















RXC 4/9/02 9:02

3:02-CV-00668 JONES V. DAKOTA INN

1

CMP.

LAW OFFICES OF ROY L. LANDERS ROY L. LANDERS (BAR #64920) 7840 MISSION CENTER COURT, SUITE 101 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92108 TELEPHONE (619) 296-7898 FACSIMILE (619) 296-5611

02 APR -8 PM 2: 36

CLERK, U.S. MSTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ax: Olivally

DEPUTY

Attorney for Plaintiff, Dan Jones

Plaintiff,

CONNECTION, GENE BOWMAN REALTY,

NORMAN J & ROLAND BOWMAN TRUST

Defendants

DAKOTA INN, LATIN HAIR

AND DOES 1-10, Inclusive,

6 7

1

2

4

5

,

8

9

10

11

DAN JONES

vs.

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

Ι

1. (a) Jurisdiction of this action is invoked on the basis of 28 USC 1331 and 1343,42 USC 12101-12102, 12181-12183 and 12201, et. seq. Jurisdiction is also invoked pursuant to 42 USC 1981 [Civil Rights Act of 1991], et seq, which is applicable to causes of

Case No 02 6W

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

668

· L (LSP

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES RE:
VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS ON
BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION IN
PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS; UNFAIR,
UNLAWFUL AND FRAUDULENT BUSINESS
PRACTICES; NEGLIGENT INFLICTION
OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;
INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS; DEMAND FOR
JURY TRIAL

action where persons with disabilities have been denied their civil rights. Venue in the Southern Judicial District of California in the United States District Court is in accord with 28. U.S.C. section 1391(b) because a substantial part of plaintiff's claims arose within the Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Southern District of California.

(b) Supplemental Jurisdiction. The Judicial District of the District the Southern Court of United States District California has supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims alleged in this Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1367(a). Supplemental jurisdiction is appropriate in this action on the basis that all the causes of action or claims derived from federal law and those arising under state law, as herein alleged, arose from a common nucleus of operative facts. The common nucleus of operative facts, include, but are not limited to, the incidents whereby plaintiff was denied full and equal access to Defendants' facilities, goods, and/or services in violation of both federal and state laws when plaintiff attempted to enter, use, and/or exit Defendants' facilities as described with this Complaint. Further, due to this denial of full and equal access Plaintiff and other injured. Based upon such disabilities were person's with allegations the state actions, as stated herein, are so related to the federal actions that they form part of the same case or controversy, and the actions should be tried in one judicial proceeding.

1177

28 [[/ /

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

3 4

6

10

11

12 13

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28

PARTIES

2.Defendants Dakota Inn, Latin Hair Connection, and Gene Bowman Realty are and at all times herein mentioned were duly organized and operating business entities, partnerships, corporations or other legally recognized business operations duly authorized to exist and operate a business within the State of California and County of San Diego and Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said defendants are public accommodation businesses operating and existing upon a common parcel of land with addresses of 833 East 8th Street, 831 East 8th Street and 845 East 8th Street in National City, California.

3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant Norma J. & Roland Bowman Trust was and is at all times herein the owner, landlord and/or operators of the businesses and owners of the real property, which is the subject of this action. 4. Plaintiff is ignorant of the names and capacities of defendants sued as Does 1-10 herein and therefore sues each of them in the fictitious name of Doe. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon believes that each Doe defendant is in some manner responsible for the incidents, actions and violations alleged within this complaint and in their capacity were at all times acting as the agent, employee, representative, owner, or franchisee of each named defendant herein. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this complaint to name Doe defendants when the same is ascertained.

5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the named defendants herein operates a business and

or/facility of public accommodation as defined and described 1 within 42 USC 12181(7)(B)(F) of the American with Disabilities Act 2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

[ADA] and as such must comply with the ADA under provisions of Title III therein.

