USDC SCAN INDEX SHEET

















RXC 8/12/02 9:34

3:02-CV-01589 CARLOCK V. CAFE LAMAZE

1

CMP.

LAW OFFICES OF ROY L. LANDERS
ROY L. LANDERS (BAR #64920)
7840 MISSION CENTER COURT, SUITE 102 AUG -9 PM 3: 20
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92108
TELEPHONE (619) 296-7898
FACSIMILE (619) 296-5611

Attorney for Plaintiff, GAYNOR CARLOCK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GAYNOR CARLOCK

Plaintiff,

vs.

CAFÉ LAMAZE, FREDDIE & PENELOPE EVARKIO TRUST, AND DOES 1-10, Inclusive,

Defendants.

cas 02 CV 15

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

Ŕ

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 seq, 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.

Complaint for Damages - 1

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.

(b) Supplemental Jurisdiction. The Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Southern District of 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 Defendant's facilities as described within this Complaint. 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.

ΙI

PARTIES

2. Defendant(s), CAFÉ LAMAZE 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

28

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

County of San Diego and the owner, operator or lessee of the premises located at 1441 HIGHLAND AVENUE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.

- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants **FREDDIE & PENELOPE EVARKIO TRUST**, were at all times herein was and are the owners, leasors, tenants and controlling parties 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

Complaint for Damages - 3

1 transport himself and to effect the basic necessities of his 2 everyday existence. Plaintiff's disability substantially limits 3 one or more of life's major activities and therefore he is 4 disabled as defined under 42 USC 12102(2)(A)(B)(C). 5 On or about JUNE 10, 2002 plaintiff attempted to enter the 6 subject premises of the defendants herein to utilize goods and/or 7 services offered by defendants. When Plaintiff attempted to enter 8 said facility, plaintiff had difficulty entering and using the 9 facility because it failed to comply with Federal ADA Access 10 Guidelines For Building and Facilities [hereinafter "ADAAG"] 11 and/or the State of California's Title 24 Building Code 12 Requirements. 13 8. The specific difficulty Plaintiff had in entering and utilizing 14 Defendants' facility and which amount to a violation of ADAAG and 15 Title 24 of the California Building Code are: 16 Bathroom lacks international symbol of accessibility as 17 required by ADAAG 4.30.6 and Title 24 1117B.5.9; 18 (b) Bathroom grab bars are not at the proper mounting height as 19 required by ADAAG 4.17.6 & CA Title 24 1115B.8.1; 20 (c) Bathroom grab bars do not extend to at least 24 inches 21 beyond the water closet as required by ADAAG 4.17.6 & CA 22 Title 24 1115B.8.1; 23 (d) Bathroom grab bars forward ends do not extend to at least 24 54 inches from the back wall as required by ADAAG 4.17.6; 25 (e) The rear grab bar is not at least 36 inches in length as 26 required by ADAAG 4.17.6 & CA Title 24 1115B.8.1; 27 (f) The side grab bar is not at least 42 in length as required

by ADAAG 4.17.6 & CA Title 24 1115B.8.1;

25

26

27

28

significant period of time and with defendant's specific knowledge.

10. These violations are believed to have existed for a

11. Based upon the above facts, Plaintiff as been discriminated against and will continue to be discriminated against unless and until Defendants are enjoined and forced to cease and desist from 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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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 United States Department of Justice and created by Adaptive Environments. Plaintiff desires to return to Defendants' places of business 14. 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 CAFÉ LAMAZE 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:

Complaint for Damages - 7

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).

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Claim 2: Failure To Remove Architectural Barriers 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 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

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.

28

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

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

21

22

23 24

25

27

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

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

- 23. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the First Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.
- 24. The provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1981 (As amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991) provide that Plaintiff as a person with disabilities cannot be discriminated against with regard to the ability to enter into, to make or to enforce contracts. In enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1991 congress established a three tier system of remedies for a broad range of discretionary conduct, including violations of the Americans With Disabilities Act, wherein disabled individuals such as plaintiff are denied equal access to facilities they wish to conduct business in and therefore are precluded from making, entering into and enforcing contracts that plaintiff and others similarly situated may desire to effect.
- 25. Defendants, because they have individually and/or collectively denied plaintiff access to their premises, goods and services, have denied him the right to make, enter into or enforce a contract and therefor have violated the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1991 all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be determined at time of trial herein.
- 26. As a result of Defendants' actions Plaintiff was humiliated, embarrassed and discouraged and upset emotionally and physically and suffered damages according to proof.

27. The actions of the Defendants were intentional, outrageous and done with reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and therefore entitle him to an award of punitive damages.

28. By reason of Defendants' actions Plaintiff was caused to incur 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

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 1 2 telephones. 31. On the above basis Plaintiff has been wrongfully discriminated 3 4 against. 5 Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures (b) 6 Defendants have failed and refused and continue to fail and 7 refuse to provide a reasonable alternative to allow plaintiff 8 equal access to their facility by modifying their practices, policies, and procedures in that that they failed to have a 10 scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and others similarly 11 situated in entering and utilizing Defendants' goods or services 12 as required by California Civil Code section 54 and 54.1. 13 Accordingly Defendants have wrongfully discriminated against 14 Plaintiff. 15 VII 16 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION 17 (Violation of The Unruh Civil Rights Act) 18 33. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Third Cause of 19 Action as though set forth fully herein. 20 34. Section 51(b) of the Cal. Civ. Code [The Unruh Civil Rights 21 Act], provides in pertinent part: 22 "All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, 23 religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, or medical condition is entitled to the full and equal accommodations, 24 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all 25 business establishments of every kind whatsoever." 26 35. Defendants have violated the provisions of Civ. Code 51 (b) by 27 failing and refusing to provide free and equal access to Plaintiff

to their facility on the same basis as other persons not disabled.

1 By their failure to provide equal access to Plaintiff as herein 2 alleged, Defendants have also violated 42 U.S.C. section 3 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) as provided in Cal. Civ. Codes section 51(f). 4 36. By reason of their acts and denial of Plaintiff's civil rights 5 Defendants also violated the provisions of Cal. Civ. Code section 6 7 52, which makes a person or entity in violation of Cal.Civ. Code 8 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 JUNE 10, 2002 respectively and continuing to the present time, knew that persons with physical disabilities were denied 12 their rights of equal access to all portions of this public 14 facility. Despite such knowledge, Defendants, and each of them, 15 failed and refused to take steps to comply with the applicable 16 access statutes and despite knowledge of the resulting problems and denial of civil rights suffered by Plaintiff and other 18 19 similarly situated persons with disabilities. 38. Defendants and each of them have failed and refused to take 21 action to grant full and equal access to persons with physical 22 disabilities. Defendants have carried out a course of conduct of 23 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

Complaint for Damages - 13

Regulations]. Such actions and continuing course of conduct by

10

11

13

17

20

24

25

26

27

1 Defendants, and each of them, evidence despicable conduct in 2 conscious disregard of the rights and/or safety of Plaintiff and 3 those similarly situated and thus justify an award of treble damages pursuant to section 52(a) and 54.3(a) of the Cal.Civ. Code or alternatively an award of punitive damages in an appropriate 6 7 amount. 8 39. Plaintiff has suffered emotional and physical damage and

continues to suffer such damages all in an amount to be determined at time of trial.

40. Under the provisions of Cal. Civ. Code section 55 Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs as a result of having to bring this action. Plaintiff requests the court to award such fees in an appropriate amount.

VIII

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unfair And Unlawful Business Practice)

- 41. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.
- 42. California Business and Professions Code Section 17200 states in pertinent part:
 - "As used in this chapter, unfair competition shall mean and include any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act ... "
- 43. Defendants, as alleged herein, are in violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act and Title 24 of the California Building Code, in that they have denied equal access to their

Complaint for Damages - 14

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

1 places of public accommodation to Plaintiff and others similarly 2 situated to Plaintiff. Defendants have failed and refused and 3 continue to refuse to comply with equal access laws all in 4 violation of 42 USC 12181-12183; 42 USC 1981; and 42 USC 12188. In 5 addition the complained of acts are in violation of California 6 7 Civil Code Sections 51,52, 54, and 54.1, California Health and 8 Safety Code section 19955 and California Government Code section 12948 all of which require Defendants to provide equal access to 10 their facility to disabled persons such as plaintiff. Defendants 11 are also in violation of the indicated statutes because of their 12 13 failure to remove architectural barriers, which prevent equal 14 access to their facility by disabled persons and because of their 15 failure to modify their practices, policies and procedures to have 16 a scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and others similarly 17 situated to enter and utilize Defendants' services as required by 18 19 the Unruh Act. 20

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

28

27

21

22

23

24

25

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

Complaint for Damages - 16

9 10 11

13 14

12

15 16

18

17

19 20

22

23

21

24 25

26 27

28

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 barriers, Plaintiff would suffer emotional and/or mental distress because of such discrimination and disparate treatment. Defendants breached their duty of care to plaintiff by the perpetration of the acts outlined herein.

50. As a proximate result of the actions of Defendants Plaintiff did suffer emotional and mental stress and pain and suffering all in an amount to be determined at time of trial.

X

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 51. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of Action as though set forth fully herein.
- 52. The actions of Defendants and each of them are despicable, intentional and done with conscious disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff and as such should be regarded at outrageous.
- 53. As a proximate result of Defendants' actions Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional and mental distress all to his damage in an amount to be determined at time of trial.
- 54. Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive damages for this claim as the actions of Defendants are tantamount to outrageous conduct and subject them to exemplary damages.

DEMAND FOR JURY

1 55. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the claims made herein be heard and determined by a jury. 3 WHEREFORE PLAINTIFF PRAYS: 4 1. For general damages according to proof; 5 2. For special damages according to proof; 6 3. For damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code section 52, in the 7 amount of \$4,000 for each and every offense of California Civil 8 Code section 51, Title 24 of the California Building Code and the Americans With Disabilities Act. 10 4. For Injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 12188(a) and 11 California Business and Professions Code section 17200 5. For an award of attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1988, 42 12 U.S.C. 1981, 42 U.S.C. 12205 and Cal. Civ. Code section 55; 6. For treble damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code 52 (a); 14 15 7. For punitive damages according to proof; 16 8. For a Jury Trial; 17 9. For costs of suit incurred herein and; 18 10. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper. 19 Respectfully submitted, 20 Attorney for Plaintiff, GAYNOR CARLOCK 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Complaint for Damages - 18

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write brief statement of cause

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: 🗶 JURY DEMAND: U No (See

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) instructions): IF ANY

SIGNATURE

DOCKET NUMBER

ATTORNEY OF RECORD

JUDG

E

454 AMOUN \$150.90 APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE