4.943

....

25.4

28

771.74

1

2

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP
MARK D. POTTER, ESQ., SBN 166317
RUSSELL C. HANDY, ESQ., SBN 195058
JAMES R. BOYD, ESQ., SBN175597
STEVE WEDEL, ESQ. SBN 214908
P.O. Box 34606
San Diego, CA 92163-4606
(619) 291-7593
Fax: (619) 725-0720

202 July - F. D. 3: 0.00 Class version of 3: 0.0 Since the control of 3: 0.00

Attorney for Plaintiff, CHRIS LANGER,

3871 01 11 61C789964 06/06/02 12:59 02 001 New Civil \$199,00

CT

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CHRIS LANGER,

Plaintiff,

V.

MICHAEL BARTELL; ELIZABETH J.)
GARFIELD; MELISSA GARFIELD)
BARTELL; MARIA SANCHEZ, and DOES)
1 through 10, inclusive

Defendants.

Case No.: GIC 789964

) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS
) OF: UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT;
) CALIFORNIA'S DISABLED PERSON ACT;
BETH J.) NEGLIGENCE; CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR
GARFIELD) BUSINESS PRACTICE ACT.

DEMAND FOR JURY

Plaintiff CHRIS LANGER, (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") complains of MICHAEL BARTELL; ELIZABETH J. GARFIELD; MELISSA GARFIELD BARTELL; MARIA SANCHEZ, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, (hereinafter referred to as "Defendants") and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION:

1. This is a Civil Rights action for discrimination against persons with physical disabilities, of which Plaintiff is a member

services, and accommodations thereof. 9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PARTIES:

violations.

2. Plaintiff

seeks

3. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities who uses a wheelchair to travel about in public.

injunctive

violations of civil rights and for damages flowing from such

relief

and

damages

for

said class, for failure to remove architectural barriers

- 4. Defendants, MICHAEL BARTELL; ELIZABETH J. GARFIELD; MELISSA GARFIELD BARTELL; MARIA SANCHEZ, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive alternatively referred to collectively as "Defendants"), are the owners and operators, lessors and/or lessees, or agents of the owners, lessors and/or lessees, and/or alter egos, franchisers and/or franchisees, of the building and/or buildings which constitute a public facility in and of itself, occupied by the above described defendants, and subject to the requirements of federal and state law requiring full and equal access to public accommodations and facilities.
- 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access

 violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

PRELIMINARY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

- 6. Defendants are or were at the time of the incident the owners and operators, lessors and lessees of the public facility, located at 3851 Clairemont Mesa Blvd., San Diego, California. The public accommodation, its path of travel, parking, restrooms and its other facilities are each a "public accommodation or facility" subject to the requirements of state and federal law. On information and belief, each such facility has, since July 1, 1970, undergone "alterations, structural repairs and additions," each of which has subjected the public accommodations, and each of their facilities to handicapped access requirements per the Americans with Disabilities Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG) and Title 24 of California's Code of Regulations.
- 7. On at least once occasion within the statutory period preceding the filing of this complaint, Plaintiff was an invitee and customer at the subject public accommodation.
- 8. During Plaintiff's visit, the subject public accommodation exhibited various violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines ("ADAAG") and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations including but not limited to: there was a lack

9

6

11

12 13

15

16

14

17

18

19 20

2122

2324

25

2627

28

of properly configured disabled parking; a lack of van accessible designated disabled parking; and inaccessible public paths of travel.

