

1 LAW OFFICES OF ROY L. LANDERS
2 ROY L. LANDERS (BAR #64920)
3 7840 MISSION CENTER COURT, SUITE 101
4 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92108
5 TELEPHONE (619) 296-7898
6 FACSIMILE (619) 296-5611

Handwritten initials: JL

7 Attorney for Plaintiff, Gaynor Carlock

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 WESTERN DIVISION

2004 SEP 15 PM 2:21
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FILED

ORIGINAL

11 GAYNOR CARLOCK,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 DEL TACO MANAGEMENT
15 SERVICES, INC., dba DEL TACO;
16 DEL TACO, INC.; AND DOES 1-10,
17 INCLUSIVE,
18 Defendants.

Case No.:

CV04-7660 DDP

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES RE:
VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS ON
BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION IN
PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS;
NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;
INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;
DECLARATORY RELIEF; UNFAIR
AND UNLAWFUL BUSINESS
PRACTICE; DEMAND FOR JURY
TRIAL

JWJ

19 I

20 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21 1. (a) Jurisdiction of this action is invoked on the basis of 28 USC 1331 and 1343, 42
22 USC 12101-12102, 12181-12183 and 12201, et. seq., which is applicable to causes of
23 action where persons with disabilities have been denied their civil rights. Venue in
24 the Central Judicial District of California in the United States District Court is in
25 accord with 28. U.S.C. Section 1391(b) because a substantial part of Plaintiff's claims
26 arose within the Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Central
27 District of California.

28 DOCKETED ON CM
SEP 23 2004

Handwritten signature: S

Handwritten circled number: 1

1 (b) Supplemental Jurisdiction. The Judicial District of the United States District
2 Court of the Central District of California has supplemental jurisdiction over the state
3 claims alleged in this Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1367(a).
4 Supplemental jurisdiction is appropriate in this action on the basis that all the causes
5 of action or claims derived from federal law and those arising under state law, as
6 herein alleged, arose from a common nucleus of operative facts. The common
7 nucleus of operative facts, include, but are not limited to, the incidents whereby
8 Plaintiff was denied full and equal access to Defendant's facilities, goods, and/or
9 services in violation of both federal and state laws when Plaintiff attempted to enter,
10 use, and/or exit Defendant's facilities as described within this Complaint. Further, due
11 to this denial of full and equal access, Plaintiff and other person's with disabilities
12 were injured. Based upon such allegations, the state actions, as stated herein, are so
13 related to the federal actions that they form part of the same case or controversy, and
14 the actions would ordinarily be expected to be tried in one judicial proceeding.

15 II

16 PARTIES

17 2. Defendants, Del Taco Management Services, Inc., dba Del Taco and Del Taco, Inc.
18 was and at all times herein mentioned, were duly organized businesses, associations,
19 or corporations duly authorized to exist and operate within the State of California and
20 County of Los Angeles and the owners, lessees, or tenants of the premises located at
21 3190 E. Pacific Coast Highway Long Beach, California.

22 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant Del Taco, Inc.
23 is also the owner and/or landlord of the subject property upon which Defendants'
24 business is sited.

25 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the named
26 defendants herein operate a business and or/facility of public accommodation as
27 defined and described within 42 USC 12181(7)(b) of the American with Disabilities
28

1 Act [ADA] and, as such, must comply with the ADA under provisions of Title III
2 therein.

3 5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the Defendants sued as Does 1-10 herein, and therefore sues
4 them in their fictitious names as Doe Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes
5 and thereon alleges that Does 1-10 are the owners, operators, lessees or tenants of the
6 subject property and each of the Doe Defendants at all times herein were acting as the
7 agent and or representative of each other and, thereby, are responsible in some
8 manner for the injuries and damages complained of herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of
9 the court to amend this complaint to name Doe Defendants when the same is
10 ascertained.

11 III

12 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS

13 6. Plaintiff is a male who is disabled and confined to a wheelchair. He has no
14 control over his lower extremities and must use a wheelchair to transport himself and
15 to affect the basic necessities of his everyday existence. Plaintiff's disability
16 substantially limits one or more of life's major activities and therefore he is disabled
17 as defined under section 42 USC 12102(2)(A)(B)(C).

18 7. On or about April 4, 2004 Plaintiff patronized the premises of Defendants to
19 utilize goods and/or services offered by Defendants. When Plaintiff attempted to
20 gain access to the goods and/or services offered by Defendants he encountered access
21 barriers because the premises failed to comply with federal ADA Access Guidelines
22 For Building and Facilities [hereinafter "ADAAG"]; Department of Justice [DOJ]
23 regulations at 28 CFR. 36.201; 36.304 and/or the State of California's Title 24
24 Building Code Requirements.

