















NMC 3/12/04 10:52

3:04-CV-00524 RIVERA V. MLSL LP

1

CMP.

C3

LAW OFFICES OF ROY L. LANDERS
ROY L. LANDERS (BAR #64920)
LaTOYA S. REDD (BAR # 218342)
7840 MISSION CENTER COURT, SUITE 101
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92108
TELEPHONE (619) 296-7898
FACSIMILE (619) 296-5611

Old MAR 11 PM 5: 04

11 55 M. H.S. DICTRICT COURT

11 FAM - N DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DEPUTY

Attorney for Plaintiff, Ismael Rivera

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

'04 CV 0 0 5 2 4 LAB (LSP)

ISMAEL RIVERA

Plaintiff,

vs.

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MLSL, LP, SCOTT E. CARL DOES 1-10 Inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No.:

) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES RE:
) VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS ON
) BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION IN
) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS; NEGLIGENT
) INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL
) DISTRESS; INTENTIONAL INFLICTION
) OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;
) DECLARATORY RELIEF; DEMAND FOR
) JURY TRIAL

Ι

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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., which is applicable to causes of 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

Complaint for Damages re Violation of Civil Rights 1

X

Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Southern District of California.

(b) Supplemental Jurisdiction. The Judicial District of the States United District Court of the Southern 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 Defendant's facilities, goods, and/or services in violation of both federal and state laws when plaintiff attempted to enter, use, and/or exit facilities as described within Defendant's this Complaint. Further, due to this denial of full and equal access Plaintiff and other person's with disabilities were injured. Based upon such 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 would ordinarily be expected to be tried in one judicial proceeding.

II

PARTIES

2. Defendant MLSL, LP was and at all times herein mentioned was a duly organized business, association, or corporation duly authorized to exist and operate within the State of California and County of San Diego and the owners, lessees, or tenants of the

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

premises located at 1820 Escondido Boulevard Escondido, California 92025.

- 3. Plaintiff is informed and thereon alleges that defendant Scott
- E. Carl is the owner and/or landlord of the subject property upon which defendant business is sited.
- 6 4 Plaintiff is informed and believe
- 6 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
- 7 | each of the named defendants herein operates a business and
- 8 or/facility of public accommodation as defined and described
- 9 | within 42 USC 12181(7)(F) of the American with Disabilities Act
- $10 \parallel [ADA]$ and as such must comply with the ADA under provisions of
- 11 Title III therein.

1

2

3

4

5

- 12 | 5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the defendants sued as Does 1-10
- 13 herein, and therefore sues them in their fictitious names as Doe
- defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges
- 15 that Does 1-10 are the owners, operators, lessees or tenants of
- 16 the subject property and each of the Doe defendants at all times
- 17 herein was acting as the agent and or representative of each other
- 18 and thereby are responsible in some manner for the injuries and
- damages complained of herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court
- 20 to amend this complaint to name Doe defendants when the same is
- 21 ||ascertained.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

III

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS

6. Plaintiff is a 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 affect the basic necessities of his everyday existence. Plaintiff's disability substantially limits one or more of life's major activities and

1 therefore he is disabled as defined under 42 USC 2 12102(2)(A)(B)(C). 3 7. On or about February 2, 2004 plaintiff patronized the premises 4 of defendants to utilize goods and/or services offered by 5 defendants. When Plaintiff attempted to gain access to the goods 6 and/or services offered by defendants he encountered access 7 barriers because the premises failed to comply with federal ADA 8 Access Guidelines For Building and Facilities [hereinafter "ADAAG"]; Department of Justice [DOJ] regulations at 28 CFR. 10 36.201; 36.304 and/or the State of California's Title 24 Building 11 Code Requirements. 12 8. The specific difficulty Plaintiff had in entering and utilizing 13 Defendants' facility and which amount to a violation of ADAAG, DOJ 14 regulations and Title 24 of the California Building Code are: 15 (a) Site lacks NO PARKING signage as required by Title 24 16 1129B.4.1&2. 17 Lack of van accessible parking as required by ADAAG (b) 18 4.1.2(5)(a)(b) and Title 24 1129B.4.2 19 Lack of van accessible aisle as required by ADAAG 4.6.3 (c) 20 Lack of signage as required by ADAAG 4.6.4 (d) 21 Facility lacks route of travel as required by ADAAG 4.6.2. (e) 22 Entrance signage does not comply with ADAAG 4.1.3(16)(b) (f) 23 and Title 24 1127B.3 24 Bathroom international symbol of accessibility does not (q) 25 exist as required by ADAAG 4.30.6 and Title 24 1117B.5.9; 26 Bathroom international pictogram does not comply with ADAAG (h)

4.30.4 and Title 24 1117B.5.5.2

27

- (1)Door mount signage (men and women) does not comply with Title 24 1115B.5
- (m) Faucet fixtures do not comply with ADAAG 4.27.4 and Title 24 1508.1&2; (one hand operable and Max 5 lb force).
- Water closet mounting and/or location violates Title 24 (n) 1115B.7.1.2
- Accessories/fixtures are not at proper height as required (o) by ADAAG 4.23.7 and Title 24 1115B.9.2
- Coat hook height does not comply with ADAAG 4.18.2 and (p) Title 24 1118B.4.1 through B.6.
- Urinal rim height does not comply with 4.18.2 and Title 24 (q) 1503.2.1
- Toilet stall is not properly sized and in violation of (r) ADAAG 4.17.3 and Title 24 1115B.1.
- Hardware does not meet requirements of ADAAG 4.13.9 and (s) Title 24 1133B.2.5.1;1115B.7.1.4
- Drain and hot water pipes are not insulated as required by (t) ADAAG 4.24.6
- 9. Based upon the above facts, Plaintiff as been discriminated against and will continue to be discriminated against unless and until Defendants are enjoined and forced to cease and desist from

28

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 continuing to discriminate against Plaintiff and others similarly 2 situated. 3 10. Pursuant to federal [ADA], Title 28 CFR 36.201; 36.203; 4 36.304; 36.305 and state law [California Title 24], Defendants are 5 required to remove barriers to their existing facilities. 6 Defendants have been put on notice pursuant to the ADA and 7 California Civil Codes [51,52] prior to the statutory effect of 8 the ADA on January 26, 1992 that Defendants and each of them had a duty to remove barriers to persons with disabilities such as 10 plaintiff. Defendants also knew or should have known that 11 individuals such as plaintiff with a disability are not required 12 to give notice to a governmental agency prior to filing suit 13 alleging Defendants' failure to remove architectural barriers. 14 11. Plaintiff believes and thereon allege that Defendants' 15 facilities, as described herein, have other access violations not 16 directly experienced by Plaintiff, which preclude or limit access 17 by others with disabilities, including, but not limited to, Space 18 Allowances, Reach Ranges, Accessible Routes, Protruding Objects, 19 Ground and Floor Surfaces, Parking and Passenger Loading Zones, 20 Curb Ramps, Ramps, Stairs, Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair 21 Lifts), Windows, Doors, Entrances, Drinking Fountains, and Water 22 Coolers, Water Closets, Toilet Stalls, Urinals, Lavatories and 23 Mirrors, Sinks, Storage, Handrails, Grab Bars, Telephones, 24 Controls and Operating Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings and 25 Signage. Accordingly, Plaintiff alleges Defendants are required to 26 remove all architectural barriers, known or unknown. Also, 27 Plaintiff alleges Defendants are required to utilize the ADA 28 checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal approved by the

United States Department of Justice and created by Adaptive Environments.

12. Plaintiff desires to return to Defendants' places of business and utilize their facilities without being discriminated against in the immediate future.

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. Defendant business is a public accommodation owned, leased and/or operated by Defendants and each of them. Defendants' existing facilities and/or services failed to provide full and equal access to Defendants' facility 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) and 42 U.S.C. section 12188 because Plaintiff was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

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 of or has been classified as having a physical impairment as required by 42 U.S.C. section 12102(2)(A).