- 9. On information and belief, other portions of the facility were improperly inaccessible for use by persons with physical disabilities.
- 10. On information and belief, the facilities continue to the date of filing this complaint to deny equal access to Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities.
- 11. As a result of the inaccessible facilities, Plaintiff was humiliated, embarrassed and frustrated, suffering emotional injuries. Moreover, as a result of the inaccessible facilities, Plaintiff, suffered bodily and physical injury.
- 12. Plaintiff would like to return and use the Defendants' public accommodations but because of Defendants' violations, Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities are unable to use public facilities such as those owned and operated by Defendants on a "full and equal" basis unless such facility is in compliance with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Accessibility Guidelines and state accessibility law as pled herein. Plaintiff has, therefore, been deterred from returning and using the Defendants' public accommodations.
- 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore alleges that Defendants and each of them (1) caused the subject improved real properties which constitute the subject public accommodation to be constructed, altered and maintained in such a manner that persons with physical disabilities were denied full and equal access to, within and throughout said improved real property(s); (2) that the

and exemplary damages per Civil Code section 3294.

the

lack of

- FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (On behalf of Plaintiff and Against All Defendants) (Cal Civ § 51 et seq.)
- Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 15. California Civil Code § 52 provides that a party that discriminates against a plaintiff in violation of Civ. Code § 51 shall be liable for actual damages, up to three times actual damages but not less than \$1000 for each such offense, and any attorney's fees incurred by the plaintiff.

Count One:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

16. Defendants have not ensured that their facilities The

Count Two:

- 17. The Defendants have not complied with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
- II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S DISABLED PERSONS ACT, (On Behalf of Plaintiff and Against All Defendants) (California Civil Code § 54 et seq.)
- 18. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint and incorporates them herein as if separately repled.
- 19. California Civil Code §55 provides that a person aggrieved under §54 of the Civil Code may bring an action to enjoin such violation and shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees.

Count One:

20. The Defendants have not ensured that their facilities comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the California Building Code—as it—applies to physical access for persons with disabilities and have failed to ensure that disabled persons have full and equal access to public accommodations and/or other places that the general public is invited and that disabled persons enjoy the same accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges to the facilities identified above.

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

- The Defendants have not complied with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
- 22. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages hereinafter stated.
- III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE (On behalf of the Plaintiff and Against All Defendants)
- Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- Defendants had a duty to exercise ordinary care, i.e., comply with the various accessibility laws and ensure that their property was safely configured.
- Defendants failed to exercise ordinary care in that they failed to ensure that their facilities complied with accessibility guidelines or that their facilities were configured to promote safe and effective use by persons with wheelchairs.
- 26. As the actual and proximate result of Defendants' failure to exercise ordinary care, Plaintiff suffered damages in an amount to be determined by proof.
- Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages and 27. relief as hereinafter stated.
- FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT (On behalf of the Public and Against All Defendants) (Cal. Bus. & Prof. § 17200 et seg.)
- Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

2425

26 27

28

- 29. In addition to the access violations described above, Defendants' facilities are in violation of California and Federal law in that they do not provide required access for disabled persons.
- 30. Defendants' acts and omissions alleged herein are a violation of both statutory requirements and public policy and, therefore, constitute a violation of Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq.
- 31. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself/herself and the general public, seeks injunctive relief requiring Defendants to remedy the disability access violations present at their facilities.
- 32. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages and relief as hereinafter stated.

PRAYER:

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

- 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the Unruh Civil Rights Act, and California's Disabled Person Act, which order will include the removal of barriers and the implementation of reasonable modifications in policies, practice, eligibility criteria and procedures so as to afford full access to qoods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages accommodations being offered.
- 2. General, Special and Penalty damages in an amount to be determined by proof;
- 3. Reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52,55, and Cal. Civ. Proc. §

I	1021.5;					
2	4. For such other and further relief as the court may dee					
3	proper.					
4	Dated: April 17, 2002 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS. LLP					
5	Dated: April 17, 2002 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP					
6	By:					
7	MARK D. POTTER RUSSELL C. HANDY					
8	JAMES R. BOYD Attorneys for Plaintiff					
9						
10	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL					
11	Plaintiff hereby demands a jury for all claims for which a jury					
12	is permitted.					
13						
14	Dated: April 17, 2002 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP					
15						
16	By: MARK D. POTTER BUGGELL G. HANDY					
17	RUSSELL C. HANDY JAMES R. BOYD					
18	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
19						
20						
21						
22 23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	-9-					
- 1	·					

1 2 3 4	ERIC B. FREEDUS (SBN 61175) JOHN M. FEDOR (SBN 149587) FRANK AND FREEDUS, A P.C. 1202 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 6000 San Diego. California 92101-3344 (619) 239-3000 / (619) 236-0217 (Fax)	et m. et Ell ED - 15 15 3				
5	Attorneys for Defendants MICHAEL BARTELL, ELIZABETH GARFIE	ELD,				
6 7	MELISSA BARTELL AND MARIA SANCHI	EZ				
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO					
10	CENTRA	L DIVISION				
11	CHRIS LANGER,) CASE NO.: GIC 789964				
12	Plaintiff,	Complaint Filed: June 5, 2002				
13	V. ·) NOTICE TO PARTIES AND COURT OF REMOVAL OF ACTION TO				
14	MICHAEL BARTELL; ELIZABETH J.) FEDERAL COURT)				
15	GARFIELD; MELISSA GARFIELD BARTELL; MARIA SANCHEZ, and DOES)				
16	1 through 10, inclusive, Defendants.	Judge: Honorable Wayne L. Peterson				
17	Defendants.) Dept.: 5 / (619) 685-6120				
18	TO: CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COUR	RT, PLAINTIFF CHRIS LANGER AND TO				
19	PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY OF RECORD:					
20	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT Defendants filed a Notice of Removal of this action in					
21	the United States District Court for the Southern District of California on July 22, 2002, under					
22	Federal Case Number 02 CV 01432 B (RBB).					
23	A copy of the said Notice of Removal is attached to this Notice, and is served herewith.					
24	Dated: July 23, 2002	FRANK AND FREEDUS, A P.C.				
25		By:				
26		John M. Lolan				
27		Attorneys for Defendants MICHAEL BARTELL, ELIZABETH				
28		GARFIELD, MELISSA BARTELL AND MARIA SANCHEZ				
	PA2154 NOR-State 072302 NOTICE TO PARTIES AND COURT OF REMOVAL OF ACTION TO FEDERAL COURT					

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ERIC B. FREEDUS (SBN 61175) JOHN M. FEDOR (SBN 149587) FRANK AND FREEDUS, A P.C. 1202 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 6000 San Diego, California 92101-3344 (619) 239-3000 / (619) 236-0217 (Fax) Attorneys for Defendants MICHAEL BARTELL, ELIZABETH GARFII MELISSA BARTELL AND MARIA SANCH	ر ELD, EZ	2012 00L 22 A 10: 49 4278 01 07 GIC7899640002422/02 1 02 040 1st Paper Fee 2 CA \$784			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO					
10	CENTRAL DIVISION					
11	CHRIS LANGER,		ASE NO.: GIC 789964 mplaint Filed: June 5, 2002			
12	Plaintiff,)	FENDANTS' ANSWER			
13	v.		COMPLAINT			
14	MICHAEL BARTELL; ELIZABETH J. GARFIELD; MELISSA GARFIELD	Ś				
15	BARTELL; MARIA SANCHEZ, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,)) Judge: Honorable Wayne L. Peterson				
16	Defendants.) Der	pt.: 5 / (619) 685-6120			
17		, (१)	②			
18	COME NOW Defendants MICHAEL BARTELL, ELIZABETH GARFIELD, MELISSA					
19	BARTELL and MARIA SANCHEZ ("Defendants") and answer the Complaint of plaintiff					
20	CHRIS LANGER ("plaintiff") as follows:					
21	That under the provisions of section 431.30 of the California Code of Civil Procedure					
22	answering Defendants, and each of them, deny each, every and all allegations of said Complaint					
23	and the whole thereof, including each and every purported cause of action contained therein, and					
24	deny that the plaintiff sustained injury or damage in the sum or sums alleged, or in any other sun					
25	or sums whatsoever, or at all.					
26	///					
27	<i>///</i>					
28	<i>///</i>					
	PA2154 Answer-All 072202 DEFENDANTS' ANS	WER TO C	COMPLAINT			
1						