25 8. The specific difficulty Plaintiff had in entering and utilizing Defendants' facility
26 and which amount to a violation of ADAAG, DOJ regulations and Title 24 of the
27 California Building Code are:

28 a. Site entrance signage did not comply with Title 24 1129B.5

- b. Lack of van accessible parking as required by ADAAG 4.1.2(5)(b) and Title 24 1129B.4.2;
- c. Lack of access aisle No Parking signage per Title 24 1129B.4. 1&2;
- d. Lack of regular access aisle required by Title 24 1129B.4.1
- e. Lack of van accessible aisle as required by ADAAG 4.6.3 and Title 24 1129B.4.2
- f. Lack of proper signage required by ADAG 4.6.4;
- g. Facility failed to have shortest route of travel to an accessible entrance as required by ADAAG 4.6.2
- h. Lack of access route of travel required by ADAAG 4.1.3(2); 4.3.2(2) and title 24 1114B.1.2
- i. Facility disabled parking space signage is not at proper height as required by ADAAG 4.6.4 and Title 24 1129B.5
- j. Lack of parking space emblem as required by ADAAG 4.6.4
- k. Lack of entrance signage required by ADAAG 4.1.3(16)(b) and title 24 1127B.3
- l. Bathroom signage does not comply with ADAAG 4.30.6 and Title 24 1117B.5.9; ADAAG 4.30.4 and Title 24 1117B.5.5.2; Title 24 1117B.5.6.1&2
- m. Wall mount signage does not comply with ADAAG 4.1.2(7)(d) and title 24 1117B.5.1.1 & 5.6.3; ADAAG 4.30.6 and title 24 1117B.5.9
- n. Grab bars do not comply with ADAAG 4.17.6 and Title 24 115B.5.9; ADAAG 4.14.6 and Title 24 1115B.8.1; ADAAG 4.17.6;
- o. Flush valve is not on correct side as required by ADAAG 4.16.5 and Title 24 1502.0
- p. Hardware does not comply with ADAAG 4.13.9 and Title 24 1115B.7.1.4

9. 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.

1 10. Pursuant to Federal [ADA], Title 28 CFR 36.201; 36.203; 36.304; 36.305 and
2 state law [California Title 24], Defendants are required to remove barriers to their
3 existing facilities. Defendants have been put on notice pursuant to the ADA and
4 California Civil Codes [51,52] prior to the statutory effect of the ADA on January 26,
5 1992 that Defendants and each of them had a duty to remove barriers to persons with
6 disabilities such as plaintiff. Defendants also knew or should have known that
7 individuals such as Plaintiff with a disability are not required to give notice to a
8 governmental agency prior to filing suit alleging Defendants' failure to remove
9 architectural barriers.

10 11. Plaintiff believes and thereon allege that Defendants' facilities, as described
11 herein, have other access violations not directly experienced by Plaintiff, which
12 preclude or limit access by others with disabilities, including, but not limited to,
13 Space Allowances, Reach Ranges, Accessible Routes, Protruding Objects, Ground
14 and Floor Surfaces, Parking and Passenger Loading Zones, Curb Ramps, Ramps,
15 Stairs, Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair Lifts), Windows, Doors, Entrances,
16 Drinking Fountains, and Water Coolers, Water Closets, Toilet Stalls, Urinals,
17 Lavatories and Mirrors, Sinks, Storage, Handrails, Grab Bars, Telephones, Controls
18 and Operating Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings and Signage. Accordingly,
19 Plaintiff alleges Defendants are required to remove all architectural barriers, known
20 or unknown. Also, Plaintiff alleges Defendants are required to utilize the ADA
21 checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal approved by the United States
22 Department of Justice and created by Adaptive Environments.

23 12. Plaintiff desires to return to Defendants' places of business and utilize their
24 facilities without being discriminated against in the immediate future.

25 //

26 //

27 //

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
27
28

IV

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Civil Rights-American With Disabilities Act)

13. Plaintiff realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 12 as though set forth fully herein.

Claim 1: Denial of Full and Equal Access

14. Based on the facts asserted above Plaintiff has been denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations. Defendant business 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) and 42 U.S.C. section 12188 because Plaintiff was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

15. 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

16. 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) and 28 CFR 36.304. Plaintiff is informed and

1 believes, and thus alleges that architectural barriers which are structural in nature
2 exist at the following physical elements of Defendants' facilities:

3 Space Allowance and Reach Ranges, Accessible Route, Protruding Objects, Ground
4 and Floor Surfaces, Parking and Passenger Loading Zones, Curb Ramps, Ramps,
5 Stairs, Elevators, Platform Lifts (Wheelchair Lifts), Windows, Doors, Entrances,
6 Drinking Fountains and Water Coolers, Water Closets, Toilet Stalls, Urinals,
7 Lavatories and Mirrors, Sinks, Storage, Handrails, Grab Bars, and Controls and
8 Operating Mechanisms, Alarms, Detectable Warnings, Signage, and Telephones.

