

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

REBEKAH KATHERINE BREWIS,)	
)	
Plaintiff, Pro Se,)	Case No. 1:25-cv-03513
)	
v.)	Judge Sara L. Ellis
)	
PETERSON FARMS FRESH, LLC;)	Magistrate Judge
AARON LEROY PETERSON,)	Daniel P. McLaughlin
a/k/a R.J. ELLIOT, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**PLAINTIFF'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR HIPAA PROTECTIVE ORDER AND
ORDER RESTRICTING INSTITUTIONAL ACCESS TO PLAINTIFF'S PROTECTED
HEALTH INFORMATION**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff Rebekah Katherine Brewis, proceeding *pro se*, respectfully moves this Court for an emergency protective order restricting institutional access to Plaintiff’s protected health information (“PHI”) under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (“HIPAA”), 42 U.S.C. § 1320d et seq., and for an order directing Plaintiff’s Medicaid managed care organization, Aetna Better Health of Illinois, to provide a complete accounting of all disclosures of Plaintiff’s PHI pursuant to 45 C.F.R. § 164.528.

2. This motion is necessitated by the discovery of a direct corporate governance connection between Plaintiff's health insurer and the investment structure funding the Defendants' enterprise—a connection joined through a single individual who held compliance authority at one institution and now holds board-level governance authority at the other—combined with anomalous case management behaviors and an invasive, clinically unjustified fixation on Plaintiff's protected intersex anatomy by Aetna-affiliated care coordinators.

II. THE AETNA-BLACKROCK-PETERSON CORPORATE GOVERNANCE CONNECTION

3. Plaintiff is insured through Aetna Better Health of Illinois, a Medicaid managed care organization operating under the Aetna corporate family (a subsidiary of CVS Health Corporation). Aetna Better Health holds Plaintiff's complete medical records, psychiatric treatment history, disability documentation, prescription records, residential location data, and—critically—records pertaining to Plaintiff's intersex anatomy and associated medical history.

4. On March 27, 2025, BlackRock, Inc. (NYSE: BLK)—the world's largest asset manager with over \$12.5 trillion in assets under management—nominated **Kathleen Murphy** to stand for election as an independent director to BlackRock's Board of Directors at the company's 2025 Annual Meeting of Shareholders.

5. Prior to her nomination, Kathleen Murphy served in various positions at **Aetna, Inc.**, including as *General Counsel and Chief Compliance Officer of Aetna Financial Services*. In that capacity, Murphy was the senior legal officer responsible for regulatory compliance, legal risk management, and institutional governance of Aetna's financial services operations. She

subsequently served at ING/Voya Financial (2000–2008), then as President of Personal Investing at Fidelity Investments (2009–2021), and as Senior Advisor to Fidelity’s CEO until retirement.

6. BlackRock is a Limited Partner in MIC Capital Partners III, a \$1.6 billion private equity fund domiciled in the Cayman Islands, managed by Mubadala Capital (an arm of the Abu Dhabi sovereign wealth fund Mubadala Investment Company). BlackRock’s Secondaries & Liquidity Solutions (“SLS”) unit, within BlackRock Private Equity Partners, committed \$400 million to MIC Capital Partners III in approximately August 2021 as part of a consortium of global institutional investors.

7. MIC Capital Partners III is the investment vehicle through which Mubadala Capital holds its ownership interest in Peterson Farms, Inc.—the apex corporate entity of the Peterson enterprise. The corporate chain runs: BlackRock SLS → MIC Capital Partners III → MIC CP Peterson Aggregator LP (Cayman Islands) → PFI Holdco, LLC (Delaware) → PFI Upper Midco, LLC → PFI Lower Midco, LLC → Peterson Farms Fresh, LLC / Peterson Farms, Inc. (the named Defendants in this action).

8. Murphy’s nomination to BlackRock’s Board occurred on **March 27, 2025**—precisely *four days* before Plaintiff filed this federal action on April 1, 2025, and four days before Plaintiff filed Criminal Complaint No. 2025-ne033117134I8-A with the Michigan Attorney General on March 31, 2025. Whether coincidental or not, this timing placed a former Aetna senior compliance officer on the governing board of the ultimate financial beneficiary of Defendants’ enterprise at the precise moment Plaintiff’s litigation posed a material disclosure threat to that investment structure.

