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

7003 JAN

Attorney for Plaintiff, CHRIS LANGER,

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

CHRIS LANGER,

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

26

27

28

ν.

্যুন্ড 12

) Case No.:

GIC 803673

Plaintiff,

) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS) OF: UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT;

PARTNERSHIP; LIMITED SDCCC CIMA OIL COMPANY, INC., and DOES) 1 through 10, inclusive

) NEGLIGENCE; CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR LA) BUSINESS PRACTICE ACT.

Defendants.

DEMAND FOR JURY

LANGER, (hereinafter referred CHRIS Plaintiff "Plaintiff") complains of SDCCC LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; LA CIMA OIL INC., and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, (hereinafter COMPANY, 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 said class, for failure to remove architectural barriers 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, SDCCC LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; LA CIMA OIL COMPANY, INC., 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.
- 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 5790 Balboa Ave., 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 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.
- 12. Defendants knew their facilities were inaccessible and continued to maintain these facilities in an inaccessible condition and in doing so, knowingly continued to violate and interfere with the rights of disabled persons including Plaintiff. Such conduct by defendants is despicable, and was carried on by defendant with a willful and conscious disregard for the rights of disabled persons, including Plaintiff.
- 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 Act Accessibility Guidelines and state accessibility law as pled herein. Plaintiff has, therefore, been deterred from returning and using the Defendants' public accommodations.
- 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore alleges that Defendants and each of them (1) caused the subject improved

the

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

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as 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 § shall be liable for actual damages, up to three times actual damages

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

but not less than \$4000 for each such offense, and any attorney's fees incurred by the plaintiff.

Count One:

The Defendants have not ensured that their facilities 17. 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 advantages, facilities, accommodations, equal and "full have privileges, or services" to the facilities identified above.

Count Two:

- The Defendants have not complied with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
- SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE (On behalf of the Plaintiff and Against All Defendants) II.
- 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, comply with the various accessibility laws and ensure that their property was safely configured.
- Defendants failed to exercise ordinary care in that they complied the facilities their failed to ensure that accessibility guidelines or that their facilities were configured to promote safe and effective use by persons with wheelchairs.
- 22. As the actual and proximate result of Defendants' failure to exercise ordinary care, Plaintiff suffered damages in an amount to be determined by proof.

- 23. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages and relief as hereinafter stated.
- III. THIRD 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.)
- 24. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 25. 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.
- 26. 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.
- 27. 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.
- 28. 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.
- 2. General and Special damages in an amount to be determined by proof;

| | and costs of |
|----|---|
| 1 | 3. Reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs of |
| 2 | suit, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52, and Cal. Civ. Proc. § |
| 3 | 1021.5; |
| 4 | 4. For Punitive Damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code Section |
| 5 | 3294(c)(1); |
| 6 | 5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem |
| 7 | proper. |
| 8 | Dated: December 27, 2002 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP |
| 9 | bacca. |
| 10 | By: MARK D. POTTER |
| 11 | RUSSELL C. HANDY |
| 12 | Attorneys for Plaintiff |
| 13 | DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL |
| 14 | Plaintiff hereby demands a jury for all claims for which a jury |
| 15 | |
| 16 | is permitted. |
| 17 | Dated: December 27, 2002 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP |
| 18 | Dated: December 27, 2002 CDM2- |
| 19 | By: |
| 20 | |
| 2 | $\sim 10^{-10}$ |
| 2 | |
| 2 | 3 |
| 2 | $4 \parallel$ |
| 2 | 25 |
| 2 | 26 |
| | 27 |
| | -8- |
| | -8- |