9 Pursuant to 42 USC section 12182(b)(2)(iv) and 28 CFR 36.304 Title III requires
10 places of public accommodation to remove architectural barriers that are structural in
11 nature within existing facilities. Failure to remove such barriers and disparate
12 treatment against a person who has a known association with a person with a
13 disability are forms of prohibited discrimination. Accordingly, Plaintiff was subjected
14 to discrimination in violation of 42 USC 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 USC 12182
15 (b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 USC 12188.

16 **Claim 3: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures**

17 17. Based on the facts alleged in this Complaint Defendants failed and refused to
18 provide a reasonable alternative by modifying its practices, policies and procedures in
19 that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and/or others
20 similarly situated in entering and utilizing Defendants' services, as required by 42
21 U.S.C. Section 12188(a). Thus, Plaintiff was subjected to discrimination in violation
22 of 42 U.S.C. section 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 28 CFR 36.302 and 42 U.S.C. section 12188
23 because Plaintiff was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

24 18. As a result of the wrongful and discriminatory practices of defendants, plaintiff
25 has suffered actual damages consisting of special damages and general damages in an
26 amount to be determined at time of trial herein.

27 19. Pursuant to the provisions of 42 USC 12188 plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and
28 an order directing defendants to cease and desist from discriminating against plaintiff

1 and others similarly situated and for an order that defendants comply with the
2 Americans With Disabilities Act forthwith.

3 20. Under the provisions of 42 USC 12205 Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
4 reasonably attorneys fees and requests that the court grant such fees as are
5 appropriate.

6 **VI**

7 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Violation Of Civil Rights Under California Accessibility Laws)**

9 21. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the First Cause of Action as though set forth
10 fully herein.

11 **(a) Denial Of Full And Equal Access**

12 22. Plaintiff has been denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods services,
13 facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations within a public accommodation
14 owned, leased, and/or operated by Defendants in violation of California Civil Code
15 Sections 54 and 54.1 and California Health and Safety Code Section 19955. The
16 actions of Defendants also violate the provisions of Title 24 of the State of California
17 Building Codes with regard to accessibility for persons with disabilities by failing to
18 provide access to Defendants facilities due to violations pertaining to accessible
19 routes, ground and floor surfaces, parking and passenger loading zones, curb ramps,
20 ramps, stairs, elevators, platform lifts (wheelchair lifts), windows, doors, toilet stalls,
21 urinals, lavatories and mirrors, sinks, storage, handrails, grab bars, controls and
22 operating mechanisms
23 alarms, detectable warnings, signage and telephones.

24 23. On the above basis Plaintiff has been wrongfully discriminated against.

25 **(b) Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures**

26 24. Defendants have failed and refused and continue to fail and refuse to provide a
27 reasonable alternative to allow plaintiff equal access to their facility by modifying
28 their practices, policies, and procedures in that that they failed to have s scheme, plan,

1 or design to assist Plaintiff and others similarly situated in entering and utilizing
2 Defendants' goods or services as required by California Civil Code section 54 and
3 54.1. Accordingly Defendants have wrongfully discriminated against Plaintiff.

4 **VII**

5 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Violation of The Unruh Civil Rights Act)**

7 25. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Second Cause of Action as though set
8 forth fully herein.

9 26. Section 51(b) of the Cal. Civ. Code [The Unruh Civil Rights Act], provides in
10 pertinent part:

11 "All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are
12 free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color,
13 religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, or medical
14 condition is entitled to the full and equal accommodations,
15 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all
16 business establishments of every kind whatsoever."

17 27. Defendants have violated the provisions of Civ. Code 51 (b) by
18 failing and refusing to provide free and equal access to Plaintiff to their facility on the
19 same basis as other persons not disabled. By their failure to provide equal access to
20 Plaintiff as herein alleged, Defendants have also violated 42 U.S.C. section
21 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) as provided in Cal. Civ. Codes section 51(f).

