judge: Honorable  
                  ) James H. Ashford  
                  ) Trial Date: None

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS AHLANI  
K. QUIOGUE, EO, AND CONSTANCE I.  
CABRAL, EO'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT, FILED ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2017**

(Filed Dec. 29, 2017)

On December 20, 2017, Defendants Ahlani K. Quiogue, EO, and Constance I. Cabral EO's Motion for Summary Judgment (Motion) came on for hearing before the Honorable James H. Ashford in his courtroom at 777 Punchbowl Street. Deputy Attorney General Mana Moriarty, Esq., appeared and argued on behalf of the Executive Officers. Plaintiff *pro se* Lillian M. Jones appeared and argued. Ms. Jones submitted a declaration in open court; the declaration was received [without over /s/ JHA] objection from Mr. Moriarty.

The Court reviewed the Motion, the Memorandum in Support of Motion, and the accompanying declaration and exhibits; the Memorandum in Opposition and the accompanying exhibits; the Reply; and Ms. Jones' declaration. The Court heard oral argument from Ms. Jones and Mr. Moriarty.

**Order**

(1) Summary judgment is awarded on Ms. Jones' claim under the Health Care Quality Improvement Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 11101 *et seq.* (HCQIA), alleged in her First Cause of Action in the First Amended Complaint, filed on April 8, 2016 (FAC), as there is no private cause of action available to Ms. Jones under the HCQIA. Based on *Wang v. City and County of Honolulu*, 66

## App. 20

Haw. 389, 665 P.2d 157 (1983), this Court declines to disturb its earlier ruling awarding judgment on the pleadings in favor of the Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board on Ms. Jones' HCQIA claim.<sup>1</sup>

(2) Summary judgment is awarded on Ms. Jones' common law claims against the Executive Officers, as there is no genuine issue of material fact and the Executive Officers are entitled to judgment on the basis of qualified immunity, *See Runnels v. Okamoto*, 56 Haw. 1, 525 P.2d 1125 (1974). More specifically:

(a) Summary judgment is awarded in favor of the Executive Officers on Ms. Jones' libel claim, alleged in her Second Cause of Action in the FAC, because the Executive Officers are entitled to qualified immunity;

(b) Summary judgment is awarded in favor of the Executive Officers on Ms. Jones' defamation claim, alleged in her Third Cause of Action in the FAC, because the Executive Officers are entitled to qualified immunity; and

(c) Summary judgment is awarded in favor of the Executive Officers on Ms. Jones' intentional interference with prospective business relations claim, alleged in her Fourth Cause of Action in the FAC, because the Executive Officers are entitled to qualified immunity.

---

<sup>1</sup> *See Order Granting Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment*, filed April 19, 2017.

App. 21

The Motion is granted pursuant to Rule 56, Hawai'i Rules of Civil Procedure, and summary judgment is awarded in favor of the Executive Officers on till claims against them in the First Amended Complaint.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, DEC 27 2017, 2017.

/s/ James H. Ashford  
JUDGE OF THE ABOVE-  
ENTITLED COURT

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

/s/ Lillian M. Jones  
LILLIAN M. JONES  
Plaintiff *Pro Se*

---

*Jones v. Hawai'i Medical Board, et al.*, Civil No. 15-1-001958 RAN, Circuit Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawai'i; ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS AHALANI K. QUIOGUE, EO, AND CONSTANCE I. CABRAL, EO'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, FILED ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2017

---

App. 22

DOUGLAS S. CHIN 6465  
Attorney General of Hawai'i

BRYAN C. YEE 4050  
SHARI WONG 5384  
MANA MORIARTY 9227

Deputy Attorneys General  
Department of the Attorney  
General, State of Hawai'i  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813  
Telephone: (808) 586-1180  
Facsimile: (808) 586-1205

Attorneys for Defendants HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT  
STATE OF HAWAII

LILLIAN M. JONES, M.D., ) CIVIL NO. 15-1-001958 RAN  
Plaintiff, ) (Other Non-Vehicle Tort)  
vs. ) ORDER GRANTING  
HAWAII MEDICAL ) DEFENDANT HAWAII  
BOARD, AHLANI K. ) MEDICAL BOARD'S  
QUIOGUE, EO, ) MOTION FOR JUDGMENT  
CONSTANCE I. ) ON THE PLEADINGS OR,  
CABRAL, EO, AND ) IN THE ALTERNATIVE,  
JOHN DOES 1-20, ) FOR SUMMARY  
Defendants. ) JUDGMENT, FILED  
 ) ON FEBRUARY 8, 2017  
 ) Hearing  
 ) Date: March 8, 2017  
 ) Time: 9:00 a.m.  
 ) Judge: Honorable  
 ) Rhonda A. Nishimura  
 ) Trial Date: None

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT HAWAI'I  
MEDICAL BOARD'S MOTION FOR  
JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS OR, IN  
THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT, FILED ON FEBRUARY 8, 2017**

(Filed Apr. 19, 2017)

On March 8, 2017, Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's (Defendant) Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment (Motion) came on for hearing before the Honorable Rhonda A. Nishimura in her courtroom at 777 Punchbowl Street. Defendant was represented by Deputy Attorney General Mana Moriarty, Esq. Plaintiff *pro se* Lillian Jones (Plaintiff) appeared in person at the hearing.

On March 7, 2017, Plaintiff filed her Addendum of Second Page Missing from Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's Motion for Summary Judgment on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment (Addendum). A copy of the Addendum was provided to Defendant's counsel at the hearing on March 8, 2017.

The Court reviewed the Motion, Memorandum in Support of Motion, and the accompanying declaration and exhibits; Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment, filed March 1, 2017 (Opposition); Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's Reply to Plaintiff Lillian M. Jones, M.D.'s Memorandum in Opposition to

Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board's Motion for Summary Judgment on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment, filed March 3, 2017 (Reply); and the Addendum; and the Court heard oral argument from Plaintiff and counsel for Defendant.

**Order**

- (1) Plaintiff's claim under the Health Care Quality Improvement Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 11101 *et seq.* (HCQIA), alleged in Plaintiff's First Cause of Action in the First Amended Complaint, filed on April 8, 2016 (Complaint), is dismissed as there is no private cause of action available to Plaintiff under HCQIA;
- (2) Plaintiff's libel claim, alleged in Plaintiff's Second Cause of Action in the Complaint, is barred by sovereign immunity, which is retained by Defendant under section 662-15(4), Hawai'i Revised Statutes (HRS);
- (3) Plaintiff's defamation claim, alleged in Plaintiff's Third Cause of Action in the Complaint, is likewise barred by sovereign immunity, which is retained by Defendant under HRS § 662-15(4); and [[illegible] alleged in Plaintiff's Fourth Cause of Action]
- (4) Plaintiff's intentional interference with prospective business relations claim, is also barred by sovereign immunity, which is retained by Defendant under HRS § 662-15(4).
- (5) Although the Court does not rely on this basis in issuing its ruling, Plaintiff's libel, defamation, and

intentional interference with prospective business relations claims are also barred by collateral estoppel arising out of the operation of the Final Judgment entered in favor of Defendant Hawai'i Medical Board and against Plaintiff in Civil No. 10-1-2238-10 KTN.

The Motion is granted as to all claims asserted by Plaintiff against Defendant in the Complaint, pursuant to Rule 12(c), Hawai'i Rules of Civil Procedure, and all claims asserted by Plaintiff against Defendant are dismissed.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, March 24th, 2017.

/s/ Rhonda A. Nishimura  
JUDGE OF THE ABOVE-  
ENTITLED COURT

APR 17 2017

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

/s/ Lillian M. Jones  
LILLIAN M. JONES  
Plaintiff *Pro Se*

---

*Jones v. Hawaii Medical Board, et al.*, Civil No. 15-1-001958 RAN, Circuit Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawai'i; ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, FILED ON FEBRUARY 8, 2017

---

App. 26

SCWC-18-0000776

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE  
STATE OF HAWAI'I

---

LILLIAN M. JONES, M.D.,  
Petitioner/Plaintiff-Appellant,

vs.

HAWAI'I MEDICAL BOARD; AHLANI K.  
QUIOGUE, EO, and CONSTANCE I. CABRAL, EO,  
Respondents/Defendants-Appellees,

---

CERTIORARI TO THE  
INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS  
(CAAP-18-0000776; CIV. NO. 1CC151001958)

ORDER REJECTING APPLICATION  
FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

(Filed Mar. 9, 2023)

(By: McKenna, Acting C.J., Eddins, J.,  
Circuit Judge Remigio in place of Recktenwald, C.J.,  
recused, Circuit Judge Johnson in place of  
Nakayama, J., recused, and Circuit Judge Morikawa  
in place of Wilson, J., recused)

The application for writ of certiorari filed on January 31, 2023 by Petitioner/Plaintiff-Appellant Lillian M. Jones, M.D. is hereby rejected.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, March 9, 2023.

/s/ Sabrina S. McKenna

/s/ Todd W. Eddinsn

/s/ Catherine H. Remigio [SEAL]

App. 27

/s/ Ronald G. Johnson

/s/ Trish K. Morikawa

---

App. 28

NO. CAAP-18-0000776

IN THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS  
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

LILLIAN M. JONES, M.D., Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

HAWAII MEDICAL BOARD, AHLANI K. QUIOGUE,  
EO, CONSTANCE I. CABRAL, EO,  
Defendants-Appellees,  
and  
JOHN DOES 1-20, Defendants

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE  
FIRST CIRCUIT (CIVIL NO. 1CC151001958)

JUDGMENT ON APPEAL

(By: Hiraoka, J., for the court<sup>1</sup>)

(Filed Dec. 2, 2022)

Pursuant to the Memorandum Opinion of the Intermediate Court of Appeals of the State of Hawai'i entered on November 7, 2022, the "Final Judgment in Favor of Defendants Hawai'i Medical Board, Ahlani K. Quiogue, EO, and Constance I. Cabral, EO, and Against Plaintiff Lillian M. Jones" of the Circuit Court of the First Circuit entered on September 11, 2018, is affirmed.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, December 2, 2022.

FOR THE COURT:

/s/ Keith K. Hiraoka  
Associate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Leonard, Presiding Judge, Hiraoka and McCullen, JJ.

---