



NMC 7/22/04 14:27
3:04-CV-01461 PINNOCK V. KIDS FURNITURE
1
CMP.

FILED
04 JUL 21 PM 4:06

PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD

A Professional Corporation
Michelle L. Wakefield, Esq.
David C. Wakefield, Esq.
3033 Fifth Ave., Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92103
Telephone: (619) 858-3671
Facsimile: (619) 858-3646

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT
Bar # 200424
Bar # 185736
DEPUTY

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

'04 CV 1461 J (RBB)
Case No.:

MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE, SUING
ON BEHALF OF THEODORE A.
PINNOCK AND ITS MEMBERS; and
THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An
Individual,
Plaintiffs,

CIVIL COMPLAINT:
DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN
PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS
[42 U.S.C. 12182(a) ET. SEQ;
CIVIL CODE 51, 52, 54, 54.1]

v.

NEGLIGENCE
[CIVIL CODE 1714(a), 2338,
3333; EVIDENCE CODE 669(a)]

KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET;
ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST;
ADELAIDE WOODWARD, TRUSTEE OF
THE ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST;
ADELAIDE WOODWARD; And DOES 1
THROUGH 10, Inclusive
Defendants.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
[F.R.Civ.P. rule 38(b);
Civ.L.R. 38.1]

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE SUING ON BEHALF OF THEODORE
A. PINNOCK AND ITS MEMBERS and THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual,
herein complain, by filing this Civil Complaint in accordance with
rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in the Judicial
District of the United States District Court of the Southern
District of California, that Defendants have in the past, and
presently are, engaging in discriminatory practices against

1 individuals with disabilities, specifically including minorities
2 with disabilities. Plaintiffs allege this civil action and others
3 substantial similar thereto are necessary to compel access
4 compliance because empirical research on the effectiveness of
5 Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act indicates this
6 Title has failed to achieve full and equal access simply by the
7 executive branch of the Federal Government funding and promoting
8 voluntary compliance efforts. Further, empirical research shows
9 when individuals with disabilities give actual notice of potential
10 access problems to places of public accommodation without a
11 federal civil rights action, the public accommodations do not
12 remove the access barriers. Therefore, Plaintiffs make the
13 following allegations in this federal civil rights action:

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 1. The federal jurisdiction of this action is based on the
16 Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 United States Code 12101-
17 12102, 12181-12183 and 12201, et seq. Venue in the Judicial
18 District of the United States District Court of the Southern
19 District of California is in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)
20 because a substantial part of Plaintiffs' claims arose within the
21 Judicial District of the United States District Court of the
22 Southern District of California.

23 **SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION**

24 2. The Judicial District of the United States District Court of
25 the Southern District of California has supplemental jurisdiction
26 over the state claims as alleged in this Complaint pursuant to 28
27 U.S.C. § 1367(a). The reason supplemental jurisdiction is proper
28

1 in this action is because all the causes of action or claims
2 derived from federal law and those arising under state law, as
3 herein alleged, arose from common nucleus of operative facts. The
4 common nucleus of operative facts, include, but are not limited
5 to, the incidents where Plaintiff's Member Theodore A. Pinnock was
6 denied full and equal access to Defendants' facilities, goods,
7 and/or services in violation of both federal and state laws when
8 they attempted to enter, use, and/or exit Defendants' facilities
9 as described below within this Complaint. Further, due to this
10 denial of full and equal access, Theodore A. Pinnock and other
11 persons with disabilities were injured. Based upon the said
12 allegations, the state actions, as stated herein, are so related
13 to the federal actions that they form part of the same case or
14 controversy and the actions would ordinarily be expected to be
15 tried in one judicial proceeding.

16
17 **NAMED DEFENDANTS AND NAMED PLAINTIFFS**

18 3. Defendants are, and, at all times mentioned herein, were, a
19 business or corporation or franchise organized and existing and/or
20 doing business under the laws of the State of California.

