



1 of 99 DOCUMENTS

**JOHN DOE 1631, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. QUEST DIAGNOSTICS, INC., and  
QUEST DIAGNOSTICS CLINICAL LABORATORIES, INC., d/b/a QUEST DI-  
AGNOSTICS, Defendants/Respondents, and LABONE, INC., Defendant.**

**No. ED96516**

**COURT OF APPEALS OF MISSOURI, EASTERN DISTRICT**

*2012 Mo. App. LEXIS 860*

**June 26, 2012, Decided  
June 26, 2012, Opinion Filed**

**NOTICE:**

NOT FINAL UNTIL EXPIRATION OF THE RE-  
HEARING PERIOD.

**SUBSEQUENT HISTORY:** Transferred by *Doe v. Quest Diagnostics, Inc.*, 2012 Mo. LEXIS 260 (Mo., Sept. 25, 2012)

Superseded by, Remanded by *Doe v. Quest Diagnostics, Inc.*, 2013 Mo. LEXIS 16 (Mo., Mar. 19, 2013)

**PRIOR HISTORY:** [\*1]

Appeal from the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis. Honorable Dennis M. Schaumann.

**COUNSEL:** Kenneth M. Chackes, Bridget L. Halquist, Chackes, Carlson & Halquist, LLP, St. Louis, MO, for appellant.

Teresa Bartosiak, Kenneth W. Bean, Sandberg Phoenix & von Gontard P.C., St. Louis, MO; Constantine J. Passodelis, JonesPassodelis, PLLC, Pittsburgh, PA, for respondents.

**JUDGES:** Before Kathianne Knaup Crane, P.J., Lawrence E. Mooney, J., and Gary M. Gaertner, Jr., J. Kathianne Knaup Crane, P.J., Lawrence E. Mooney, J., and Gary M. Gaertner, Jr., J., concurring.

**OPINION**

**ORDER**

Plaintiff appeals from a judgment entered on a jury verdict in favor of one defendant on plaintiff's claims of breach of fiduciary duty and wrongful disclosure of HIV results, in violation of *section 191.656 RSMo* (2000). He also appeals from a judgment entered on a directed verdict in favor of the other defendant. The evidence in support of the jury verdict is not insufficient. No error of law appears. An opinion reciting the detailed facts and restating the principles of law would have no precedential value. However, the parties have been furnished with a memorandum opinion, for their information only, setting forth the facts and reasons for [\*2] this order.

We affirm the judgment pursuant to *Rule 84.16(b)*.

PER CURIAM.