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

Claim 2: Failure To Remove Architectural Barriers 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) and 28 CFR 36.304. 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 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) and 28 CFR 36.304 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) and 42 USC 12188.

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); 28 CFR 36.302 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 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 42 USC 12205 plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonably attorneys fees and requests that the court grant such fees as are appropriate.

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

1

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10 11

13

14

12

15 16

> 17 18

19 20

21

22

23

against.

24

25 26

27 28

(Violation Of Civil Rights Under California Accessibility Laws)

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

(a) Denial Of Full And Equal Access

22. 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 California Civil Code Sections 54 and 54.1 and California Health and Safety Code Section 19955. The actions of Defendants also violate the provisions of Title 24 of the State of California Building Codes with regard to accessibility for persons with disabilities by failing to provide access to Defendants facilities due to violations pertaining to accessible routes, ground and floor surfaces, parking and passenger loading zones, curb ramps, ramps, stairs, elevators, platform lifts (wheelchair lifts), windows, doors, toilet stalls, urinals, lavatories and mirrors, sinks, storage, handrails, grab bars, controls and operating mechanisms alarms, detectable warnings, signage and telephones. 23. On the above basis Plaintiff has been wrongfully discriminated

Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures

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 s

1 scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and others similarly 2 situated in entering and utilizing Defendants' goods or services 3 as required by California Civil Code section 54 and 54.1. 4 Accordingly Defendants have wrongfully discriminated against 5 Plaintiff. 6 VII 7 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION 8 (Violation of The Unruh Civil Rights Act)

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

26. 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."

27. 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 their 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). 28. By reason of their 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

28

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

51 liable for the actual damages to a Plaintiff including treble damages where appropriate.

29. Defendants and each of them, at all times prior to and including February 2004, 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, and each of them, 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.

30. Defendants and each of them have failed and refused to take action to grant full and equal access to person with physical disabilities. Defendants have carried out a course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or correct complaints about unequal access and have refused to comply with their legal obligations to make the subject facility accessible pursuant the ADAAG and the California Building Code [Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations]. Such actions and continuing course of conduct by Defendants, and each of them, evidence despicable conduct in conscious disregard of the rights and/or safety of Plaintiff and those similarly situated and thus justify an award of treble damages pursuant to section 52(a) and 54.3(a) of the Cal.Civ. Code

or alternatively an award of punitive damages in an appropriate amount.

31. Plaintiff has suffered emotional and physical damage and continues to suffer such damages all in an amount to be determined at time of trial.

32. Under the provisions of Cal. Civ. Code section 55 Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs as a result of having to bring this action. Plaintiff requests the court to award such fees in an appropriate amount.

VIII

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

33. Plaintiff relleges the allegations of the Third Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.

34. Defendants and each of them owed a duty to Plaintiff to make their facility accessible and to keep Plaintiff reasonably safe from known 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.

35. 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.

36. As a proximate result of the actions of Defendants Plaintiff did suffer emotional and mental stress and pain and suffering all in an amount to be determined at time of trial.

IX

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 37. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.
- 38. The actions of Defendants and each of them are despicable, intentional and done with conscious disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff and as such should be regarded at outrageous.
- 39. 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.

40. Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive damages for this claim as the actions of Defendants are tantamount to outrageous conduct and subject them to exemplary damages.

x

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(DECLARATORY RELIEF)

- 41. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-40 of this complaint as though set forth fully herein.
- 42. An actual controversy now exists in that plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants' premises are in violation of the disabled access laws of the State of California
- including, but not limited to, Civil Code Sections 51, et seq.,
- 14 | Section 52, et seq., Title 24 of the California Code of
- 15 Regulations and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act
- 16 and the Americans with Disabilities Access Guidelines (ADAAG).
- | 43. A declaration of plaintiff's rights is necessary and
- 18 appropriate in order for the parties to this action to know their
- respective rights and duties. Accordingly, the court should make a declaration of the rights of the parties.
- 21

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

DEMAND FOR JURY

- 22 44. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the claims made herein be
 23 heard and determined by a jury.
 - WHEREFORE PLAINTIFF PRAYS:
- 25 | 1. For general damages according to proof;
- 26 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

Code section 51, Title 24 of the California Building Code and the Americans with Disabilities Act. 4. For Injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 12188(a. 5. For an award of attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1988, 42 U.S.C. 12205 and Cal. Civ. Code section 55; 6. For treble damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code 52 (a); 7. For punitive damages according to proof; 8. For a Jury Trial; 9. For costs of suit incurred herein and; 10. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper. Respectfully submitted, Dated: 3/2/04

| JS 44 (Rev. 3/99) | _ • | CIVIL COV | ER SHEET | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| ne JS-44 civil cover sheet and law, except as provided by se of the Clerk of Court for t | the information cont local rules of court. The he purpose of initiating th | herein neither replatorm, approved by the e civil docket sheet. | ce nor supplement the tilin e Judicial Conference of the (SEE INSTRUCTIONS O | g and vice of pleadings or e United States in September IN THE REVERSE OF THE | other papers as required 1974, is required for the FORM.) |
| (a) PLAINTIFFS | | | DEFENDANT | rs . | - |
| ISMAEL RIVERA | | | MLSL, LP | ,et al. i | autor () F |
| (b) County of Residence of (EXCE | First Listed Plaintiff PT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA | Diego SES) | NOTE: IN LANE | OL MISER DE ON U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF CONDEMNATION CASES USE TO INVOLVED. | 02.774 |
| (c) Attorney's (Firm Name | Address, and Telephone Nu | ımber) | Attomeys (If Kn | own) | |
| Roy L. Land | lers (619 on Center CT, | 9)296-7898 | | 14 CV 00524 | LABEPUT (LSP) |
| II. BAŠIS OF JURISDI | CTION (Place an "X" in | One Box Only) | . CITIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only) | RINCIPAL PARTIES(Place | e an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant) |
| □ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff | 3 Federal Question (U.S. Governmen | nt Not a Party) | Citizen of This State | DEF 1 1 D 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In 3 | DEF incipal Place |
| □ 2 U.S. Government Defendant | ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizen in Item III) | ship of Parties | Citizen of Another State C | of Business In A | |
| | | | Foreign Country | 3_3_ D-3Foreign Nation | |
| CONTRACT | (Place an "X" in On TOR | | FORFEITURE/PENALT | Y BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STATUTES |
| 110 Insurance 120 Marins 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of 151 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veteran's Benefits 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Forecleasure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Tents to Land 245 Tent Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property | □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Stander □ 330 Federal Employers Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 700 Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ CIVIL RIGHTS □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 444 Welfare ■ 440 Other Civil Rights | PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury— Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury— Product Liability 368 Axioestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition | 610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizur of Property 21 USC 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standard Act 720 Labor/Mgmt, Relating 730 Labor/Mgmt, Relating 740 Railway Labor Act 740 Railway Labor Act 740 Railway Labor Act 740 Railway Labor Act 750 Other Labor Litigat | 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS R30 Taxes (ILS Plaintiff | □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antimust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and □ Corrupt Organizations □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ □ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of □ Information Act □ 900 Appeal of Fee □ Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes □ 890 Other Statutory Actions |
| V. ORIGIN | State Court | Remanded from C | J 4 Reinstated or □ 5 (s) Reopened | ensferred from sother district | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACT 42 USC 121 Discrimina | Do not cite jurisdiction 01-12102, 121 | nahistatotes unless diversity 81-12183 a | nd 12201, et : | • | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| VII. REQUESTED I COMPLAINT: | XX UNDER F.R.C | IS IS A CLASS ACTION. P. 23 | ON DEMANDS | CHECK YES on JURY DEMAN | ly if demanded in complaint: D: 💢 Yes 🗆 No |
| VIII. RELATED CA | (See SE(S) instructions): | JUDG E | | DOCKET NUMBER | |

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
RECEIPT 1 10/852 AMOUN SKNAFURFOFATTORNEY OF FEODS

MS APPLYING IFF

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE