

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

27

CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court Of Callorina County Of Los Angeles

MATTHEW E. HESS (STATE BAR No. 214732) MATTHEW E. HESS, ATTORNEY AT LAW 2 1801 CENTURY PARK EAST, 24TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067 TELEPHONE: (310) 751-7544 FACSIMILE: (310) 464-0397 E-MAIL: matthew.hess@hesslawvers.com Attorney for Plaintiffs BRANDON MCWHORTER, DANIEL SCANNELL, COPPER WILLIS and SAM NEIRA IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES** BRANDON McWHORTER, an individual; ) Case No. DANIEL SCANNELL, an individual; COOPER WILLIS, an individual; SAM COMPLAINT FOR: NEIRA, an individual, Plaintiffs. **ENJOYMENT**; VS. 16 BRONSON AVENUE PROPERTIES, LLC, a California limited liability company; JASON VOGEL, an individual; ) and JAMES JOHN WALLS, individually and d/b/a WALLS PROPERTY MANAGEMENT; and DOES 1 through **NEGLIGENCE**; 25, inclusive, 20 Defendants. PROF. C. § 17200) 24 26 28

. JAN 1-9 2016

By: Kristina Vargas, Doputy

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk

BC 6 0 7 4 8 0

- BREACH OF CONTRACT; (2) BREACH OF THE IMPLIED
- **COVENANT OF QUIET**
- (3) BREACH OF THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF HABITABILITY;
- (4) BREACH OF THE IMPLIED **COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH** AND FAIR DEALING
- FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT;
- **CONSTRUCTIVE EVICTION;**
- VIOLATIONS OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES RENT STABILIZATION **ORDINANCE - MUNICIPAL CODE** 
  - § 151.00 et seq.; and UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS. &

Plaintiffs Brandon McWhorter, Daniel Scannell, Cooper Willis and Sam Neira hereby allege as follows:

## **SUMMARY OF THE ACTION**

- 1. This is a lawsuit brought by former residents of the multi-unit apartment complex located at 1527 1533 ½ North Bronson Avenue in Los Angeles, California. Defendant Bronson Avenue Properties, LLC ("BAP") owns the building. Defendant and its principal, Jason Vogel, have devised a scheme to circumvent the Los Angeles rent control laws by turning the apartment building into an unlicensed hotel. Defendant James Walls, individually and d/b/a Walls Property Management, aided and abetted BAP and Vogel in implementing their unlawful scheme.
- 2. The apartment complex was originally built by Charlie Chaplin and, until Defendants implemented the scheme which is the subject of this Complaint, was a quiet, elegant and tasteful residential apartment complex primarily inhabited by professionals.
- 3. The complex was more than a place to live it was a *bona fide* community. Residents regularly had communal meals in the complex's well-tended garden and dined together several times per week.
- 4. Because the complex was such a pleasant place to live, it was inhabited by many long-term tenants. The City of Los Angeles's strict rent control laws limited the rate at which Defendants BAP and Vogel could increase their tenants' rent.
- 5. In order to circumvent the city's rent-control laws, Defendants BAP and Vogel decided to turn the apartment complex into an unlicensed hotel which permits them to charge much higher rents.
- 6. To implement this scheme, Defendants stopped performing vital maintenance. Then, after the resulting sewage leaks, rats, and maggots drive the long-term tenants out, Defendants rent their apartments to tourists on a short-term, revolving-door basis by using websites such as AirBNB and Craigslist.

7. This residential apartment complex is now a short-term, unlicensed hotel frequented primarily by tourists seeking a hedonistic Hollywood vacation. Most of the long-term tenants are now gone, and a once-lovely residential apartment complex has been transformed into a short-term hotel where there is endemic drug use, alcohol consumption, loud music, and raucous partying.

## **PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

## A. Plaintiffs and Named Defendants

- 8. Plaintiff Brandon McWhorter is an individual resident of Los Angeles, California.
- Plaintiff Daniel Scannell is an individual resident of Los Angeles,
   California.
  - 10. Plaintiff Cooper Willis is an individual resident of Los Angeles, California.
  - 11. Plaintiff Sam Neira is an individual resident of Pasadena, California.
- 12. Defendant Bronson Avenue Properties, LLC is a California limited liability company with its principal place of business at 1527 North Bronson Avenue, California.
- 13. Defendant Jason Vogel is, upon information and belief, an individual resident of Orange County, California.
- 14. Defendant James Walls, individually and d/b/a Walls Property Management, is an individual resident of North Hills, California.

## B. Fictitiously Named Doe Defendants

15. Plaintiff are currently ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of the defendants sued herein under the fictitious names Does 1 through 25, inclusive, and therefore sue such defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of said fictitiously named defendants when their true names and capacities have been ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that each of the fictitiously named Doe defendants is legally responsible in some manner for the events and occurrences alleged herein.

16. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that all defendants, including the fictitious Doe defendants, were at all relevant times acting as actual agents, conspirators, ostensible agents, partners and/or joint venturers and employees of all other defendants, and that all acts alleged herein occurred within the course and scope of said agency, employment, partnership, and joint venture, conspiracy or enterprise, and with the express and/or implied permission, knowledge, consent, authorization and ratification of their co-defendants; however, each of these allegations are deemed "alternative" theories whenever not doing so would result in a contradiction with the other allegations.

### C. Alter Ego Allegations

17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendant Bronson Avenue Properties, LLC is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the alter ego of defendant Vogel. Plaintiffs further allege that there exists, and at all times herein mentioned has existed, a unity of interest and ownership between Bronson Avenue Properties, LLC and defendant Vogel such that any separateness between them has ceased to exist, in that Defendant Vogel has managed and controlled the business of Bronson Avenue Properties, LLC to perpetrate a fraud and evade the City of Los Angeles rent control laws. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of Bronson Avenue Properties, LLC as an entity distinct from the individual defendants would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and would promote injustice.

#### D. Jurisdiction and Venue

- 18. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to <u>C.C.P.</u> § 410.10, because the acts and omissions complained of herein took place in the state of California, and because all of the parties are residents of the State of California.
- 19. Venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles pursuant to <u>C.C.P.</u> § 395(a) because: (1) Defendants are residents of Los Angeles County; and (2) the wrongful acts complained of herein took place in Los Angeles County.

-11///

## **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

- 20. Plaintiffs Brandon McWhorter, Daniel Scannell, Cooper Willis and Sam Neira are former residents of the multi-unit apartment complex located at 1527 1533 ½ North Bronson Avenue in Los Angeles, California. Defendant Bronson Avenue Properties, LLC ("BAP") owns that apartment building.
- 21. Like most multi-unit properties in the City of Los Angeles, the apartment building to which BAP holds title is subject to the City of Los Angeles Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO).
- 22. More than 52 percent of Los Angeles residents are renters, and housing stock is very scarce. In an effort to ensure that long-term renters were not driven from their homes due to rapidly rising rents, in 1978, Los Angeles enacted the RSO, Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) § 151.00 *et seq*. The RSO ensures affordable rents for long-term tenants by regulating allowable rent increases. LAMC § 151.04.
- 23. Plaintiffs are former residents of the apartment building owned by Defendant, and are part of the class of persons that the RSO was intended to benefit. All of the plaintiffs herein were long-term tenants of the complex who intended to reside there for the foreseeable future.
- 24. When Plaintiffs first moved into the apartment building, it was a quiet, multi-unit property occupied by long-term residents. Shortly thereafter, Defendants VAP and Vogel began transforming the building into an unlicensed and unpermitted hotel.
- 25. Whenever a long-term resident moved out, Defendant would <u>not</u> re-let the apartment to another long-term tenant. Instead, Defendants would list the now-vacant apartment as a short-term vacation rental on web sites such as AirBnB and Craigslist.
- 26. Upon information and belief, by leasing the apartments as short-term rentals, Defendants were able to charge rents far in excess of those allowed by the RSO.

- 27. As soon as the transient vacationers began occupying some of the apartments, the character of the building rapidly changed. The transient residents were interested in a hedonistic Hollywood vacation and treated their apartments like cheap motel rooms, not like residential dwellings. On a near-constant basis, the transient residents engaged in the following behavior:
  - (a.) Illegal drug use;
  - (b.) Throwing wild, raucous, noisy parties;
  - (c.) Playing loud music well past midnight;
  - (d.) Shouting, fighting, and causing disturbances;
  - (e.) Smoking, drinking, and playing music in the apartment building's common areas;
  - (f.) Vandalizing the building and stealing outdoor furniture and property left on the outdoor spaces of other residents;
  - (g.) Entering the building at all hours of the day and night, and inviting unsavory characters into the building;
  - (h.) Taking plaintiff's assigned parking spaces.
- 28. After the first apartment was converted into an unlicensed hotel room, these problems snowballed. The many problems caused by the transient occupants of the first apartment illegally converted to a hotel room disturbed the building's long-term residents, many of whom responded by vacating their apartments in turn. Once those residents vacated their apartments, the apartments were converted to short-term rentals, which made the problems even worse and caused even more residents to move out, and so on.
- 29. However, not all of the long-term residents were willing or able to leave the building, and Defendants were therefore unable to convert their apartments into more lucrative unlicensed hotel rooms.
- 30. Upon information and belief, Defendant BAP's principal, Jason Vogel, was able to get rid of some of the residents by notifying them, pursuant to

§ 151.09.A.8, that he was going to move a relative or an on-site property manager into their apartments. This did not happen. Instead, once the long-term tenants of one or more of those apartment moved out, Defendants BAP and Vogel converted their apartments into AirBNB rentals.

- 31. Defendant then attempted to get rid of the rest of the building's residents by neglecting tenant complaints and failing to perform routine maintenance until conditions became intolerable. Plaintiffs Scannell and Willis are two of the residents who were evicted in this way.
- 32. First, Defendants ignored the vast majority of Plaintiffs' complaints about the problems caused by the transient unlawful hotel tenants. Plaintiffs repeatedly called and e-mailed Defendant BAP's property managers, who were employed by Defendant James Walls d/b/a Walls Property Management. The property managers were implored to address Plaintiffs' concerns, but the vast majority of their complaints fell on deaf ears and nothing was ever done.
- 33. In one incredible instance, Defendant Walls actually told Plaintiff
  McWhorter (in response to a maintenance request) that "there are two levels of service
  here market-rate and rent controlled." He went on to say, in essence, that "rent
  controlled tenants won't get help until the problems are building-critical or they start
  paying market rate. Market-rate tenants get better service."
- 34. After Defendants began neglecting routine maintenance, the apartments inhabited by all of the Plaintiffs herein began developing holes in their ceilings and walls, apparently caused by water leaks. Defendants did not fix the holes for months. The ceiling in Plaintiff McWhorter's living room ultimately collapsed as a result of the water leaks, and he was forced to move to another apartment in the complex.
- 35. When Defendants finally fixed the holes in the ceiling of the apartment occupied by Plaintiffs Scannell and Willis, Defendants used incompetent contractors (selected and supervised by Defendant Walls) whose work was so substandard that

9

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

25

24

26 27

28

the new ceiling in their kitchen actually collapsed after it was installed. Hazardous mold then began appearing in the apartment as a result of the water leaks.

- 36. Next, rats appeared in the walls and ceilings of Plaintiffs' apartments. Defendants refused to exterminate the pests, and nonchalantly stated they are "just roof rats." One of the rats died, and the stench of decay and maggot flies began invading the home of Plaintiffs Scannell and Willis. Defendants did nothing, and the smell and flies only went away when the process of decomposition had run its course.
- 37. Then a sewage backup occurred in a pipe leading from the apartment leased by Plaintiffs Scannell and Willis. Defendants' "solution" to this problem was to break away the wall covering the pipe, remove the cap, and leave the uncapped sewer pipe open to the elements. Not surprisingly, when the pipe clogged again, this time water contaminated with *urine and untreated fecal matter* began gushing into Plaintiff's backyard. When Plaintiffs Scannell and Willis complained, Defendants initially claimed that the problem was caused by "tree roots." Defendants' agents then inspected the open pipe a second time and, rather than repairing it, simply placed a brick on top of it and poured gravel over the brick.
- 38. That was the last straw for Plaintiffs Scannell and Willis. They called the City of Los Angeles, which demanded that Defendants repair the pipe within 24 hours. At that point, Messers. Scannell and Willis- having endured rats, maggots, hazardous mold, holes in the walls, a collapsed ceiling in the kitchen, and untreated sewage in the backyard – finally realized that Defendants were never going to comply with the warranty of habitability or the covenant of quiet enjoyment, and they and vacated the apartment.
- 39. Plaintiff McWhorter also became fed up with the deteriorating conditions and vacated his apartment.
- 40. In some instances, Defendants' wrongdoing went beyond mere neglect – Defendants began actively provoking long-term residents in an attempt to drive them out of their rent-controlled apartments. For example, after Defendant Walls Property

Management began managing the complex, Defendants hired contractors to rip out the complex's pleasant and well-tended communal gardens and shrubs and pave them over to provide additional parking for AirBNB renters. Defendants then moved the complex's trash dumpster from its old location to a new one, which was located directly outside the front door of the apartment occupied by one of the complex's most long-term tenants. Sometimes Defendants would not pay the bill and the dumpster would not be emptied for two to three weeks. As a result, the noxious odor of rotting garbage would suffuse the long-term tenant's apartment.

- 41. Defendants' plan to violate the rent control laws succeeded, because as soon as Plaintiffs vacated their rent-controlled apartments, Defendants converted them into AirBNB rentals.
- 42. Upon information and belief, Defendant Jason Vogel has engaged in a pattern of similar conduct in order to illegally convert other rent-controlled Los Angeles apartments that he owns to unlicensed AirBNB hotels, including but not limited to:
  - (a.) 2076 N. Commonwealth Avenue;
  - (b.) 1005 N. Serrano; and
  - (c.) 1511 N. Hoover.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

### **BREACH OF CONTRACT**

## (By All Plaintiffs Against Defendants BAP and Vogel)

- 43. Paragraphs 1 through 42 are hereby incorporated by reference.
- 44. Plaintiffs and Defendant BAP entered into a written lease, the material terms of which required Plaintiffs to pay rent, and required Defendant BAP to permit Plaintiffs to occupy residential apartments in a residential apartment complex owned by BAP, and to maintain those units.
- 45. Plaintiffs did all, or substantially all, of the significant things that the contract required them to do, or were excused from doing those things.

- 46. All conditions required by the contract for Defendant BAP's performance have occurred.
- 47. Defendant BAP breached the lease by failing to maintain the apartments, and by failing to to deliver apartments in a residential apartment complex to Plaintiffs; instead, BAP delivered apartments in an unlicensed hotel to Plaintiffs. The latter breach was contrary to Plaintiff's reasonable expectations, because the guests in the hotel did not behave like apartment dwellers; they behaved like transient, short-term occupants seeking a hedonistic Hollywood vacation as alleged in ¶ 26, *supra*.
- 48. Plaintiffs were harmed by Defendant's breach and suffered damages in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.
- 49. As Defendants BAP and Vogel are *alter <u>egos</u>* of one another, Defendant Vogel is liable for BAP's breach.

## **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

# BREACH OF THE IMPLIED COVENANT OF QUIET ENJOYMENT (By All Plaintiffs Against Defendants BAP and Vogel)

- 50. Paragraphs 1 through 49 are hereby incorporated by reference.
- 51. Plaintiffs and Defendant BAP entered into a written lease, the material terms of which required Plaintiffs to pay rent, and required Defendant BAP to permit Plaintiffs to occupy residential apartments in a residential apartment complex owned by BAP, and to maintain those units.
- 52. Plaintiffs did all, or substantially all, of the significant things that the contract required them to do, or were excused from doing those things.
- 53. All conditions required by the contract for Defendant BAP's performance have occurred.
- 54. An implicit term of the lease between BAP and Plaintiffs was that BAP would not do, or permit, anything to disturb Plaintiffs' rights to quiet enjoyment of their apartments.

- 55. Defendants breached that warranty for the reasons stated in ¶¶ 26-39, supra.
- 56. Plaintiffs were harmed by Defendant's breach and suffered damages in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.
- 57. As Defendants BAP and Vogel are *alter* <u>egos</u> of one another, Defendant Vogel is liable for BAP's breach.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

## BREACH OF THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF HABITABILITY (By All Plaintiffs Against Defendants BAP and Vogel)

- 58. Paragraphs 1 through 57 are hereby incorporated by reference.
- 59. Plaintiffs and Defendant BAP entered into a written lease, the material terms of which required Plaintiffs to pay rent, and required Defendant BAP to permit Plaintiffs to occupy residential apartments in a residential apartment complex owned by BAP, and to maintain those units.
- 60. Plaintiffs did all, or substantially all, of the significant things that the contract required them to do, or were excused from doing those things.
- 61. All conditions required by the contract for Defendant BAP's performance have occurred.
- 62. An implicit term of the lease between BAP and Plaintiffs was that BAP must put Plaintiffs' apartments into a condition fit for occupation, and repair all subsequent dilapidations thereof, which render it untenantable.
- 63. In violation of Civil Code § 1941.1, Defendants breached that warranty by failing to deliver apartments that were (1) effectively waterproofed; (2) connected to an adequate sewage system; and clean, sanitary, and free from all accumulations of debris, filth, rubbish, garbage, rodents, and vermin; (2) for the reasons stated in ¶¶ 26-39, *supra*.
- 64. Plaintiffs were harmed by Defendants' breach and suffered damages in amount to be proven at the time of trial.

	1	
1	86.	Defendants' negligence was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs
2	harm.	
3		SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
4		CONSTRUCTIVE EVICTION
5		(By All Plaintiffs Against Defendants BAP and Vogel)
6	87.	Paragraphs 1 to 86 set forth above are hereby incorporated by reference.
7	88.	At all times pertinent hereto, Plaintiffs had the right to peaceably possess
8	their apartm	ents.
9	89.	Defendants' acts and omissions interfered with Plaintiffs' right to
10	possession	for the reasons stated in ¶¶ 26-39, <i>supra</i> .
11	90.	As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' acts and omissions
12	Plaintiffs we	re forced to vacate their apartments and surrender possession thereof.
13		EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION
14		UNFAIR COMPETITION - BUS. & PROF. C. § 17200
15		(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants)
16	91.	Paragraphs 1 to 90 set forth above are hereby incorporated by reference.
17	92.	The acts and omissions of Defendants were unlawful, unfair and
18	fraudulent fo	or the reasons described above.
19	93.	Plaintiffs suffered actual injury to their business and property as a result
20	of Defendan	ts' acts and omissions.
21		PRAYER FOR RELIEF
22	WHE	REFORE Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court grant him the
23	following rel	ief:
24	On the First	Cause of Action
25	1.	Actual damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
26	On the Seco	ond Cause of Action
27	1.	Actual damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
28	<i>  </i>	
		40

