USDC SCAN INDEX SHEET

















RXC 9/10/02 9:30

3:02-CV-01785 CARLOCK V. AIBERTOS TACO SHOP

1

CMP.

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

Attorney for Plaintiff, GAYNOR CARLOCK

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

'02 CV 01785(TM (LSP)

GAYNOR CARLOCK

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

27

28

Plaintiff,

vs.

AIBERTOS TACO SHOP, FELIPE OSORIA, GARY ORLANSKY, AND DOES 1-10, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES RE:) VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS ON) BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION IN) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS; UNFAIR,) UNLAWFUL AND FRAUDULENT BUSINESS PRACTICES; NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS; INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS; 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. Jurisdiction is also invoked pursuant to 42 USC 1981 [Civil Rights Act of 1991], et seg, which is applicable to causes of action where persons with disabilities have been denied their civil rights and Title II, section 201, et. seq. of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. 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 Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Southern District of California.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

(b) Supplemental Jurisdiction. The Judicial District of the of the States District Court Southern District United 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 described within this Complaint. Defendant's facilities as 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(s), **AIBERTOS TACO SHOP** is and at all times herein mentioned were duly organized business, association, or corporation duly authorized to exist and operate within the State of California and County of San Diego and the owner, operator or

- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants **GARY ORLANSKY**, were at all times herein was and are the owners, joint operator and/or controlling party, leasors, tenants of the property, which is the subject of this action and in some manner responsible for the violations of law as alleged herein.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the named defendants herein operates a business and or/facility of public accommodation as defined and described within 42 USC 12181(7)(B) of the American with Disabilities Act [ADA] and as such must comply with the ADA under provisions of Title III therein.
- 5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the defendants sued as Does 1-10 herein, and therefore sues them in their fictitious names as Doe defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Does 1-10 are the owners, operators, lessees or tenants of the subject property and each of the Doe defendants at all times herein was acting as the agent and or representative of each other and thereby are responsible in some manner for the injuries and damages complained of herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to name Doe defendants when the same is ascertained.

III

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS

6. Plaintiff 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 effect the basic necessities of his

- 7. On or about April 27, 2002 plaintiff attempted to enter the subject premises of the defendants herein to utilize goods and/or services offered by defendants. When Plaintiff attempted to enter said facility, plaintiff had difficulty entering and using the facility because it failed to comply with Federal ADA Access Guidelines For Building and Facilities [hereinafter "ADAAG"] and/or the State of California's Title 24 Building Code Requirements.
- 8. The specific difficulty Plaintiff had in entering and utilizing Defendants' facility and which amount to a violation of ADAAG and Title 24 of the California Building Code are:
 - (a) Site Entrance Sign does not exist and is a violation of CA Title 24 1129B.5;
 - (b) Site entrance signage is not filled out with the telephone number of the tow company that has vehicle as required by Title 24 1129B.5.;
 - (c) Site entrance signage is not filled out with the address to reclaim vehicle in the event a vehicle is towed as required by Title 24 1129B.5.;
 - (d) There is no regular access aisle with at any regular access aisle as required by CA Title 24 1129B.4.1;
 - (e) There are no van accessible parking spaces as required by ADAAG 4.1.2(5)(b)& CA Title 24 1129B.4.2;
 - (f) There are no van accessible parking signs as required by ADAAG 4.1.2(5)(B) & CA Title 24 1129B.4.2;

against and will continue to be discriminated against unless and until Defendants are enjoined and forced to cease and desist from

26

27

continuing to discriminate against Plaintiff and others similarly situated.

12. Pursuant to federal [ADA] and state law [California Title 24], Defendants are required to remove barriers to their existing facilities. Defendants have been put on notice pursuant to the ADA and the California Civil Code prior to the statutory effect of the ADA on January 26, 1992 that Defendants and each of them had a duty to remove barriers to persons with disabilities such as plaintiff. Defendants also knew or should have known that individuals such as plaintiff with a disability are not required to give notice to a governmental agency prior to filing suit alleging Defendants' failure to remove architectural barriers. 13. Plaintiff believes and thereon allege that Defendants' facility, as described herein, have other access violations not directly experienced by Plaintiff, which preclude or limit access by others with disabilities, including, but not limited to, Space Allowances, Reach Ranges, Accessible Routes, 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, Telephones, Controls and Operating Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings and Signage. Accordingly, Plaintiff alleges Defendants are required to remove all architectural barriers, known or unknown. Also, Plaintiff alleges Defendants are required to utilize the ADA checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal approved by the

Complaint for Damages - 6

.. _

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

United States Department of Justice and created by Adaptive Environments.

14. 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)

15. Plaintiff realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 14 as though set forth fully herein.

Claim 1: Denial of Full and Equal Access

16. Based on the facts asserted above Plaintiff has been denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations. Defendant AIBERTOS TACO SHOP 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); 42 USC 1981 and 42 U.S.C. Section 12188 because Plaintiff was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

17. 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).

Claim 2: Failure To Remove Architectural Barriers

18. 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). 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), 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

Complaint for Damages - 8

3

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25 26

27

discrimination in violation of 42 USC 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 USC 12182 (b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 USC 1981 and 42 USC 12188.

Claim 3: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures

19. 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); 42 U.S.C. 1981 and 42 U.S.C. section 12188 because Plaintiff was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. Under the provisions of 42 USC 12205 Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys fees and requests that the court grant such fees as are appropriate.

V

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Civil Rights 42 U.S.C. 1991)

1 23. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the First Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein. 3 24. The provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1981 (As amended by the Civil 4 Rights Act of 1991) provide that Plaintiff as a person with 5 disabilities cannot be discriminated against with regard to the 6 ability to enter into, to make or to enforce contracts. In 7 enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1991 congress established a three 8 tier system of remedies for a broad range of discretionary 9 conduct, including violations of the Americans With Disabilities 10 Act, wherein disabled individuals such as plaintiff are denied 1.1 equal access to facilities they wish to conduct business in and 12 therefore are precluded from making, entering into and enforcing 13 contracts that plaintiff and others similarly situated may desire 14 to effect. 15 25. Defendants, because they have individually and/or collectively 16 denied plaintiff access to their premises, goods and services, 17 have denied him the right to make, enter into or enforce a 18 contract and therefor have violated the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 19 1991 all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be determined at 20 time of trial herein. 21 26. As a result of Defendants' actions Plaintiff was humiliated, 22 embarrassed and discouraged and upset emotionally and physically and suffered damages according to proof. 23 24 27. The actions of the Defendants were intentional, outrageous and 25 done with reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and therefore 26 entitle him to an award of punitive damages. 27 28. By reason of Defendants' actions Plaintiff was caused to incur

Complaint for Damages - 10

costs and expenses of litigation, including attorney's fees, to

seek and redress his civil rights. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of costs and attorney's fees associated with the necessity of bringing this lawsuit.

VI

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation Of Civil Rights Under California Accessibility Laws)

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

(a) Denial Of Full And Equal Access

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

30. 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; California Health and Safety Code Section 19955 and California Government Code Section 12948. 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.

31. On the above basis Plaintiff has been wrongfully discriminated against.

(b) Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures

1 Defendants have failed and refused and continue to fail and 32. 2 refuse to provide a reasonable alternative to allow plaintiff 3 equal access to their facility by modifying their practices, policies, and procedures in that that they failed to have a 4 scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and others similarly 5 situated in entering and utilizing Defendants' goods or services 7 as required by California Civil Code section 54 and 54.1. 8 Accordingly Defendants have wrongfully discriminated against 9 Plaintiff. 10 VII 11 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION 12 (Violation of The Unruh Civil Rights Act) 33. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Third Cause of 13 Action as though set forth fully herein. 34. 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."

35. 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

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

36. 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 51 liable in the amount of \$4,000 per violation of said statute. 37. Defendants and each of them, at all times prior to and including April 27, 2002 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. 38. Defendants and each of them have failed and refused to take action to grant full and equal access to persons 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

continue to refuse to comply with equal access laws all in

27

1 v a 3 C S 1 T a a f a 14 S 15

 violation of 42 USC 12181-12183; 42 USC 1981; and 42 USC 12188. In addition the complained of acts are in violation of California Civil Code Sections 51,52, 54, and 54.1, California Health and Safety Code section 19955 and California Government Code section 12948 all of which require Defendants to provide equal access to their facility to disabled persons such as plaintiff. Defendants are also in violation of the indicated statutes because of their failure to remove architectural barriers, which prevent equal access to their facility by disabled persons and because of their failure to modify their practices, policies and procedures to have a scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and others similarly situated to enter and utilize Defendants' services as required by the Unruh Act.

- 44. Defendants' acts are unlawful and unfair and are therefore in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200.
- 45. Pursuant to the provisions of California Business and Professions Code section 17201 Plaintiff is a person as identified within said section and therefore allowed to bring this action on behalf of himself and the general public to effectuate California Business and Professions Code 17200 as provided for within Business and Professions Code section 17204.
- 46. Thus, Plaintiff, under Bus & Prof. Code section 17200 seeks injunctive relief, on behalf of himself and the general public,

requiring Defendants to remedy the disabled access violations present within Defendants' facility and that Defendants be ordered to cease and desist from continuing in noncompliance with disabled access statutes and regulations.

IX

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 47. Plaintiff relleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.
- 48. 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.
- 49. 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

1 barriers, Plaintiff would suffer emotional and/or mental distress 2 because of such discrimination and disparate treatment. Defendants 3 breached their duty of care to plaintiff by the perpetration of 4 the acts outlined herein. 5 50. As a proximate result of the actions of Defendants Plaintiff 6 7 did suffer emotional and mental stress and pain and suffering all 8 in an amount to be determined at time of trial. 9 10 SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION 11 (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress) 12 51. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of 13 Action as though set forth fully herein. 14 52. The actions of Defendants and each of them are despicable, 15 intentional and done with conscious disregard of the rights and 16 safety of Plaintiff and as such should be regarded as outrageous. 17 53. As a proximate result of Defendants' actions Plaintiff has 1.8 suffered severe emotional and mental distress all to his damage in 19 an amount to be determined at time of trial. 20 54. Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive damages for this claim as 21 the actions of Defendants are tantamount to outrageous conduct and 22 subject them to exemplary damages. 23 DEMAND FOR JURY 55. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the claims made herein be heard and determined by a jury. WHEREFORE PLAINTIFF PRAYS: 1. For general damages according to proof;

For special damages according to proof;

24

25

26

27

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information of med herein neither replace nor supplement the illing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DEFENDANTS LIBERTOS TACO SHOP, FELIPE OSORIA, GARY GAYNOR CARLOCK ORLANSKY, AND DOES 1-10, Inclusive, San Diego San Diego County of Residence of First Listed

DISTRICT COURT (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

RICT OF CALIFORNIA (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff SOUTHERN DISTRIC (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) LAND INVOLVED. Attornes (Known) (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Roy L. Landers (619)296-7898 '02 CV 01 7 85 JM (LSP) 7840 Mission Center CT, Suite 101 San Diego, CA 92108 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) DEF □ 1 U.S. Government 3 Federal Question Citizen of This State \Box 1 Incorporated or Principal Place

4 4 Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) of Business In This State 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State

2 □ 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties of Business In Another State in Item III) Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation □ 6 □ 6 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT **TORTS** FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES □ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 610 Agriculture 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 400 State Reapportionment 120 Marine 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury— 620 Other Food & Drug ☐ 410 Antitrust 130 Miller Act 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice 625 Drug Related Seizure 423 Withdrawal ☐ 430 Banks and Banking 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury of Property 21 USC 28 USC 157 ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 150 Recovery of Overpayment 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability 630 Liquor Laws ☐ 460 Deportation & Enforcement of PROPERTY RIGHTS Slander ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal 640 R.R. & Truck ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and 194891881care Act 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product 650 Airline Regs. Corrupt Organizations 820 Copyrights ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability Liability 660 Occupational ☐ 810 Selective Service 830 Patent Student Loans 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPERTY Safety/Health ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ 840 Trademark (Excl. Veterans) 345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud 690 Other Exchange □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment Liability 371 Truth in Lending □ 875 Customer Challenge 350 Motor Vehicle LABOR of Veteran's Benefits SOCIAL SECURITY 380 Other Personal 12 USC 3410 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts 710 Fair Labor Standards 861 HIA (1395ff) 190 Other Contract ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act 195 Contract Product Liability 862 Black Lung (923) 360 Other Personal Injury Product Liability □ 893 Environmental Matters 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 894 Energy Allocation Act REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS 864 SSID Title XVI 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting □ 895 Freedom of П 865 RSI (405(g)) D 210 Land Condemnation 441 Voting Information Act 510 Motions to Vacate & Disclosure Act □ 900 Appeal of Fee 220 Foreclosure 442 Employment 740 Railway Labor Act FEDERAL TAX SUITS Sentence Determination Under Equal 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff Accommodations 240 Torts to Land Access to Justice 530 General 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 950 Constitutionality of or Defendant) 245 Tort Product Liability 444 Welfare 535 Death Penalty 290 All Other Real Property ¥ 440 Other Civil Rights State Statutes 540 Mandamus & Other 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ■ 871 IRS—Third Party 550 Civil Rights Security Act 26 USC 7609 555 Prison Condition (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) V. ORIGIN Appeal to District Transferred from Judge from Magistrate another district Original Removed from Remanded from ☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ 5 □ 6 Multidistrict State Court Appellate Court Judgment Reopened Litigation VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) 42 USC 12101-12102, 12181-12183 and 12201, et seq. Discrimination on basis of disability (Public Accommodations) VII. REQUESTED IN ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION **DEMAND \$** CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 COMPLAINT: XX JURY DEMAND: □ No (See VIII. RELATED CASE(S) instructions): IF ANY TUDG DOCKET NUMBER E SIGNAPUR FOR OFFICE USE ONLY 39*1* amoun/<u>D</u>), 10 RECEIPT # JUDGE MAG. JUDGE