III

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS

- 6. Plaintiff is an African American male who is disabled and confined to a wheelchair. He has no control over his lower extremities and must use a wheelchair to transport himself and to effect the basic necessities of his everyday existence. Plaintiff's disability substantially limits one or more of life's major activities [walking] and therefore he is disabled as defined under 42 USC 12102(2)(A)(B)(C). 7. On or about February 15, 2002 plaintiff attempted to enter the subject premises of the defendants herein to purchase food,
- beverage and/or services offered by defendants. When Plaintiff attempted to enter the facilities he had difficulty entering and using the facilities because they failed to comply with federal ADA Access Guidelines For Building and Facilities [hereinafter | "ADAAG"] and/or the State of California's Title 24 Building Code Requirements.
- 8. The specific difficulty Plaintiff had in entering and utilizing Defendants' facilities and which amount to a violation of ADAAG and Title 24 of the California Building Code are:
- (a) Property entrance site signage is improper and in violation of Title 24 1129B.5.
 - (b) There is no designated van accessible parking space as required by ADAAG 4.1.2(5)(b) and Title 24 1129B.4.2.

Complaint for Damages - 4

(c) There is no van accessible aisle as required by ADAAG 4.6.3 & 2 Title 24 1129B.5. (d) There is no accessible route of travel as required by ADAAG 4.6.4 and Title 24 1129B.5. 4 (e) Bathroom facility lacks proper directional signage as required by ADAAG 4.30.7(d) and Title 24 1117B. 5.1.1.1. &5.3. 6 (f) Bathroom lacks proper international symbol of access as 7 required by ADAAG 4.30.6 and Title 24 1117B.5.9. 8 (g) Bathroom facility lacks proper delineation of disability 9 access for men and women as required by Title 24 1115B.5. 10 (h) Urinal is at improper height and in violation of ADAAG 4.18.3 11 & Title 24 1115B.9.4. 12 (i) Toilet height is in violation of ADAAG 4.16.3 and Title 24 13 14 1502. (j) Bathroom grab bars are not at proper lengths as required by 15 16 ADAAG 4.17.6. (k) Bathroom water closet clearance is not sufficient and 17 therefore in noncompliance with ADAAG 4.17.3 and Title 24 1115B.1. 18 (1) Bathroom accessories/fixtures are at improper height and in 19 20 violation of ADAAG 4.23.7 and Title 24 1115B9.2. (m) Toilet stall is at improper size and in violation of ADAAG 21 22 4.17.3 and Title 24 1115B.1. (o) Toilet room door handles are improper and in violation of 23 ADAAG 4.13.9 and Title 24 1133B.2.5.1. 24 (p) Restroom lacks raised Braille characters as required by ADAAG 25 4.30.4 and Title 24 1117B.5.6.1&2.

(q) Faucet fixtures are improper and violate ADAAG 4.27.4 and

27

28

Title 24 1508.1 & 2.

11. Plaintiff believes and thereon allege that Defendants' facility, as described herein, has other access violations not

alleging Defendant's failure to remove architectural barriers.

26

directly experienced by Plaintiff, which preclude or limit access by others with disabilities, including, but not limited to, Space Allowances, Reach Ranges, Accessible Routes, Protruding Objects, Ground and Floor Surfaces, Parking and Passenger Loading Zones, Curb Ramps, Ramps, Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair Lifts), Windows, Doors, Entrances, Drinking Fountains, and Water Coolers, Water Closets, Toilet Stalls, Urinals, Lavatories and Mirrors, Sinks, Storage, Handrails, Grab Bars, Telephones, Controls and Operating Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings and Signage. Accordingly, Plaintiff alleges Defendants are required to remove all architectural barriers, known or unknown. Also, Plaintiff alleges Defendants are required to utilize the ADA checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal approved by the United States Department of Justice and created by Adaptive Environments. Plaintiff desires to return to Defendants' place of business and utilize their facilities without being discriminated against in the immediate future.

2

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IV

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Civil Rights-American With Disabilities Act)

13. Plaintiff realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 12 as though set forth fully herein.

Claim 1: Denial of Full and Equal Access

14. Based on the facts asserted above Plaintiff has been denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations. Defendants are a public accommodation owned, leased and/or operated by Defendants named herein. Defendants' existing facilities and/or services failed to

provide full and equal access to Defendants' facilities as required by 42 U.S.C. section 12182(a). Thus, Plaintiff was subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. 12182(b) (2) (A) (ii) (iv); 42 USC 1981 and 42 U.S.C. section 12188 because Plaintiff was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facility.

15. Plaintiff has a physical impairment as alleged herein because his condition affects one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, and/or cardiovascular. Further, his physical impairments substantially limits one or more of the following major life activities: walking. In addition, Plaintiff 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 has a history

Claim 2: Failure To Remove Architectural Barriers

16. Based upon the facts alleged herein, Plaintiff 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 the named Defendants. Defendants individually and collectively failed to remove barriers as required by 42 U.S.C. 12182(a). Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thus alleges that architectural barriers which are structural in nature exist at the following physical elements of Defendants' facilities:

Space Allowance and Reach Ranges, Accessible Route, Protruding Objects, Ground and Floor Surfaces, Parking and Passenger Loading

of or has been classified as having a physical impairment as

required by 42 U.S.C. section 12102(2)(A).

Zones, Curb Ramps, Ramps, Stairs, Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair Lifts), Windows, Doors, Entrances, Drinking Fountains and Water Coolers, Water Closets, Toilet Stalls, Urinals, Lavatories and Mirrors, Sinks, Storage, Handrails, Grab Bars, and Controls and Operating Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings, Signage, and Telephones. Pursuant to 42 USC section 12182(b)(2)(iv), Title III requires places of public accommodation to remove architectural barriers that are structural in nature within existing facilities. Failure to remove such barriers and disparate treatment against a person who has a known association with a person with a disability are forms of prohibited discrimination. Accordingly, Plaintiff was subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 USC 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 USC 12182 (b) (2) (A) (iv); 42 USC 1981 and 42 USC 12188. Claim 3: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures 17. Based on the facts alleged in this Complaint Defendants failed

Claim 3: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures

17. Based on the facts alleged in this Complaint Defendants failed and refused to provide a reasonable alternative by modifying its practices, policies and procedures in that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and/or others similarly situated in entering and utilizing Defendants' services, as required by 42 U.S.C. section 12188(a). Thus, Plaintiff was subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. 1981 and 42 U.S.C. section 12188 because Plaintiff was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

18. As a result of the wrongful and discriminatory practices of defendants, plaintiff has suffered actual damages consisting of

28

2

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

special damages and general damages in an amount to be determined at time of trial herein.

19. Pursuant to the provisions of 42 USC 12188 plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and an order directing defendants to cease and desist from discriminating against plaintiff and others similarly situated and for an order that defendants comply with the Americans With Disabilities Act forthwith.

20. Under the provisions of section 42 USC 12205 plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonably attorneys fees and requests that the court grant such fees as are appropriate.

V

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Civil Rights 42 U.S.C. 1991)

21. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the First Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.

22. The provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1981 (As amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991) provide that Plaintiff as a person with disabilities cannot be discriminated against with regard to the ability to enter into, to make or to enforce contracts. In enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1991 congress established a three tier system of remedies for a broad range of discretionary conduct, including violations of the Americans With Disabilities Act, wherein disabled individuals such as plaintiff are denied equal access to facilities they wish to conduct business in and therefore are precluded from making, entering into and enforcing contracts that plaintiff and others similarly situated may desire to effect.

4

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

24. As a result of Defendants' actions Plaintiff was humiliated, embarrassed and discouraged and upset emotionally and physically and suffered damage according to proof.

25. The actions of Defendants were intentional, outrageous and done with reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and therefore entitle him to an award of punitive damages.

26. By reason of Defendants' actions Plaintiff was caused to incur costs and expenses of litigation, including attorney's fees, to seek and redress his civil rights. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of costs and attorney's fees associated with the necessity of brining this lawsuit.

VI

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation Of Civil Rights Under California Accessibility Laws)

27. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Second Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.

