

FILED
CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE 11
CENTRAL DIVISION

2002 DEC -4 P 3 23

STEPHEN THUNBERG
CLERK-SUPERIOR COURT
SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA

1 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP
2 MARK D. POTTER, ESQ., SBN 166317
3 RUSSELL C. HANDY, ESQ., SBN 195058
4 JAMES R. BOYD, ESQ., SBN175597
5 STEVE WEDEL, ESQ. SBN 214908
6 P.O. Box 34606
7 San Diego, CA 92163-4606
8 (619) 291-7593
9 Fax: (619) 725-0720

6 Attorney for Plaintiff, CHRIS LANGER,

5341 01 07 810801208 12/05/02 09:59
DE 001 New Civil

ORIGINAL
COUNTING

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

12 CHRIS LANGER,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 DAVID KELTON as TRUSTEE of the)
16 DAVID KELTON AND LENORA L. KELTON)
17 FAMILY TRUST; LENORA L. KELTON as)
18 TRUSTEE of the DAVID KELTON AND)
19 LENORA L. KELTON FAMILY TRUST; L.)
20 J. HAGEMAN, INC., and DOES 1)
21 through 10, inclusive)

22 Defendants.

Case No.: GIC 801208

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

DEMAND FOR JURY

21 Plaintiff CHRIS LANGER, (hereinafter referred to as
22 "Plaintiff") complains of DAVID KELTON as TRUSTEE of the DAVID
23 KELTON AND LENORA L. KELTON FAMILY TRUST; LENORA L. KELTON as
24 TRUSTEE of the DAVID KELTON AND LENORA L. KELTON FAMILY TRUST; L. J.
25 HAGEMAN, INC., and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, (hereinafter
26 referred to as "Defendants") and alleges as follows:

27 INTRODUCTION:
28

1 1. This is a Civil Rights action for discrimination against
2 persons with physical disabilities, of which Plaintiff is a member
3 of said class, for failure to remove architectural barriers
4 structural in nature at Defendants' place of business, located at
5 903 Otay Lakes Rd., Chula Vista, California, a place of public
6 accommodation; and for failure to modify practices and or policies
7 in order to accommodate, thereby discriminatorily denying Plaintiff
8 and the class of other similarly situated persons with physical
9 disabilities access to, the full and equal enjoyment of, opportunity
10 to participate in, and benefit from, the goods, facilities,
11 services, and accommodations thereof.

12 2. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and damages for
13 violations of civil rights and ~~for~~ damages flowing from such
14 violations.

15 **PARTIES:**

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

18 4. Defendants, DAVID KELTON as TRUSTEE of the DAVID KELTON AND
19 LENORA L. KELTON FAMILY TRUST; LENORA L. KELTON as TRUSTEE of the
20 DAVID KELTON AND LENORA L. KELTON FAMILY TRUST; L. J. HAGEMAN, INC.,
21 and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive (hereinafter alternatively referred
22 to collectively as "Defendants"), are the owners and operators,
23 lessors and/or lessees, or agents of the owners, lessors and/or
24 lessees, and/or alter egos, franchisers and/or franchisees, of the
25 building and/or buildings which constitute a public facility in and
26 of itself, occupied by the above described defendants, and subject
27 to the requirements of federal and state law requiring full and
28 equal access to public accommodations and facilities.

1 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their
2 business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and
3 business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access
4 violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and
5 common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and
6 believes that each of the Defendants herein, including DOES 1
7 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the
8 events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining
9 appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true
10 names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the
11 Defendants and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

12 **PRELIMINARY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

13 6. Defendants are or were at the time of the incident the
14 owners and operators, lessors and lessees of the public facility,
15 located at 903 Otay Lakes Rd., Chula Vista, California. The public
16 accommodation, its path of travel, parking, restrooms and its other
17 facilities are each a "public accommodation or facility" subject to
18 the requirements of state and federal law. On information and
19 belief, each such facility has, since July 1, 1970, undergone
20 "alterations, structural repairs and additions," each of which has
21 subjected the public accommodations, and each of their facilities to
22 handicapped access requirements per the Americans with Disabilities
23 Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG) and Title 24 of California's Code of
24 Regulations.

25 7. On at least once occasion within the statutory period
26 preceding the filing of this complaint, Plaintiff was an invitee and
27 customer at the subject public accommodation.

28 8. During Plaintiff's visit, the subject public accommodation

1 exhibited various violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act
2 Accessibility Guidelines ("ADAAG") and Title 24 of the California
3 Code of Regulations including but not limited to: there was a lack
4 of properly configured disabled parking; and a lack of van
5 accessible designated disabled parking.

6 9. On information and belief, other portions of the facility
7 were improperly inaccessible for use by persons with physical
8 disabilities.

9 10. On information and belief, the facilities continue to the
10 date of filing this complaint to deny equal access to Plaintiff and
11 other persons with physical disabilities.

12 11. As a result of the inaccessible facilities, Plaintiff was
13 humiliated, embarrassed and frustrated, suffering emotional
14 injuries. Moreover, as a result of the inaccessible facilities,
15 Plaintiff, suffered bodily and physical injury.

16 12. Defendants knew their facilities were inaccessible and
17 continued to maintain these facilities in an inaccessible condition
18 and in doing so, knowingly continued to violate and interfere with
19 the rights of disabled persons including Plaintiff. Such conduct by
20 defendants is despicable, and was carried on by defendant with a
21 willful and conscious disregard for the rights of disabled persons,
22 including Plaintiff.

23 13. Plaintiff would like to return and use the Defendants'
24 public accommodations but because of Defendants' violations,
25 Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities are unable to
26 use public facilities such as those owned and operated by Defendants
27 on a "full and equal" basis unless such facility is in compliance
28 with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act

1 Accessibility Guidelines and state accessibility law as pled herein.
2 Plaintiff has, therefore, been deterred from returning and using the
3 Defendants' public accommodations.

4 **14.** Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore alleges
5 that Defendants and each of them (1) caused the subject improved
6 real properties which constitute the subject public accommodation to
7 be constructed, altered and maintained in such a manner that persons
8 with physical disabilities were denied full and equal access to,
9 within and throughout said improved real property(s); (2) that the
10 Defendants have had actual and constructive notice that the
11 facilities were not legally accessible to persons with disabilities;
12 (3) that despite being informed of such effect on Plaintiff and
13 other persons with physical disabilities due to the lack of
14 accessible facilities, Defendants, and each of them, knowingly and
15 willfully refused to take any steps to rectify the situation and to
16 provide full and equal access for Plaintiff and other persons with
17 physical disabilities to the subject public accommodation. Said
18 defendants, and each of them, have continued such practices, in
19 conscious disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff and other
20 persons with physical disabilities. Said conduct, with knowledge of
21 the effect it was and is having on Plaintiff and other persons with
22 physical disabilities, constitutes despicable conduct in conscious
23 disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff and of other
24 similarly situated persons, justifying the imposition of punitive
25 and exemplary damages per Civil Code section 3294.

26 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT**
27 (On behalf of Plaintiff and Against All Defendants) (Cal Civ S
28 51 et seq.)

15. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if

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

3 16. California Civil Code § 52 provides that a party that
4 discriminates against a plaintiff in violation of Civ. Code § 51
5 shall be liable for actual damages, up to three times actual damages
6 but not less than \$4000 for each such offense, and any attorney's
7 fees incurred by the plaintiff.

8 **Count One:**

9 17. The Defendants have not ensured that their facilities
10 comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the
11 California Building Code as it applies to physical access for
12 persons with disabilities and failed to ensure that disabled persons
13 have "full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities,
14 privileges, or services" to the facilities identified above.

15 **Count Two:**

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

18 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE**
19 (On behalf of the Plaintiff and Against All Defendants)

20 19. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if
21 fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior
22 paragraphs of this complaint.

23 20. Defendants had a duty to exercise ordinary care, i.e.,
24 comply with the various accessibility laws and ensure that their
25 property was safely configured.

26 21. Defendants failed to exercise ordinary care in that they
27 failed to ensure that their facilities complied with the
28

1 accessibility guidelines or that their facilities were configured to
2 promote safe and effective use by persons with wheelchairs.

3 22. As the actual and proximate result of Defendants' failure
4 to exercise ordinary care, Plaintiff suffered damages in an amount
5 to be determined by proof.

6 23. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages and
7 relief as hereinafter stated.

8 **III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR**
9 **BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT (On behalf of the Public and Against All**
10 **Defendants) (Cal. Bus. & Prof. § 17200 et seq.)**

11 24. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if
12 fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior
13 paragraphs of this complaint.

14 25. In addition to the access violations described above,
15 Defendants' facilities are in violation of California and Federal
16 law in that they do not provide required access for disabled
17 persons.

18 26. Defendants' acts and omissions alleged herein are a
19 violation of both statutory requirements and public policy and,
20 therefore, constitute a violation of Business and Professions Code
21 sections 17200 et seq.

22 27. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself/herself and the general
23 public, seeks injunctive relief requiring Defendants to remedy the
24 disability access violations present at their facilities.

25 28. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages and
26 relief as hereinafter stated.

27 **PRAYER:**

28 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and

1 provide relief as follows:

2 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with
3 the Unruh Civil Rights Act.

4 2. General and Special damages in an amount to be determined by
5 proof;

6 3. Reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs of
7 suit, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52, and Cal. Civ. Proc. §
8 1021.5;

9 4. For Punitive Damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code Section
10 3294(c)(1);

11 5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem
12 proper.

13 Dated: November 20, 2002

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP

14

15

By: 

MARK D. POTTER
RUSSELL C. HANDY
JAMES R. BOYD
Attorneys for Plaintiff

16

17

18

19

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

20

21

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury for all claims for which a jury
is permitted.

22

23

Dated: November 20, 2002

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP

24

25

By: 

MARK D. POTTER
RUSSELL C. HANDY
JAMES R. BOYD
Attorneys for Plaintiff

26

27

28

FILED
CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE 5
CENTRAL DISTRICT

2003 JAN 30 P 3 04

CLERK-SUPERIOR COURT
SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA

SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
A Limited Liability Partnership
Including Professional Corporations
TIMOTHY B. TAYLOR, CAL. BAR NO. 116292
MARTHA H. SOTTOSANTI, CAL. BAR NO. 178593
501 West Broadway, 19th Floor
San Diego, California 92101-3598

Telephone: (619) 338-6500
Facsimile: (619) 234-3815

8583 01 05 GIC801208 01/31/03 09:50
02 040 1st Paper Fee \$672.60

Attorneys for Defendants
DAVID KELTON and LENORA L. KELTON,
TRUSTEES OF THE DAVID KELTON AND
LENORA L. KELTON FAMILY TRUST,
and L.J. HAGEMAN, INC.

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

CHRIS LANGER,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID KELTON as TRUSTEE of the
DAVID KELTON AND LENORA L.
KELTON FAMILY TRUST; LENORA L.
KELTON as TRUSTEE of the DAVID
KELTON AND LENORA L. KELTON
FAMILY TRUST; L.J. HAGEMAN, INC.,
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. GIC 801208
(Complaint Filed: December 4, 2002)

**DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO
COMPLAINT**

Dept.: 61
Hon. John S. Meyer

TRIAL DATE: None Set

ORIGINAL