21 Defendant KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET is located at 1502 Highland
22 Avenue, National City, California 91950. Plaintiffs are informed
23 and believe and thereon allege that Defendant ADELAIDE WOODWARD
24 TRUST is the owner, operator, and/or lessor of the property
25 located at 1502 Highland Avenue, National City, California 91950,
26 Assessor Parcel Number 560-131-30. Defendant ADELAIDE WOODWARD,
27 TRUSTEE OF THE ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST is located at 7115 Vista
28 Del Mar Avenue, National City, California 91950. The words

1 "Plaintiffs" and "Plaintiff's Member" as used herein specifically
2 include the organization MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE, its Members, its
3 member Theodore A. Pinnock and persons associated with its Members
4 who accompanied Members to Defendants' facilities, as well as
5 THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual.

6 4. Defendants Does 1 through 10, were at all times relevant
7 herein subsidiaries, employers, employees, agents, of KIDS
8 FURNITURE OUTLET; ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST; ADELAIDE WOODWARD,
9 TRUSTEE OF THE ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST; and ADELAIDE WOODWARD.

10 Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of
11 Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and
12 therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names.

13 Plaintiffs will pray leave of the court to amend this complaint to
14 allege the true names and capacities of the Does when ascertained.

15 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that
16 Defendants and each of them herein were, at all times relevant to
17 the action, the owner, lessor, lessee, franchiser, franchisee,
18 general partner, limited partner, agent, employee, representing
19 partner, or joint venturer of the remaining Defendants and were
20 acting within the course and scope of that relationship.

21 Plaintiffs are further informed and believe, and thereon allege,
22 that each of the Defendants herein gave consent to, ratified,
23 and/or authorized the acts alleged herein to each of the remaining
24 Defendants.

25 **CONCISE SET OF FACTS**

26 6. Plaintiff MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE is an organization that
27 advocates on the behalf of its members with disabilities when
28

1 their civil rights and liberties have been violated. Plaintiff's
2 member THEODORE A. PINNOCK is a member of Plaintiff Organization
3 and has an impairment in that he has Cerebral Palsy and due to
4 this impairment he has learned to successfully operate a
5 wheelchair.

6 7. On June 1, 2004, Plaintiff's member THEODORE A. PINNOCK went
7 to Defendants' KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET facilities to utilize their
8 goods and/or services. When Plaintiff's member patronized
9 Defendants' KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET facilities, he was unable to use
10 and/or had difficulty using the public accommodations' disabled
11 parking, exterior path of travel, entrance, and interior path of
12 travel facilities at Defendants' business establishment because
13 they failed to comply with ADA Access Guidelines For Buildings and
14 Facilities (hereafter referred to as "ADAAG") and/or California's
15 Title 24 Building Code Requirements. Defendants failed to remove
16 access barriers within the disabled parking, exterior path of
17 travel, entrance, and interior path of travel facilities of
18 Defendants' KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET establishment.

19 8. Plaintiff's member personally experienced difficulty with
20 said access barriers at Defendants' KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET
21 facilities. For example, the parking facility of Defendants'
22 establishment is inaccessible. The entryway into the parking lot
23 fails to have the required signage warning motorists that anyone
24 illegally parking in a disabled parking space would be towed/fined
25 or both. The parking facility has a total of twenty-one (21)
26 parking spaces, none of which are a disabled parking space. It is
27 required that there is at least One (1) "van accessible" disabled
28

1 parking space.

2 9. The exterior path of travel of the Defendants' establishment
3 is inaccessible. There fails to be a safe and accessible path of
4 travel from the parking lot to the primary accessible entrance, as
5 members of the disability community are forced to traverse through
6 vehicular traffic without the benefit of a marked path of travel.

7 10. The entrance to the Defendants establishment is inaccessible,
8 as the front entrance door fails to have the required disability
9 signage.

10 11. The interior path of travel is inaccessible, as the interior
11 path of travel is only twenty-one inches (21") wide. The interior
12 path of travel is required to be at least thirty-six (36") wide.

13 12. Pursuant to federal and state law, Defendants are required to
14 remove barriers to their existing facilities. Further, Defendants
15 had actual knowledge of their barrier removal duties under the
16 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Civil Code before January
17 26, 1992. Also, Defendants should have known that individuals
18 with disabilities are not required to give notice to a
19 governmental agency before filing suit alleging Defendants failed
20 to remove architectural barriers.

21 13. Plaintiffs believe and herein allege Defendants' facilities
22 have access violations not directly experienced by Plaintiff's
23 Member which preclude or limit access by others with disabilities,
24 including, but not limited to, Space Allowance and Reach Ranges,
25 Accessible Route, Protruding Objects, Ground and Floor Surfaces,
26 Parking and Passenger Loading Zones, Curb Ramps, Ramps, Stairs,
27 Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair Lifts), Windows, Doors,
28

1 Entrances, Drinking Fountains and Water Coolers, Water Closets,
 2 Toilet Stalls, Urinals, Lavatories and Mirrors, Sinks, Storage,
 3 Handrails, Grab Bars, and Controls and Operating Mechanisms,
 4 Alarms, Detectable Warnings, Signage, and Telephones. Accordingly,
 5 Plaintiffs allege Defendants are required to remove all
 6 architectural barriers, known or unknown. Also, Plaintiffs allege
 7 Defendants are required to utilize the ADA checklist for Readily
 8 Achievable Barrier Removal approved by the United States
 9 Department of Justice and created by Adaptive Environments.

10 14. Based on these facts, Plaintiffs allege Plaintiff's Member
 11 and Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock was discriminated against each
 12 time he patronized Defendants' establishments. Plaintiff's Member
 13 and Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock was extremely upset due to
 14 Defendants' conduct. Further, Plaintiff's Member and Plaintiff
 15 THEODORE A. PINNOCK experienced pain in his legs, back, arms,
 16 shoulders and wrists when he attempted to enter, use, and exit
 17 Defendants' KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET establishment.

18 **WHAT CLAIMS ARE PLAINTIFFS ALLEGING AGAINST EACH NAMED DEFENDANT**

19 15. KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET; ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST; ADELAIDE
 20 WOODWARD, TRUSTEE OF THE ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST; ADELAIDE
 21 WOODWARD; and Does 1 through 10 will be referred to collectively
 22 hereinafter as "Defendants."

23 16. Plaintiffs aver that the Defendants are liable for the
 24 following claims as alleged below:

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS- Claims Under The Americans With Disabilities Act Of 1990

CLAIM I AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Denial Of Full And Equal Access

17. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff's Member was denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations. Plaintiffs allege Defendants are a public accommodation owned, leased and/or operated by Defendants. Defendants' existing facilities and/or services failed to provide full and equal access to Defendants' facility as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Thus, Plaintiff's Member was subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b) (2) (A) (iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188 because Plaintiff's Member was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

18. Plaintiff's member Theodore A. Pinnock has physical impairments as alleged in ¶ 6 above because his conditions affect one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, and/or cardiovascular. Further, Plaintiff's member Theodore A. Pinnock's said physical impairments substantially limits one or more of the following major life activities: walking. In addition, Plaintiff's member Theodore A. Pinnock cannot perform one or more of the said major life activities in the manner, speed, and duration when compared to the average person. Moreover, Plaintiff's member Theodore A. Pinnock has a history of or has been classified as having a

1 physical impairment as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2)(A).

2 CLAIM II AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Failure To Make Alterations In
3 Such A Manner That The Altered Portions Of The Facility Are
4 Readily Accessible And Usable By Individuals With Disabilities

5 19. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above and elsewhere in
6 this complaint, Plaintiff's Member Theodore A. Pinnock was denied
7 full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities,
8 privileges, advantages, or accommodations within a public
9 accommodation owned, leased, and/or operated by Defendants.
10 Defendants altered their facility in a manner that affects or
11 could affect the usability of the facility or a part of the
12 facility after January 26, 1992. In performing the alteration,
13 Defendants failed to make the alteration in such a manner that, to
14 the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility
15 are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with
16 disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs, in
17 violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183(a)(2).

18 20. Additionally, the Defendants undertook an alteration that
19 affects or could affect the usability of or access to an area of
20 the facility containing a primary function after January 26, 1992.
21 Defendants further failed to make the alterations in such a manner
22 that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the
23 altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains
24 serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by
25 individuals with disabilities in violation 42 U.S.C. §12183(a)(2).

26 21. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12183(a), this failure to make the
27 alterations in a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, are
28 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities

1 constitutes discrimination for purposes of 42 U.S.C. §12183(a).
2 Therefore, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff's Member
3 Theodore A. Pinnock in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

4 22. Thus, Plaintiff's Member Theodore A. Pinnock was subjected to
5 discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a), 42 U.S.C.
6 §12182(a) and 42 U.S.C. §12188 because said Member Theodore A.
7 Pinnock was denied equal access to Defendants' existing
8 facilities.

9
10 CLAIM III AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Failure To Remove
Architectural Barriers

11 23. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above and elsewhere in
12 this complaint, Plaintiff's Member was denied full and equal
13 access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges,
14 advantages, or accommodations within a public accommodation owned,
15 leased, and/or operated by Defendants. Defendants failed to
16 remove barriers as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Plaintiffs
17 are informed, believe, and thus allege that architectural barriers
18 which are structural in nature exist within the following physical
19 elements of Defendants' facilities: Space Allowance and Reach
20 Ranges, Accessible Route, Protruding Objects, Ground and Floor
21 Surfaces, Parking and Passenger Loading Zones, Curb Ramps, Ramps,
22 Stairs, Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair Lifts), Windows,
23 Doors, Entrances, Drinking Fountains and Water Coolers, Water
24 Closets, Toilet Stalls, Urinals, Lavatories and Mirrors, Sinks,
25 Storage, Handrails, Grab Bars, and Controls and Operating
26 Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings, Signage, and Telephones.
27 Title III requires places of public accommodation to remove
28

1 architectural barriers that are structural in nature to existing
2 facilities. [See, 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).]
3 Failure to remove such barriers and disparate treatment against a
4 person who has a known association with a person with a disability
5 are forms of discrimination. [See 42 United States Code
6 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).] Thus, Plaintiff's Member was subjected to
7 discrimination in violation of 42 United States Code
8 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188 because said Member was
9 denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

10 CLAIM IV AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Failure To Modify Practices,
11 Policies And Procedures

12 24. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above and elsewhere in
13 this complaint, Defendants failed and refused to provide a
14 reasonable alternative by modifying its practices, policies and
15 procedures in that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or design
16 to assist Plaintiff's Member and/or others similarly situated in
17 entering and utilizing Defendants' services, as required by 42
18 U.S.C. § 12188(a). Thus, said Member was subjected to
19 discrimination in violation of 42 United States Code
20 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188 because said Member was
21 denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

22 25. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above, Claims I, II, and
23 III of Plaintiffs' First Cause Of Action above, and the facts
24 elsewhere herein this complaint, Plaintiffs will suffer
25 irreparable harm unless Defendants are ordered to remove
26 architectural, non-architectural, and communication barriers at
27 Defendants' public accommodation. Plaintiffs allege that
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Defendants' discriminatory conduct is capable of repetition, and this discriminatory repetition adversely impacts Plaintiffs and a substantial segment of the disability community. Plaintiffs allege there is a national public interest in requiring accessibility in places of public accommodation. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to redress the discriminatory conduct of Defendants. Plaintiff's Member desires to return to Defendants' places of business in the immediate future. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs allege that a structural or mandatory injunction is necessary to enjoin compliance with federal civil rights laws enacted for the benefit of individuals with disabilities.

26. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment and relief as hereinafter set forth.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS - CLAIMS UNDER CALIFORNIA ACCESSIBILITY LAWS

CLAIM I: Denial Of Full And Equal Access

27. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff's Member was denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations within a public accommodation owned, leased, and/or operated by Defendants as required by Civil Code Sections 54 and 54.1. Defendants' facility violated California's Title 24 Accessible Building Code by failing to provide access to Defendants' facilities due to violations pertaining to the Space Allowance and Reach Ranges, Accessible Route, Protruding Objects, Ground and Floor Surfaces, Parking and Passenger Loading Zones, Curb Ramps, Ramps, Stairs, Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair

1 Lifts), Windows, Doors, Entrances, Drinking Fountains and Water
2 Coolers, Water Closets, Toilet Stalls, Urinals, Lavatories and
3 Mirrors, Sinks, Storage, Handrails, Grab Bars, and Controls and
4 Operating Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings, Signage, and
5 Telephones.

6 28. These violations denied Plaintiff's Member full and equal
7 access to Defendants' facility. Thus, said Member was subjected
8 to discrimination pursuant to Civil Code §§ 51, 52, and 54.1
9 because Plaintiff's Member was denied full, equal and safe access
10 to Defendants' facility, causing severe emotional distress.

11 CLAIM II: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures

12 29. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above and elsewhere
13 herein this complaint, Defendants failed and refused to provide a
14 reasonable alternative by modifying its practices, policies, and
15 procedures in that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or design
16 to assist Plaintiff's Member and/or others similarly situated in
17 entering and utilizing Defendants' services as required by Civil
18 Code § 54.1. Thus, said Member was subjected to discrimination in
19 violation of Civil Code § 54.1.

20 CLAIM III: Violation Of The Unruh Act

21 30. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above and elsewhere
22 herein this complaint and because Defendants violated the Civil
23 Code § 51 by failing to comply with 42 United States Code §
24 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2), Defendants did and
25 continue to discriminate against Plaintiff's Member and persons
26 similarly situated in violation of Civil Code §§ 51, 52, and 54.1.

27 31. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-17 above, Claims I, II, and
28

1 III of Plaintiffs' Second Cause Of Action above, and the facts
2 elsewhere herein this complaint, Plaintiffs will suffer
3 irreparable harm unless Defendants are ordered to remove
4 architectural, non-architectural, and communication barriers at
5 Defendants' public accommodation. Plaintiffs allege that
6 Defendants' discriminatory conduct is capable of repetition, and
7 this discriminatory repetition adversely impacts Plaintiffs and a
8 substantial segment of the disability community. Plaintiffs
9 allege there is a state and national public interest in requiring
10 accessibility in places of public accommodation. Plaintiffs have
11 no adequate remedy at law to redress the discriminatory conduct of
12 Defendants. Plaintiff's Member desires to return to Defendants'
13 places of business in the immediate future. Accordingly, the
14 Plaintiffs allege that a structural or mandatory injunction is
15 necessary to enjoin compliance with state civil rights laws
16 enacted for the benefit of individuals with disabilities.
17
18 32. Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for damages and relief as
19 hereinafter stated.

20 **Treble Damages Pursuant To Claims I, II, III Under The California**
21 **Accessibility Laws**

22 33. Defendants, each of them respectively, at times prior to and
23 including, the month of June, 2004, and continuing to the present
24 time, knew that persons with physical disabilities were denied
25 their rights of equal access to all portions of this public
26 facility. Despite such knowledge, Defendants, and each of them,
27 failed and refused to take steps to comply with the applicable
28 access statutes; and despite knowledge of the resulting problems
and denial of civil rights thereby suffered by Plaintiff's Member

1 THEODORE A. PINNOCK and other similarly situated persons with
2 disabilities. Defendants, and each of them, have failed and
3 refused to take action to grant full and equal access to persons
4 with physical disabilities in the respects complained of
5 hereinabove. Defendants, and each of them, have carried out a
6 course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or correct complaints
7 about, denial of disabled access and have refused to comply with
8 their legal obligations to make Defendants' KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET
9 facilities accessible pursuant to the Americans With Disability
10 Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG) and Title 24 of the California Code
11 of Regulations (also known as the California Building Code). Such
12 actions and continuing course of conduct by Defendants, and each
13 of them, evidence despicable conduct in conscious disregard of the
14 rights and/or safety of Plaintiff's Member and of other similarly
15 situated persons, justifying an award of treble damages pursuant
16 to sections 52(a) and 54.3(a) of the California Civil Code.

17 34. Defendants', and each of their, actions have also been
18 oppressive to persons with physical disabilities and of other
19 members of the public, and have evidenced actual or implied
20 malicious intent toward those members of the public, such as
21 Plaintiff's Member and other persons with physical disabilities
22 who have been denied the proper access to which they are entitled
23 by law. Further, Defendants', and each of their, refusals on a
24 day-to-day basis to correct these problems evidence despicable
25 conduct in conscious disregard for the rights of Plaintiff's
26 Member THEODORE A. PINNOCK and other members of the public with
27 physical disabilities.
28

1 35. Plaintiffs pray for an award of treble damages against
2 Defendants, and each of them, pursuant to California Civil Code
3 sections 52(a) and 54.3(a), in an amount sufficient to make a more
4 profound example of Defendants and encourage owners, lessors, and
5 operators of other public facilities from willful disregard of the
6 rights of persons with disabilities. Plaintiffs do not know the
7 financial worth of Defendants, or the amount of damages sufficient
8 to accomplish the public purposes of section 52(a) of the
9 California Civil Code and section 54.3 of the California Civil
10 Code.

11 36. Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for damages and relief as
12 hereinafter stated.

13 PLAINTIFF THEODORE A. PINNOCK'S THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL
14 DEFENDANTS- Negligence as to Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK only

15 37. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-14 above and elsewhere in
16 this complaint, Defendants owed Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock a
17 statutory duty to make their facility accessible and owed
18 Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock a duty to keep Plaintiff Theodore A.
19 Pinnock reasonably safe from known dangers and risks of harm.
20 This said duty arises by virtue of legal duties proscribed by
21 various federal and state statutes including, but not limited to,
22 ADA, ADAAG, Civil Code 51, 52, 54, 54.1 and Title 24 of the
23 California Administrative Code and applicable 1982 Uniform
24 Building Code standards as amended.

25 38. Title III of the ADA mandates removal of architectural
26 barriers and prohibits disability discrimination. As well,
27 Defendants' facility, and other goods, services, and/or facilities
28

1 provided to the public by Defendants are not accessible to and
2 usable by persons with disabilities as required by Health and
3 Safety Code § 19955 which requires private entities to make their
4 facility accessible before and after remodeling, and to remove
5 architectural barriers.

6 39. Therefore, Defendants engaged in discriminatory conduct in
7 that they failed to comply with known duties under the ADA, ADAAG,
8 Civil Code 51, 52, 54, 54.1, 54.3, ADAAG, and Title 24, and knew
9 or should have known that their acts of nonfeasance would cause
10 Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK emotional, bodily and personal
11 injury. Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK alleges that there was
12 bodily injury in this matter because when Plaintiff THEODORE A.
13 PINNOCK attempted to enter, use, and exit Defendants'
14 establishment, Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK experienced pain in
15 his legs, back, arms, shoulders, and wrists. Plaintiffs further
16 allege that such conduct was done in reckless disregard of the
17 probability of said conduct causing Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK
18 to suffer bodily or personal injury, anger, embarrassment,
19 depression, anxiety, mortification, humiliation, distress, and
20 fear of physical injury. Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An
21 Individual, alleges that such conduct caused THEODORE A. PINNOCK,
22 An Individual, to suffer the injuries of mental and emotional
23 distress, including, but not limited to, anger, embarrassment,
24 depression, anxiety, mortification, humiliation, distress, and
25 fear of physical injury. Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An
26 Individual, additionally alleges that such conduct caused THEODORE
27 A. PINNOCK, An Individual, to suffer damages as a result of these
28

1 injuries.

2 40. Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for damages and relief as
3 hereinafter stated.

4 DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT FOR RELIEF:

5 A. For general damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52, 54.3,
6 3281, and 3333;

7 B. For \$4,000 in damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 for
8 each and every offense of Civil Code § 51, Title 24 of the
9 California Building Code, ADA, and ADA Accessibility Guidelines;

10 C. In the alternative to the damages pursuant to Cal. Civil
11 Code § 52 in Paragraph B above, for \$1,000 in damages pursuant to
12 Cal. Civil Code § 54.3 for each and every offense of Civil Code §
13 54.1, Title 24 of the California Building Code, ADA, and ADA
14 Accessibility Guidelines;

15 D. For injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a) and
16 Cal. Civil Code § 55. Plaintiffs request this Court enjoin
17 Defendants to remove all architectural barriers in, at, or on
18 their facilities related to the following: Space Allowance and
19 Reach Ranges, Accessible Route, Protruding Objects, Ground and
20 Floor Surfaces, Parking and Passenger Loading Zones, Curb Ramps,
21 Ramps, Stairs, Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair Lifts),
22 Windows, Doors, Entrances, Drinking Fountains and Water Coolers,
23 Water Closets, Toilet Stalls, Urinals, Lavatories and Mirrors,
24 Sinks, Storage, Handrails, Grab Bars, and Controls and Operating
25 Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings, Signage, and Telephones.

26 E. For attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988, 42 U.S.C.
27 § 12205, and Cal. Civil Code § 55;

28 F. For treble damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52(a),

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

and 54.3(a);


G. A Jury Trial and;

H. For such other further relief as the court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted:

PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD, A.P.C.

Dated: July 20, 2004

By: 
MICHELLE L. WAKEFIELD, ESQ.
DAVID C. WAKEFIELD, ESQ.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE SECOND PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I (a) PLAINTIFFS

MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE, SUING ON BEHALF OF THEODORE A. PINNOCK AND ITS MEMBERS; And THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual

DEFENDANTS: KIDS FURNITURE OUTLET; ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST; ADELAIDE WOODWARD, TRUSTEE OF THE ADELAIDE WOODWARD TRUST; ADELAIDE WOODWARD; And DOES 1 THROUGH 10, Inclusive

F.R.K. U.S. DIST. COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF San Diego (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) San Diego

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED

(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER)

Michelle L. Wakefield, Esq. SBN: 200424
David C. Wakefield, Esq. SBN: 185736
Pinnock & Wakefield, A.P.C.; 3033 Fifth Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92103
Telephone: (619) 858-3671; Facsimile: (619) 858-3646

ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
2 U.S. Government Defendant
3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT)

- Citizen of This State
Citizen of Another State
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country
1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State
2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State
3 Foreign Nation
4
5
6

IV. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE US CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE. DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY).

04 CV 1461 J (RBB)

42 U.S.C. Sections 12101-12102, 12181-12183, and 12201, Et. Seq.

V. NATURE OF SUIT (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY)

Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes various legal categories and checkboxes.

VI. ORIGIN (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY)

- 1 Original Proceeding
2 Removal from State Court
3 Remanded from Appellate Court
4 Reinstated or Reopened
5 Transferred from another district (specify)
6 Multidistrict Litigation
7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER f.r.c.p. 23
DEMAND \$ To Be Determined At Trial
JURY DEMAND: YES X NO

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See Instructions):

JUDGE Docket Number

DATE July 20, 2004

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

Michelle L. Wakefield

105631 7/21/04 1502