(a) Denial Of Full And Equal Access

28. Plaintiff has been 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 in violation of Civil Code Sections 54 and 54.1; Health and Safety Code Section 19955 and California

Government Code Section 12948. The actions of Defendants also 1 violate the provisions of Title 24 of State of California Building Codes with regard to accessibility for persons with disabilities 3 by failing to provide access to Defendants' facilities due to 4 violations pertaining to accessible routes, ground and floor 5 surfaces, parking and passenger loading zones, curb ramps, ramps, 6 stairs, elevators, platform lifts (wheelchair lifts), windows, doors, toilet stalls, urinals, lavatories and mirrors, sinks, 8 storage, handrails, grab bars, controls and operating mechanisms alarms, detectable warnings, signage and telephones. 10 11

29. On the above basis Plaintiff has been wrongfully discriminated against.

(b) Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures

30. Defendants have failed and refused and continue to fail and refuse to provide a reasonable alternative to allow plaintiff equal access to their facility by modifying their practices, policies, and procedures in that that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and others similarly situated in entering and utilizing Defendants' goods or services as required by California Civil Code section 54 and 54.1. Accordingly Defendants have wrongfully discriminated against Plaintiff.

VII

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of The Unruh Civil Rights Act)

31. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Third Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.

28

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

32. Section 51(b) of the Cal. Civ. Code [The Unruh Civil Rights Act], provides in pertinent part:

"All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, or medical condition is entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever."

33. Defendants have violated the provisions of Civ. Code 51(b) by failing and refusing to provide free and equal access to Plaintiff to their facility on the same basis as other persons not disabled. By its failure to provide equal access to Plaintiff as herein alleged, Defendants have also violated 42 U.S.C. section 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) as provided in Cal. Civ. Codes section 51(f). 34. By reason of its acts and denial of Plaintiff's civil rights Defendants also violated the provisions of Cal. Civ. Code section 52, which makes a person or entity in violation of Cal.Civ. Code 51 liable for the actual damages to a Plaintiff including treble damages where appropriate and \$4000 per statutory violation. 35. Defendants, at all times prior to and including February 14, 2002, respectively and continuing to the present time, knew that persons with physical disabilities were denied their rights of equal access to all portions of this public facility. Despite such knowledge, Defendants failed and refused to take steps to comply with the applicable access statutes and despite knowledge of the resulting problems and denial of civil rights suffered by Plaintiff and other similarly situated persons with disabilities.

27 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

36. Defendants have failed and refused to take action to grant 2 full and equal access to persons with physical disabilities. Defendants have carried out a course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or correct complaints about unequal access and has refused to comply with its legal obligation to make the subject 6 facility accessible pursuant to the ADAAG and the California 7 8 Building Code [Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations]. Such actions and continuing course of conduct by Defendants 10 evidence despicable conduct in conscious disregard of the rights 11 and/or safety of Plaintiff and those similarly situated and thus 12 justify an award of treble damages pursuant to section 52(a) and 13 14 54.3(a) of the Cal.Civ. Code or alternatively an award of punitive 15 damages in an appropriate amount. 16 37. Plaintiff has suffered emotional and physical damage and 17 continues to suffer such damages all in an amount to be determined 18 19 at time of trial. 20 38. Under the provisions of Cal. Civ. Code section 55 Plaintiff 21 seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs as a result 22 of having to bring this action. Plaintiff requests the court to 23 award such fees in an appropriate amount. 24 // 25 26 27 // 28

3

4 5

6 7

8

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

26

27

28

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unfair And Unlawful Business Practice)

39. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.

40. California Business and Professions Code Section 17200 states in pertinent part:

"As used in this chapter, unfair competition shall mean and include any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act..."

41. Defendants, as alleged herein, are in violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act and Title 24 of the California Building Code, in that it has denied equal access to their place of public accommodation to Plaintiff and others similarly situated to Plaintiff. Defendants have failed and refused and continue to refuse to comply with equal access laws all in violation of 42 USC 12181-12183; 42 USC 1981; and 42 USC 12188. In addition the complained of acts are in violation of California Civil Code Sections 51,52, 54, and 54.1,; California Health and Safety Code section 19955 and California Government Code section 12948 all of which require Defendants to provide equal access to its facility to disabled persons such as plaintiff. Defendants are also in violation of the indicated statutes because of their failure to remove architectural barriers, which prevent equal access to its facility by disabled persons and because of its failure to modify its practices, policies and procedures to have a scheme, plan, or

design to assist Plaintiff and others similarly situated to enter 1 2 and utilize Defendants' services as required by the Unruh Act. 42. Defendant's acts are unlawful and unfair and are therefore in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 5 17200. 6 43. Pursuant to the provisions of California Business and 7 Professions Code section 17201 Plaintiff is a person as identified within said section and therefore allowed to bring this action on 10 behalf of himself and the general public to effectuate California 11 Business and Professions Code 17200 as provided for within 12 Business and Professions Code section 17204. 13 14 44. Thus, Plaintiff, under Bus & Prof. Code section 17200 seeks 15 injunctive relief, on behalf of himself and the general public, 16 requiring Defendants to remedy the disabled access violations 17 present within Defendants' facility and that Defendants be ordered 18 to cease and desist from continuing in noncompliance with disabled 19 20 access statutes and regulations. 21 IX 22 SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION 23

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

45. Plaintiff relleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.

24

25

26

27

28

46. Defendants owe a duty to Plaintiff to make its facility accessible and to keep Plaintiff reasonably safe from known

Complaint for Damages - 16

dangers and risks of harm. This duty arises by virtue of the legal duties proscribed by various federal and state statutes including, but not limited to, ADA, ADAAG, California Civil Code sections 51, 52, 54, 54.1 and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Defendants had a duty of due care not to do or cause anything to happen that would subject Plaintiff to undue stress, embarrassment, chagrin, and discouragement. 47. Defendants breached their duty of care to Plaintiff by the actions and inaction complained of herein and as a result thereof Plaintiff was shocked, discouraged, embarrassed and outraged at the callousness and disregard of Defendants. Defendants knew or had reason to know that by denying Plaintiff equal access to their facility and failing and refusing to remove architectural barriers, Plaintiff would suffer emotional and/or mental distress because of such discrimination and disparate treatment. Defendants breached their duty of care to plaintiff by the perpetration of the acts outlined herein. 48. As a proximate result of the actions of Defendants Plaintiff did suffer emotional and mental distress and pain and suffering all in an amount to be determined at time of trial. 11 //

Complaint for Damages - 17

1

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

//

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

26

28

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 49. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.
- 50. The actions of Defendants are despicable, intentional and done with conscious disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff and as such should be regarded at outrageous.
- 51. As a proximate result of Defendants' actions Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional and mental distress all to his damage in an amount to be determined at time of trial.
- 52. Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive damages for this claim as the actions of Defendants are tantamount to outrageous conduct and subject it to exemplary damages.

DEMAND FOR JURY

- 53. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the claims made herein be heard and determined by a jury.
- WHEREFORE PLAINTIFF PRAYS:

Americans With Disabilities Act.

- 1. For general damages according to proof;
- 2. For special damages according to proof;
- 3. For damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code section 52, in the
- amount of \$4,000 for each and every offense of California Civil 23
- Code section 51, Title 24 of the California Building Code and the 24
 - 4. For Injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 12188(a) and
- California Business and Professions Code section 17200

1	5. For an award of attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1988, 42
2	U.S.C. 1981, 42 U.S.C. 12205 and Cal. Civ. Code section 55;
3	6. For treble damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code 52 (a);
4	7. For punitive damages according to proof;
5	8. For a Jury Trial;
6	9. For costs of suit incurred herein and;
7	10. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.
8	Respectfully submitted,
9	3-23-02 . John de John John John John John John John John
10	Attorney for Plaintiff, Dan Jones
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

E

\$150,00

RECEIPT # 08/265 AMOUN

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY

APPLYING IF

JUDGE

MAG JUDGE