III. ANOMALOUS CASE MANAGEMENT BEHAVIORS

9. Since becoming insured through Aetna Better Health of Illinois, Plaintiff has experienced the following anomalous behaviors from Aetna-affiliated case management personnel that are inconsistent with standard Medicaid care coordination:

(a) *Unprompted Benefit Enrollment Pressure.* Plaintiff's Aetna case manager, Brianne, affirmatively pressured Plaintiff to apply for food stamp (SNAP/EBT) benefits at a time when Plaintiff had not expressed financial need for such benefits and had not requested assistance with food security. This is inconsistent with standard care coordination protocols, which respond to expressed needs rather than proactively enrolling patients in government benefit programs they have not requested.

(b) *EBT/Benefits Tracking Attempts.* Plaintiff observed attempts to track her EBT benefits status, creating an unnecessary data collection point that would link Plaintiff's Aetna health insurance records to her government benefits enrollment—expanding the institutional data footprint available through the insurance infrastructure.

(c) *Invasive Fixation on Intersex Anatomy.* Most disturbingly, Aetna-affiliated care coordinators have demonstrated a spontaneous and clinically unjustified fixation on Plaintiff's physical intersex anatomy. This fixation is not responsive to any treatment need Plaintiff has expressed, is not connected to any active care plan, and has no legitimate clinical basis. The specificity and persistence of this interest can only be explained by a targeted information-gathering campaign motivated by animus toward Plaintiff's sex characteristics—information that would have value only to parties with a non-medical interest in Plaintiff's vulnerabilities.

(d) Medication Interference—Estradiol. Plaintiff’s prescribed estradiol was dispensed at half the prescribed dosage. Plaintiff submitted multiple refill requests via email and phone, none of which were acknowledged or fulfilled. Plaintiff was told she must appear in person at a facility whose location was disclosed in federal court exhibit records accessible to Defendants’ counsel—creating a physical safety risk for a trafficking victim whose treatment locations are known to her alleged traffickers.

(e) Destruction of Medication at Discharge. Upon Plaintiff’s discharge from Clayton House residential facility, staff destroyed Plaintiff’s medications rather than releasing them to her—leaving her without prescribed medications including HIV antiretroviral treatment.

(f) Refusal to Refill HIV and Other Medications. Following discharge, Aetna refused to authorize refills of Plaintiff’s medications—including HIV antiretroviral medication—for approximately four to six weeks, despite Plaintiff filing a formal grievance. The denial of HIV antiretroviral medication for this duration posed a direct and serious risk to Plaintiff’s health.

(g) Case Manager Abandonment. Despite knowledge that Plaintiff was homeless and medically vulnerable following discharge, Plaintiff’s Aetna case manager made no attempt to contact Plaintiff or coordinate continuity of care—a departure from basic Medicaid care coordination standards.

10. Taken together, these behaviors describe not care coordination but intelligence gathering: the systematic collection of financial, residential, and anatomical data about a litigation adversary through the medical infrastructure that is supposed to protect her.

IV. THE STRUCTURAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

11. The Aetna–BlackRock–Peterson connection creates a structural conflict of interest that this Court should address prophylactically. Plaintiff’s Medicaid insurer shares corporate parentage with the institution where BlackRock Board nominee Murphy served as General Counsel and Chief Compliance Officer. BlackRock is a \$400 million investor in the fund that owns Peterson Farms. Murphy now sits (or will sit) on the Board that oversees BlackRock’s fund investments—including the very fund holding the enterprise Plaintiff is suing.

12. This creates a reasonable basis to believe that Plaintiff’s protected health information may be accessible through institutional channels connected to Defendants’ investment structure. Even absent direct evidence of intentional disclosure, the *structural capacity* for information to flow from Plaintiff’s health insurer to Defendants’ ultimate financial backer through shared governance personnel is sufficient to warrant protective measures. *See In re Zyprexa Injunction*, 474 F. Supp. 2d 385 (E.D.N.Y. 2007) (protective order appropriate where structural risk of disclosure exists even absent evidence of actual disclosure).

V. INTERSECTION WITH EXECUTIVE ORDER CONCERNS

13. Plaintiff’s concerns are heightened by the current federal policy environment regarding persons with mental health conditions and disabilities. Executive Order 14168 (January 20, 2025) and subsequent executive actions have created reasonable apprehension among disabled persons that medical records—particularly psychiatric and disability-related records—may be weaponized for purposes unrelated to care. For a plaintiff with documented PTSD, autism spectrum disorder, and intersex status who is suing a company backed by a \$12.5 trillion asset manager with

demonstrable connections to her health insurer, the risk of institutional misuse of PHI is not hypothetical.

14. Plaintiff's intersex status is protected under federal anti-discrimination law. *Bostock v. Clayton County*, 590 U.S. 644 (2020), established that discrimination based on sex characteristics violates Title VII. Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, 42 U.S.C. § 18116, prohibits sex discrimination in health programs receiving federal financial assistance—which includes Medicaid managed care organizations like Aetna Better Health. The invasive, unjustified fixation on Plaintiff's intersex anatomy by Aetna-affiliated personnel may independently constitute discrimination under Section 1557.

VI. LEGAL STANDARD

15. Federal courts possess broad authority to issue protective orders safeguarding sensitive personal information in litigation. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1) authorizes protective orders “for good cause” to protect a party from “annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden.” The Seventh Circuit has recognized that medical records, disability status, and sex-related personal information warrant heightened protection. *See Doe v. City of Chicago*, 360 F.3d 667, 669 (7th Cir. 2004).

16. HIPAA's Privacy Rule, 45 C.F.R. § 164.502, prohibits covered entities from using or disclosing PHI except as permitted. Under 45 C.F.R. § 164.528, patients have the right to an accounting of disclosures of their PHI. Where a court has reason to believe that a covered entity's PHI disclosures may be influenced by structural conflicts of interest, a court order directing an accounting of disclosures is an appropriate prophylactic measure.

VII. RELIEF REQUESTED

17. Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order:

(a) Directing Aetna Better Health of Illinois to provide Plaintiff with a complete accounting of all disclosures of Plaintiff's protected health information, pursuant to 45 C.F.R. § 164.528, for the period from January 1, 2024 through the date of the Order, including the identity of each recipient, the date of each disclosure, the information disclosed, and the stated purpose of each disclosure;

(b) Prohibiting Aetna Better Health of Illinois, its officers, agents, employees, and affiliates from disclosing any of Plaintiff's protected health information to any person or entity connected to BlackRock, Inc., MIC Capital Partners III, Mubadala Capital, Mubadala Investment Company, Peterson Farms Fresh, LLC, Peterson Farms, Inc., Aaron Leroy Peterson, Varnum LLP, or any of their officers, agents, affiliates, or subsidiaries, without prior written authorization from Plaintiff or further order of this Court;

(c) Prohibiting Aetna Better Health of Illinois from collecting, storing, or transmitting any information regarding Plaintiff's government benefits enrollment status (including SNAP/EBT, SSI, or any other means-tested benefit) to any entity other than the administering government agency, without Plaintiff's prior written consent;

(d) Ordering that any records pertaining to Plaintiff's intersex anatomy, sex characteristics, or related medical history held by Aetna Better Health of Illinois be designated as "highly sensitive" and accessible only to Plaintiff's treating physicians with a documented clinical need, not to case managers, care coordinators, or administrative personnel;

- (e) Directing Aetna Better Health of Illinois to identify, by name and title, every individual who has accessed records pertaining to Plaintiff's intersex anatomy or sex characteristics within the preceding twelve (12) months, together with the date, time, and stated purpose of each access;
- (f) Authorizing Plaintiff to designate a patient advocate or privacy officer, independent of Aetna Better Health, to monitor compliance with this Order;
- (g) Providing that any violation of the protective order shall be subject to contempt sanctions, including but not limited to compensatory damages, coercive fines, and referral to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Civil Rights for investigation of HIPAA violations.

VIII. CONCLUSION

18. The corporate governance connection between Plaintiff's health insurer and Defendants' investment structure, combined with anomalous case management behaviors and an invasive fixation on Plaintiff's protected intersex anatomy, creates an unacceptable risk that Plaintiff's most sensitive personal information is being accessed and potentially weaponized through institutional channels. Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter the protective order described above to safeguard her privacy, her physical safety, and the integrity of this litigation.

Respectfully submitted,



Rebekah Katherine Brewis

Plaintiff, Pro Se

680 N. Lake Shore Drive, Suite 110-1901

Chicago, Illinois 60611

Telephone: (872) 222-7490

Email: owner@aeroswift.org

Dated: February 26, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Rebekah Katherine Brewis, hereby certify that on February 26, 2026, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be served upon all counsel of record via the Court's CM/ECF electronic filing system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:



Rebekah Katherine Brewis

Plaintiff, Pro Se

Counsel for Defendants:

Brion B. Doyle

Neil E. Youngdahl

VARNUM LLP

333 Bridge Street NW, Suite 1700

Grand Rapids, Michigan 49504

bbdoyle@varnumlaw.com

neyoungdahl@varnumlaw.com

Michael J. Grant

John H. Andreasen

TABET DIVITO & ROTHSTEIN, LLC

209 South LaSalle Street, 7th Floor

Chicago, Illinois 60604

mgrant@tdrlawfirm.com

jandreasen@tdrlawfirm.com