2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

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

Attorney for Plaintiff, CHRIS LANGER,

7242 01 07 GIC790959 06/20/02 04: 02 001 New Civil \$100.0

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CHRIS LANGER.

GIC 790959

Plaintiff,

Case No.:

GRAHAM KELLY, JR., TRUSTEE of the GRAHAM M. KELLY) FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST Dated) October 28, 1986, f/b/o Survivor's Trust; DAYLAMY) FARIDEH, and DOES 1 through 10,) inclusive

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

referred

as

Defendants.

CHRIS

Plaintiff

the) DEMAND FOR JURY

(hereinafter

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

INTRODUCTION:

follows:

LANGER,

"Plaintiff") complains of GRAHAM KELLY, JR., SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE of

the GRAHAM M. KELLY FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST dated October 28, 1986,

f/b/o the Survivor's Trust; DAYLAMY FARIDEH, and DOES 1 through 10,

inclusive, (hereinafter referred to as "Defendants") and alleges as

- 1. This is a Civil Rights action for discrimination against persons with physical disabilities, of which Plaintiff is a member of said class, for failure to remove architectural barriers structural in nature at Defendants' place of business, located at 6695 El Cajon Blvd., San Diego, California, a place of public accommodation; and for failure to modify practices and or policies in order to accommodate, thereby discriminatorily denying Plaintiff and the class of other similarly situated persons with physical disabilities access to, the full and equal enjoyment of, opportunity to participate in, and benefit from, the goods, facilities, services, and accommodations thereof.
- 2. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and damages for violations of civil rights and for damages flowing from such violations.

PARTIES:

- 3. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities who uses a wheelchair to travel about in public.
- 4. Defendants, GRAHAM KELLY, JR., SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE of the GRAHAM M. KELLY FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST dated October 28, 1986, f/b/o the Survivor's Trust; DAYLAMY FARIDEH, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive (hereinafter 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.

common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including DOES 1 6 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the 7

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:

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 6. Defendants are or were at the time of the incident the owners and operators, lessors and lessees of the public facility, located at 6695 El Cajon 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

9

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

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 of properly configured disabled parking; and a lack of van accessible designated disabled parking.

- 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.
- Plaintiff would like to return and use the Defendants' 12. 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

and exemplary damages per Civil Code section 3294.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (On behalf of Plaintiff and Against All Defendants) (Cal Civ § 51 et seq.)

that

the

the

lack of

- Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 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.

16. 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 failed to ensure that disabled persons have "full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services" to the facilities identified above.

Count Two:

17. The Defendants have not complied with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

12 II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S DISABLE PERSONS ACT, (On Behalf of Plaintiff and Against Al 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

4

5

6

persons enjoy the same accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges to the facilities identified above.

Count Two:

The Defendants have not complied with the Americans with 21. Disabilities Act of 1990.

and damages

as

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief 22. hereinafter stated.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE (On behalf of the Plaintiff and Against All Defendants)

- Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if 23. 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 the 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.
- IV. 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 seq.)
 - Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if

fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

- 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 the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations being offered.
- 2. General, Special and Penalty damages in an amount to be determined by proof;

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

Richard M. Valdez, Bar No. 156957 **SANDLER, LASRY, LAUBE, BYER & VALDEZ LLP** 402 West Broadway, Suite 1700 San Diego, CA 92101-3542 Telephone (619) 235-5655

Attorneys for Defendants

Facsimile (619) 235-5648

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

GRAHAM KELLY, JR., Successor Trustee of the Graham M. Kelly Family Recovacable Trust and DAYLAMY FARIDEH

6168 01 01 GIC790959 07/30/02 09:56 02 040 1st Paper Fee \$392.00

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CHRIS LANGER,

Plaintiff,

٧.

GRAHAM KELLY, JR., SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE of the GRAHAM M. KELLY FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST Dated October 28, 1986, f/b/o the Survivor's Trust; DAYLAMY FARIDEH, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No GIC790959

I/C Judge: John S. Meyer

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT DEMAND FOR JURY

Complaint Filed: 6/20/02

Defendants GRAHAM KELLY, JR., Successor Trustee of the Graham M. Kelly Family Recovacable Trust and DAYLAMY FARIDEH (collectively "these answering defendants") hereby answer the complaint of Plaintiff Chris Langer ("plaintiff") as follows:

1. Under the provisions of Section 431.30(d) of the California Code of Civil Procedure, these answering defendants deny each and every allegation of the unverified complaint. Further, these answering defendants deny that plaintiff has been damaged in any sum or sums alleged, or any other sum or sums at all, or that plaintiff is entitled to the relief sought in the complaint, by reason of any act or omission on the part of these answering defendants.

ODMA PCDOCS DOCS 6753 (

	982(a)(5)
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name and iss) — Mark D. Potter SBN 16517 Center for Disability Access P.O. Box 34606	TELEPHONE NO: FOR COURT USE ONLY (619) 291-7593 FILED CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE 10
San Diego, California 92163-4	
ATTORNEY FOR (Name) Chris Langer	2003 JAN -3 ₱ 3: 20
Insert name of court and name of judicial district and branch court, if any: The Superior Court of the State In and For the County of San Di PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Chris Langer	
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT:Graham Kelly, Jr Daylamy Farideh	., Trustee
REQUEST FOR DISMIS Personal Injury, Property Damage, or Wrongform Motor Vehicle Pamily Law Eminent Domain Other (specify): Civil	1
- A conformed copy will not be returned by th	e clerk unless a method of return is provided with the document
a. (1) With prejudice (2) Without prejudice b. (1) Complaint (2) Petition (3) Cross-complaint filed by (name): (4) Cross-complaint filed by (name): (5) Entire action of all parties and all causes o (6) Other: (specify):*	on <i>(date)</i> : on <i>(date)</i> :
iark D. Potter (TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF X ATTORNEY PARTY WITHOUT A	(SIGNATURE) Attorney or party without attorney for: Chris Langer
If dismissal requested is of specified parties only, of specified causes of action only, or of specified cross-complaints only, so state and identify the parties, causes of action, or cross-complaints to be dismissed.	
2. TO THE CLERK: Consent to the above dismissal is he Date:	reby given.**
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF ATTORNEY PARTY WITHOUT A	(SIGNATURE)
If a cross-complaint - or Response (Family Law) seeking affirmative relief - is on file, the attorney for the cross-complainant (respondent) must sign this consent if required by Code of Civil Procedure section 581(i) or (j)	Attorney or party without attorney for: Plaintiff/Petitioner Defendant/Respondent Cross-complainant
To be completed by clerk) Dismissal entered as requested on (date): JAN Dismissal entered on (date): Dismissal not entered as requested for the following the complete content of the following the complete content of the following the complete content of the content o	as to only <i>(name)</i> : ving reasons <i>(specify)</i> :
a. Attorney or party without attorney notified on (b. Attorney or party without attorney not notified. a copy to conform means to recommodified.	Filing party failed to provide sturn conformed copy
ate: 1277 d v 3003	Clerk, by, Deput
Form Adopted by the	QUEST FOR DISMISSAL L. Uriarte Code of Civil Procedure, § 581 et seq. Cal Rules of Court, rules 383, 1233

Judicial Council of California ∃2(a)(5) [Rev. January 1, 1997] Mandatory Form idin Dean's Essential Forms TM