1	On the Third	d Cause of Action
2	1.	Actual damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
3	On the Four	th Cause of Action
4	1.	Actual damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
5	On the Fifth	Cause of Action
6	1.	Actual damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial; and
7	2.	Punitive damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
8	On the Sixth	Cause of Action
9	1.	Actual damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
10	On the Seve	enth Cause of Action
11	1.	Actual damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial; and
12	2.	Punitive damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
13	On the Eigh	th Cause of Action
14	1.	Restitution in an amount according to proof at the time of trial; and
15	2.	An injunction prohibiting Defendants from offering residential apartments
16		for rent as as unlicensed, unpermitted hotel rooms.
17	<i>  </i>	
18	<i>  </i>	
19	<i>   </i>	
20	<i>   </i>	
21	<i>   </i>	
22	///	
23	<i>  </i>	
24	///	
25	///	
26	///	
27	<i>  </i>	
28	///	
	1	1.1

1	On All Caus	es of Action		
2	1.	Prejudgment interest.		
3	2.	Cost of this action;		
4	3.	Reasonable attorneys' fee	s purs	uant to Civil Code § 1942.4(b)(2) and the
5		lease; and		
6	4.	Such other and further reli	ef as tl	his Court may deem just and proper.
7				Doon outfully, outputted
8	Detect: lass	ion/10, 2016		Respectfully submitted,
9	Dated: Jant	uary 19, 2016		MATTHEW E. HESS ATTORNEY AT LAW
10				Muto 6 7
11			Ву:	2 1000
12				Matthew E. Hess, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiffs BRANDON MCWHORTER, DANIEL SCANNELL, COPPER WILLIS and SAM NEIRA
13				COPPER WILLIS and SAM NEIRA
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul>				
25				
26				
27				
28				
			45	
			15	

COMPLAINT

## SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

BRONSON AVENUE PROPERTIES, LLC, a California limited liability company; JASON VOGEL, an individual;

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: Part. 45 After of (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

BRANDON MCWHORTER, an individual; DANIEL SCANNELL, an individual; COPPER WILLIS, an individual; SAM NEIRA, an individual

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Gauge Of California
County Of Los Aproles

JAN 19 2016

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk By: Kristina Vargas, Deputy

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the Callfornia Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form, if you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpoalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be pald before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 dias, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una ilamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamer a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotes y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Superior Court of Los Angeles County Stanley Mosk Courthouse, 111 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90012

CASE NUMBER: (Número del Caso): BC 6 0 7 4 8 0

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Matthew E. Hess, Esq., 1801 Century Park East, 24th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90067, Tel. (310) 751-7544

DATE: (Fecha)	SHERRI R. CARTER	Clerk, by (Secretario)	Kristina Vargas , Deputy (Adjunto)
		rio Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-01	0)).
(SEAL)	1. as an individu	SON SERVED: You are served all defendant. is sued under the fictitious name of (specify)	) <i>:</i>
JAN 1920	3. On behalf of (s	specify):	
	CCP.	416.10 (corporation) 416.20 (defunct corporation) 416.40 (association or partnership)	CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.70 (conservatee) CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
	<u> </u>	(specify): lelivery on (date):	Page 1 of

	SUM-200(A)
SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:
MCWHORTER v. BRONSON AVENUE PROPERTIES, LLC	
INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE	
<ul> <li>This form may be used as an attachment to any summons if space does not pern</li> <li>If this attachment is used, insert the following statement in the plaintiff or defenda Attachment form is attached."</li> </ul>	
List additional parties (Check only one box. Use a separate page for each type of	party.):
Plaintiff  Defendant  Cross-Complainant  Cross-E	efendant
JAMES JOHN WALLS, individually and d/b/a WALLS PROPERTY through 25, inclusive	MANAGEMENT; and DOES 1

Page 1 of 1

			CM-010
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Beer Matthew E. Hess, Esq. (State Bar No. 2147) MATTHEW E. HESS, ATTORNEY AT L. 1801 Century Park East, 24th Floor, Los An	W U	CO	PROCURT USE ONLY ONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED
TELEPHONE NO.: (310) 751-7544 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs Brandon Mo		S	ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court Of California County Of Los Anneles
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LC	3 ANGELES		JAN 19 2016
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles 90012 BRANCH NAME: Central District - Stan	lev Mosk Courthouse		Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk : Kristina Vargas, Deputy
CASE NAME: MCWHORTER V. BRONSON AVE	- ye galanin a sana	H-0-A-11101011111	·
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER C	607480
✓ Unlimited Limited (Amount	Counter Joinder		3 4 1 K 4 A
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defend (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3,402)	DEPT:	
	ow must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).	
1. Check one box below for the case type that  Auto Tort  Auto (22)	Contract  Breach of contract/warranty (06)	Provisionally Complex (Cal. Rules of Court, ru	
Unineured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade re	
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)	Construction defe	ect (10)
Asbestos (04)	Insurance coverage (18) Other contract (37)	Securities litigation	on (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/To	
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse	Insurance covera	age claims arising from the
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed prov types (41)	risionally complex case
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	Enforcement of Judgn	
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of ju	<b>1</b>
Civil rights (08)	Commercial (31)		- T . T .
Defamation (13) Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	Miscellaneous Civil Co	ompiaint
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	RICO (27)	(not specified above) (42)
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	'	
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05).	Miscellaneous Civil Pe	****
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	<del></del>	corporate governance (21) of specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	Caron permon ins	a specified allevel (40)
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)		
factors requiring exceptional judicial manag			ise is complex, mark the
a. Large number of separately repres	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	r of witnesses	
b Extensive motion practice raising of			ending in one or more courts
issues that will be time-consuming	şann-n-mış		es, or in a federal court
c. Substantial amount of documentar	y evidence i. La Substantial p	ostjudgment judicial s	upervision
<ol> <li>Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.</li> <li>Number of causes of action (specify): 9 -</li> </ol>			ve relief c. punitive of Quiet Enjoyment, etc
<ul><li>5. This case is is is not a clas</li><li>6. If there are any known related cases, file a</li></ul>	s action suit.	navues form CM 046	q.)
Date: January 19, 2016	tra serve a manoc or related edge, (1) or i	nay use form our-bic	<i>i</i>
Matthew E. Hess, Esq.		Muth &	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		IGNATURE OF PARTY OR AT	TORNEY FOR PARTY)
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the fi under the Probate Code, Family Code, or V in sanctions.     File this cover sheet in addition to any cover	Velfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rul	g (except small claim es of Court, rule 3 220	s cases or cases filed 0.) Fallure to file may result
<ul> <li>If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et so other parties to the action or proceeding.</li> <li>Unless this is a collections case under rule</li> </ul>	seq. of the California Rules of Court, you		

#### INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action, To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

#### **Auto Tort**

}.

Auto (22)-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wrongful Death)

Asbestos (04)

Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death

Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24)

Medical Malpractice (45)

Medical Malpractice-Physicians & Surgeons

Other Professional Health Care Malpractice

Other PI/PD/WD (23) Premises Liability (e.g., slip

and fall)

Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD

(e.g., assault, vandalism) Intentional Infliction of **Emotional Distress** 

Negligent Infliction of

**Emotional Distress** 

Other PI/PD/WD

#### Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

**Business Tort/Unfair Business** Practice (07)

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

false arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)

Fraud (16)

Intellectual Property (19)

Professional Negligence (25)

Legal Malpractice

Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)
Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

**Employment** 

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

#### **CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES**

Contract Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)

Breach of Rental/Lease

Contract (not unlawful detainer

or wrongful eviction) Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller

Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)

Negligent Breach of Contract/

Warranty

Other Breach of Contract/Warranty

Collections (e.g., money owed, open

book accounts) (09)

Collection Case-Seller Plaintiff

Other Promissory Note/Collections

Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

complex) (18)

Auto Subrogation

Other Coverage

Other Contract (37)

Contractual Fraud

Other Contract Dispute

#### **Real Property**

Eminent Domain/Inverse

Condemnation (14)

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26) Writ of Possession of Real Property

Mortgage Foreclosure

Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent

domain, landlord/tenant, or

#### foreclosure) Unlawful Detainer

Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal

drugs, check this item; otherwise,

report as Commercial or Residential)

## Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Writ of Mandate (02)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus

Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Case Matter

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)

Review of Health Officer Order

Notice of Appeal-Labor

Commissioner Appeals

#### Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3,400-3,403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)

Construction Defect (10)

Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)

Securities Litigation (28)

Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)

Insurance Coverage Claims

(arising from provisionally complex

case type listed above) (41)

#### **Enforcement of Judgment**

Enforcement of Judgment (20)

Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)

Confession of Judgment (non-

domestic relations)

Sister State Judgment Administrative Agency Award

(not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of

Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

#### Miscellaneous Civil Compfaint

RICO (27)

Other Complaint (not specified

above) (42)
Declaratory Relief Only
Injunctive Relief Only (non-

harassment)

Mechanics Lien

Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)

Other Civil Complaint

(non-tort/non-complex)

#### Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate

Governance (21) Other Petition (not specified

above) (43) Civil Harassment

Workplace Violence

Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse

**Election Contest** 

Petition for Name Change

Petition for Relief From Late

Claim

Other Civil Petition

## **CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND** STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.	
Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:  JURY TRIAL? YES CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 3 HOURS! ADDITIONAL 1 DATE:	YYS
Item II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg.	4):
<b>Step 1:</b> After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column <b>A</b> , the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.	
Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case.	
<b>Step 3:</b> In Column <b>C</b> , circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0.	
Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)	
<ol> <li>Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district.</li> <li>May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).</li> <li>Location where cause of action arose.</li> <li>Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.</li> <li>Location where performance required or defendant resides.</li> <li>Location where one or more of the parties reside.</li> <li>Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.</li> <li>Location where petitioner resides.</li> <li>Location where in defendant/respondent functions wholly.</li> <li>Location where one or more of the parties reside.</li> <li>Location of Labor Commissioner Office</li> </ol>	

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	<b>B</b> Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
t 보	Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Auto Tort	Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1. 2. 4.
وا بر ا	Asbestos (04)	□ A6070 Asbestos Property Darnage □ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	[2.] 2.
Proper ath To	Product Liability (24)	☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
ial Injury/   ongfu! De	Medical Malpractice (45)	□ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons □ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	□ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) □ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) □ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress □ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

MCWHORTER v. BRONSON AVENUE PROPERTIES LLC

CASE NUMBER

Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

Employment

Contract

Real Property

Unlawful Detainer

		year and trains the many decrease and
A Clyll Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1.,3.
Civil Rights (98)	□ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1, 2, 3,
Defamation (13)	☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1,, 2,, 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice ☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
Other (35)	☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	☐ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (96) (not insurance)	☐ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)  ☐ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence)  ☐ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud)  ☐ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2.6. 2.75. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	☐ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
Insurance Coverage (18)	A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Other Contract (37)	☐ A6009 Contractual Fraud ☐ A6031 Tortious Interference ☐ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Other Real Property (26)	☐ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure ☐ A6032 Quiet Title ☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2:, 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	☐ A6020FUnlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

	Α			В	_
	Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.			Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forfeiture (05)		A6108	Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
íew	Petition re Arbitration (11)	Ċ	A6115	Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review			A6151	Writ - Administrative Mandamus	2., 8.
dici	Writ of Mandate (02)		A6152	Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter	2.
3			A6153	Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2.
;	Other Judicial Review (39)		A6150	Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
ion	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)		A6003	Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
Litigat	Construction Defect (10)		A6007	Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	0	A6006	Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
Illy Co	Securities Litigation (28)		A6035	Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
risiona	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)		A6036	Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Pro	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)		A6014	Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
			A6141	Sister State Judgment	2., 9.
# #			A6160	Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.
me	Enforcement		A6107	Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2., 9.
Enforcement of Judgment	of Judgment (20)	_	A6140	Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2., 8.
enf of .				Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2., 8.
				Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8., 9.
	PICO (27)		A GO22	Podvetening (PICO) Cons	
us ints	RICO (27)		A0033	Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints			A6030	Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.
College	Other Complaints		A6040	Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.
Misc	(Not Specified Above) (42)		A6011	Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
- 3			A6000	Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)		A6113	Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
			A6121	Civil Harassment	2., 3., 9.
sno			A6123	Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9.
lane etiti	Other Data -		A6124	Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above)		A6190	Election Contest	2.
<b>≅</b> ♡	(43)		A6110	Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.
			A6170	Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 4., 8.
			A6100	Other Civil Petition	2., 9.
Ī			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

MOWHORT	ER V. BRUNSUN AVEN	IUE PHOPE	HIESTLC			
	ocation: Enter the addre d in Item II., Step 3 on					
under Column C for the this case.	propriate boxes for the number of action that you have	selected for	ADDRESS: 1527 N. Bronson Ave	eriue		and the second s
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:				
Los Angeles	CA	90012				
	ssignment: I declare unde e above-entitled matter is _District of the Superior C and (d)].	s properly file	ed for assignment to	the Stanley M	osk courtho	use in the
Dated: January 19, 2	2016		· KSK	MWH SNATURE OF ATTORNE	2 EVIFLING PARTYI	

CASE NUMBER

## PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- 4. Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- 6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.

## SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES NOTICE OF CASE ASSIGNMENT - UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (NON-CLASS ACTION)

Case Number

BC 6 0 7 4 8 0

## THIS FORM IS TO BE SERVED WITH THE SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

Your case is assigned for all purposes to the judge indicated below. There is more information on the reverse side of this form.

ASSIGNED JUDGE	DEPT	ROOM	ASSIGNED JUDGE	D
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile	1	534	Hon, Elizabeth Allen White	48
Hon, Barbara A. Meiers	12	636	Hon. Deirdre Hill	49
Hon. Terry A. Green	14	300	Hon. Teresa A. Beaudet	50
Hon. Richard Fruin	15	307	Hon, Michael J. Raphael	51
Hon. Rita Miller	16	306	Hon. Susan Bryant-Deason	52
Hon. Richard E. Rico	17	309	Hon. Steven J. Kleifield	53
Hon. Stephanie Bowick	19	311	Hon. Ernest M. Hiroshige	54
Hon, Dalila Corral Lyons	20	310	Hon. Malcolm H. Mackey	55
Hon. Robert L. Hess	24	314	Hon. Michael Johnson	56
Hon. Yvette M. Palazuelos	28	318	Hon. Rolf M. Treu	58
Hon. Barbara Scheper	30	400	Hon, Gregory Keosian	(61)
Hon. Samantha Jessner	31	407	Hon. Michael L. Stern	62
Hon. Daniel S. Murphy	32	406	Hon, Mark Mooney	68
Hon. Michael P. Linfield	34	408	Hon, William F. Fahey	69
Hon. Gregory Alarcon	36	410	Hon, Suzanne G, Bruguera	· 71
Hon. Marc Marmaro	37	413	Hon. Ruth Ann Kwan	72
Hon. Maureen Duffy-Lewis	38	412	Hon. Rafael Ongkeko	73
Hon. Elizabeth Feffer	39	415	Hon. Teresa Sanchez-Gordon	74
Hon. Michelle R. Rosenblatt	40	414	Hon. Gail Ruderman Feuer	78
Hon. Holly E. Kendig	42	416		
Hon. Mel Red Recana	45	529	Hon. Emile H. Elias	324
Hon, Frederick C. Shaller	46	500	*Provisionally Complex Non-class Action Cases	
Hon. Debre K. Weintraub	47	507	Assignment is Pending Complex Determination	324

#### \*Complex

All non-class action cases designated as provisionally complex are forwarded to the Supervising Judge of the Complex Litigation Program located in the Central Civil West Courthouse (600 S. Commonwealth Ave., Los Angeles 90005), for complex/non-complex determination pursuant to Local Rule 3.3(k). This procedure is for the purpose of assessing whether or not the case is complex within the meaning of California Rules of Court, rule 3.400. Depending on the outcome of that assessment, the case may be reassigned to one of the judges of the Complex Litigation Program or reassigned randomly to a court in the Central District.

Given to the Plaintiff/Cross-Complainant/Attorney of Record on	AN 1 9 2016	SHERRI R. CARTER, Executi Kristina Vargas	ve Officer/Clerk
		Ву	_, Deputy Cleri

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR HANDLING UNLIMITED CIVIL CASES

The following critical provisions of the Chapter Three Rules, as applicable in the Central District, are summarized for your assistance.

#### **APPLICATION**

The Chapter Three Rules were effective January 1, 1994. They apply to all general civil cases.

#### PRIORITY OVER OTHER RULES

The Chapter Three Rules shall have priority over all other Local Rules to the extent the others are inconsistent.

#### **CHALLENGE TO ASSIGNED JUDGE**

A challenge under Code of Civil Procedure section 170.6 must be made within 15 days after notice of assignment for all purposes to a judge, or if a party has not yet appeared, within 15 days of the first appearance.

#### TIME STANDARDS

Cases assigned to the Individual Calendaring Court will be subject to processing under the following time standards:

COMPLAINTS: All complaints shall be served within 60 days of filing and proof of service shall be filed within 90 days of filing.

**CROSS-COMPLAINTS:** Without leave of court first being obtained, no cross-complaint may be filed by any party after their answer is filed. Cross-complaints shall be served within 30 days of the filing date and a proof of service filed within 60 days of the filing date.

A Status Conference will be scheduled by the assigned Independent Calendar Judge no later than 270 days after the filing of the complaint. Counsel must be fully prepared to discuss the following issues: alternative dispute resolution, bifurcation, settlement, trial date, and expert witnesses.

## FINAL STATUS CONFERENCE

The Court will require the parties at a status conference not more than 10 days before the trial to have timely filed and served all motions in limine, bifurcation motions, statements of major evidentiary issues, dispositive motions, requested jury instructions, and special jury instructions and special jury verdicts. These matters may be heard and resolved at this conference. At least 5 days before this conference, counsel must also have exchanged lists of exhibits and witnesses and have submitted to the court a brief statement of the case to be read to the jury panel as required by Chapter Eight of the Los Angeles Superior Court Rules.

#### **SANCTIONS**

The court will impose appropriate sanctions for the failure or refusal to comply with Chapter Three Rules, orders made by the Court, and time standards or deadlines established by the Court or by the Chapter Three Rules. Such sanctions may be on a party or if appropriate on counsel for the party.

This is not a complete delineation of the Chapter Three Rules, and adherence only to the above provisions is therefore not a guarantee against the imposition of sanctions under Trial Court Delay Reduction. Careful reading and compliance with the actual Chapter Rules is absolutely imperative.

## **VOLUNTARY EFFICIENT LITIGATION STIPULATIONS**



Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles



Los Angeles County Bar Association Litigation Section

Los Angeles County Bar Association Labor and Employment Law Section



Consumer Attorneys
Association of Los Angeles



Southern California Defense Counsel





California Employment Lawyers Association

The Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation, Discovery Resolution Stipulation, and Motions in Limine Stipulation are voluntary stipulations entered into by the parties. The parties may enter into one, two, or all three of the stipulations; however, they may not alter the stipulations as written, because the Court wants to ensure uniformity of application. These stipulations are meant to encourage cooperation between the parties and to assist in resolving issues in a manner that promotes economic case resolution and judicial efficiency.

The following organizations endorse the goal of promoting efficiency in litigation and ask that counsel consider using these stipulations as a voluntary way to promote communications and procedures among counsel and with the court to fairly resolve issues in their cases.

- **♦**Los Angeles County Bar Association Litigation Section**♦** 
  - **♦** Los Angeles County Bar Association Labor and Employment Law Section **♦**
  - **♦**Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles**♦** 
    - ♦ Southern California Defense Counsel ♦
    - ◆Association of Business Trial Lawyers ◆
  - **♦**California Employment Lawyers Association **♦**

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT AT	TORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clark's File Stamp
1			
TELEPHONE NO.:	FAX NO. (Op	otional):	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):			
SUPERIOR COURT OF CA	ALIFORNIA, COU	NTY OF LOS ANGELES	
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:	1211 011111111, 0001	11: 0: 2007022220	
PLAINTIFF:			
	1.4.00001		
DEFENDANT:			
			CASE NUMBER:
STIPULATION	- DISCOVERY RI	ESOLUTION	CASE NUMBER.
	=:0== <b>/m</b> (() ()		

This stipulation is intended to provide a fast and informal resolution of discovery issues through limited paperwork and an informal conference with the Court to aid in the resolution of the issues.

## The parties agree that:

- 1. Prior to the discovery cut-off in this action, no discovery motion shall be filed or heard unless the moving party first makes a written request for an Informal Discovery Conference pursuant to the terms of this stipulation.
- 2. At the Informal Discovery Conference the Court will consider the dispute presented by parties and determine whether it can be resolved informally. Nothing set forth herein will preclude a party from making a record at the conclusion of an Informal Discovery Conference, either orally or in writing.
- 3. Following a reasonable and good faith attempt at an informal resolution of each issue to be presented, a party may request an Informal Discovery Conference pursuant to the following procedures:
  - a. The party requesting the Informal Discovery Conference will:
    - File a Request for Informal Discovery Conference with the clerk's office on the approved form (copy attached) and deliver a courtesy, conformed copy to the assigned department;
    - ii. Include a brief summary of the dispute and specify the relief requested; and
    - iii. Serve the opposing party pursuant to any authorized or agreed method of service that ensures that the opposing party receives the Request for Informal Discovery Conference no later than the next court day following the filing.
  - b. Any Answer to a Request for Informal Discovery Conference must:
    - i. Also be filed on the approved form (copy attached);
    - ii. Include a brief summary of why the requested relief should be denied;

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:

- iii. Be filed within two (2) court days of receipt of the Request; and
- iv. Be served on the opposing party pursuant to any authorized or agreed upon method of service that ensures that the opposing party receives the Answer no later than the next court day following the filing.
- c. No other pleadings, including but not limited to exhibits, declarations, or attachments, will be accepted.
- d. If the Court has not granted or denied the Request for Informal Discovery Conference within ten (10) days following the filing of the Request, then it shall be deemed to have been denied. If the Court acts on the Request, the parties will be notified whether the Request for Informal Discovery Conference has been granted or denied and, if granted, the date and time of the Informal Discovery Conference, which must be within twenty (20) days of the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference.
- e. If the conference is not held within twenty (20) days of the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference, unless extended by agreement of the parties and the Court, then the Request for the Informal Discovery Conference shall be deemed to have been denied at that time.
- 4. If (a) the Court has denied a conference or (b) one of the time deadlines above has expired without the Court having acted or (c) the Informal Discovery Conference is concluded without resolving the dispute, then a party may file a discovery motion to address unresolved issues.
- 5. The parties hereby further agree that the time for making a motion to compel or other discovery motion is tolled from the date of filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference until (a) the request is denied or deemed denied or (b) twenty (20) days after the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference, whichever is earlier, unless extended by Order of the Court.
  - It is the understanding and intent of the parties that this stipulation shall, for each discovery dispute to which it applies, constitute a writing memorializing a "specific later date to which the propounding [or demanding or requesting] party and the responding party have agreed in writing," within the meaning of Code Civil Procedure sections 2030.300(c), 2031.320(c), and 2033.290(c).
- 6. Nothing herein will preclude any party from applying *ex parte* for appropriate relief, including an order shortening time for a motion to be heard concerning discovery.
- 7. Any party may terminate this stipulation by giving twenty-one (21) days notice of intent to terminate the stipulation.
- 8. References to "days" mean calendar days, unless otherwise noted. If the date for performing any act pursuant to this stipulation falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Court holiday, then the time for performing that act shall be extended to the next Court day.

SHORT TITLE:			CASE NUMBER:	
The folio	owing parties stipulate:			
Date:				
		>		
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)	
Date.		>		
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	*****	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)	
Date.		>		
D-t-:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)	
Date:		>		
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	·	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)	
Date:				
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR	<u> </u>
Date:			<del></del>	
		>		
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR	ט
		<b>&gt;</b>		

(ATTORNEY FOR \_\_\_

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
	FAX NO. (Optional):	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA	A, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		
PLAINTIFF:		-
DEFENDANT:		
		CASE NUMBER:
STIPULATION – EARLY ORGA	ANIZATIONAL MEETING	

This stipulation is intended to encourage cooperation among the parties at an early stage in the litigation and to assist the parties in efficient case resolution.

#### The parties agree that:

- The parties commit to conduct an initial conference (in-person or via teleconference or via videoconference) within 15 days from the date this stipulation is signed, to discuss and consider whether there can be agreement on the following:
  - a. Are motions to challenge the pleadings necessary? If the issue can be resolved by amendment as of right, or if the Court would allow leave to amend, could an amended complaint resolve most or all of the issues a demurrer might otherwise raise? If so, the parties agree to work through pleading issues so that a demurrer need only raise issues they cannot resolve. Is the issue that the defendant seeks to raise amenable to resolution on demurrer, or would some other type of motion be preferable? Could a voluntary targeted exchange of documents or information by any party cure an uncertainty in the pleadings?
  - b. Initial mutual exchanges of documents at the "core" of the litigation. (For example, in an employment case, the employment records, personnel file and documents relating to the conduct in question could be considered "core." In a personal injury case, an incident or police report, medical records, and repair or maintenance records could be considered "core.");
  - c. Exchange of names and contact information of witnesses;
  - d. Any insurance agreement that may be available to satisfy part or all of a judgment, or to indemnify or reimburse for payments made to satisfy a judgment;
  - e. Exchange of any other information that might be helpful to facilitate understanding, handling, or resolution of the case in a manner that preserves objections or privileges by agreement;
  - f. Controlling issues of law that, if resolved early, will promote efficiency and economy in other phases of the case. Also, when and how such issues can be presented to the Court;
  - g. Whether or when the case should be scheduled with a settlement officer, what discovery or court ruling on legal issues is reasonably required to make settlement discussions meaningful, and whether the parties wish to use a sitting judge or a private mediator or other options as

SHORT TITL	i:	CASE NUMBER:	
	discussed in the "Alternative Dispute Resolutio complaint;	n (ADR) Information Package" served with the	
h.	Computation of damages, including documents which such computation is based;	, not privileged or protected from disclosure, on	
i.	Whether the case is suitable for the Expedit www.lacourt.org under "Civil" and then under		
2.	The time for a defending party to respond to a to for the complaint, a	complaint or cross-complaint will be extended and for the cross-	
	complaint, which is comprised of the 30 days to and the 30 days permitted by Code of Civil P been found by the Civil Supervising Judge due this Stipulation. A copy of the General Order of click on "General Information", then click on "Vo	o respond under Government Code § 68616(b), Procedure section 1054(a), good cause having to the case management benefits provided by can be found at <a href="www.lacourt.org">www.lacourt.org</a> under "Civil",	
3.	The parties will prepare a joint report titled "Joint Status Report Pursuant to Initial Conference and Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation, and if desired, a proposed order summarizing results of their meet and confer and advising the Court of any way it may assist the parties' efficient conduct or resolution of the case. The parties shall attach the Joint Status Report to the Case Management Conference statement, and file the documents when the CMC statement is due.		
4.	References to "days" mean calendar days, unless otherwise noted. If the date for performing any act pursuant to this stipulation falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Court holiday, then the time for performing that act shall be extended to the next Court day		
The fo	llowing parties stipulate:		
Date:		>	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)	
Date;	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR)	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR)	
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(ATTORNEY FOR)	

NAME AND AD	DRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
E-MAIL A	TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO. (Op DDRESS (Optional):	itional);	·
	RIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COU	ATY OF LOS ANGELES	
COURTHO	USE ADDRESS:	TITOT LOO ANGLELO	
PLAINTIFF			
DEFENDA	NT:		
	INFORMAL DISCOVERY CON	FERENCE	CASE NUMBER:
	(pursuant to the Discovery Resolution Stipula		
1.	This document relates to:		
	Request for Informal Discovery Answer to Request for Informal		
2.	Deadline for Court to decide on Request:	-	te 10 calendar days following filing of
3.	the Request).  Deadline for Court to hold Informal Discov	very Conference:	(insert date 20 calendar
	days following filing of the Request).	<del></del>	·
4.	4. For a Request for Informal Discovery Conference, <u>briefly</u> describe the nature of the discovery dispute, including the facts and legal arguments at issue. For an Answer to Request for Informal Discovery Conference, <u>briefly</u> describe why the Court should deny the requested discovery, including the facts and legal arguments at issue.		
			17
		•	
			1
			}

ı	ALAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	r	
	NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
	TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO. (Opt E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):	·	
l	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUN	ITY OF LOS ANCELES	
	COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:	ITT OF LOS ANGELES	
	PLAINTIFF:		
	DEFENDANT:		
	STIPULATION AND ORDER MOTIO	ONS IN LIMINE	CASE NUMBER:
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

This stipulation is intended to provide fast and informal resolution of evidentiary issues through diligent efforts to define and discuss such issues and limit paperwork.

## The parties agree that:

- 1. At least \_\_\_\_\_ days before the final status conference, each party will provide all other parties with a list containing a one paragraph explanation of each proposed motion in limine. Each one paragraph explanation must identify the substance of a single proposed motion in limine and the grounds for the proposed motion.
- 2. The parties thereafter will meet and confer, either in person or via teleconference or videoconference, concerning all proposed motions in limine. In that meet and confer, the parties will determine:
  - a. Whether the parties can stipulate to any of the proposed motions. If the parties so stipulate, they may file a stipulation and proposed order with the Court.
  - b. Whether any of the proposed motions can be briefed and submitted by means of a short joint statement of issues. For each motion which can be addressed by a short joint statement of issues, a short joint statement of issues must be filed with the Court 10 days prior to the final status conference. Each side's portion of the short joint statement of issues may not exceed three pages. The parties will meet and confer to agree on a date and manner for exchanging the parties' respective portions of the short joint statement of issues and the process for filing the short joint statement of issues.
- 3. All proposed motions in limine that are not either the subject of a stipulation or briefed via a short joint statement of issues will be briefed and filed in accordance with the California Rules of Court and the Los Angeles Superior Court Rules.

SHORT TITLE:			CASE NUMBER:
The fol	lowing parties stipulate:		
Date:			
		· <b>&gt;</b>	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)
		>	
Deter	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	´ -	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)
Date:		>	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	_	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)
Duto.		>	
Data	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	_	(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)
Date:			
		>_	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR)
		>	
Date:	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(ATTORNEY FOR)
		>	
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	_	(ATTORNEY FOR)
THE CO	OURT SO ORDERS.		
Date:			
			JUDICIAL OFFICER