22 28. By reason of their acts and denial of Plaintiff's civil rights Defendants also
23 violated the provisions of Cal. Civ. Code section 52, which makes a person or entity
24 in violation of Cal.Civ. Code 51 liable for the actual damages to a Plaintiff including
25 treble damages where appropriate.
26
27
28

1 29. Defendants and each of them, at all times prior to and including April 2004,
2 respectively and continuing to the present time, knew that persons with physical
3 disabilities were denied their rights of equal access to all portions of this public
4 facility. Despite such knowledge, Defendants, and each of them, failed and refused to
5 take steps to comply with the applicable access statutes and despite knowledge of the
6 resulting problems and denial of civil rights suffered by Plaintiff and other similarly
7 situated persons with disabilities.
8
9
10

11 30. Defendants and each of them have failed and refused to take action to grant full
12 and equal access to person with physical disabilities. Defendants have carried out a
13 course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or correct complaints about unequal
14 access and have refused to comply with their legal obligations to make the subject
15 facility accessible pursuant the ADAAG and the California Building Code [Title 24
16 of the California Code of Regulations]. Such actions and continuing course of
17 conduct by Defendants, and each of them, evidence despicable conduct in conscious
18 disregard of the rights and/or safety of Plaintiff and those similarly situated and thus
19 justify an award of treble damages pursuant to section 52(a) and 54.3(a) of the
20 Cal.Civ. Code or alternatively an award of punitive damages in an appropriate
21 amount.
22
23
24
25
26

27 31. Plaintiff has suffered emotional and physical damage and continues to suffer such
28 damages all in an amount to be determined at time of trial.

1 32. Under the provisions of Cal. Civ. Code section 55 Plaintiff seeks an award of
2 reasonable attorney's fees and costs as a result of having to bring this action. Plaintiff
3 requests the court to award such fees in an appropriate amount.
4

5 **VIII**

6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)**

8
9
10 33. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Third Cause of Action as though set forth
11 fully herein.

12 34. Defendants and each of them owed a duty to Plaintiff to make their facility
13 accessible and to keep Plaintiff reasonably safe from known dangers and risks of
14 harm. This duty arises by virtue of the legal duties proscribed by various federal and
15 state statutes including, but not limited to, ADA, ADAAG, California Civil Code
16 sections 51, 52, 54, 54.1 and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.
17

18 Defendants had a duty of due care not to do or cause anything to happen that would
19 subject Plaintiff to undue stress, embarrassment, chagrin, and discouragement.
20

21 35. Defendants breached their duty of care to Plaintiff by the actions and inaction
22 complained of herein and as a result thereof Plaintiff was shocked, discouraged,
23 embarrassed and outraged at the callousness and disregard of Defendants. Defendants
24 knew or had reason to know that by denying Plaintiff equal access to their facility and
25 failing and refusing to remove architectural barriers, Plaintiff would suffer emotional
26
27
28

1 and/or mental distress because of such discrimination and disparate treatment.

2
3 Defendants breached their duty of care to plaintiff by the perpetration of the acts
4 outlined herein.

5 36. As a proximate result of the actions of Defendants Plaintiff did suffer emotional
6 and mental stress and pain and suffering all in an amount to be determined at time of
7 trial.
8

9
10 **IX**

11 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)**

13 37. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of the Fourth Cause of Action as though set
14 forth fully herein.

15 38. The actions of Defendants and each of them are despicable, intentional and done
16 with conscious disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff and as such should be
17 regarded at outrageous.

18 39. As a proximate result of Defendants' actions Plaintiff has suffered severe
19 emotional and mental distress all to his damage in an amount to be determined at time
20 of trial.

21 40. Plaintiff seeks an award of punitive damages for this claim as the actions of
22 Defendants are tantamount to outrageous conduct and subject them to exemplary
23 damages.

24 **X**

25 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **(DECLARATORY RELIEF)**

27 41. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation
28 contained in paragraphs 1-40 of this complaint as though set forth fully herein.

1 42. An actual controversy now exists in that plaintiff is informed and believes and
2 thereon alleges that Defendants' premises are in violation of the disabled access laws
3 of the State of California including, but not limited to, Civil Code Sections 51, et seq.,
4 Section 52, et seq., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and Title III of the
5 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Americans with Disabilities Access
6 Guidelines (ADAAG).

7 43. A declaration of Plaintiff's rights is necessary and appropriate in order for the
8 parties to this action to know their respective rights and duties. Accordingly, the court
9 should make a declaration of the rights of the parties.

10 IX

11 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 44. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation
13 contained in paragraphs 1-43 of this complaint as though set forth fully herein.

14 45. Pursuant to the provisions of California Business and Professions Code section
15 17200 and 17204 plaintiff has standing to bring this action on behalf of himself and
16 the general public based upon the allegation that the act or acts of defendants herein
17 are unlawful, unfair or fraudulent. Plaintiff brings this action, in part, on the basis that
18 defendants' actions are unlawful and unfair as alleged within this complaint and that
19 plaintiff, as a member of the public, brings this action on behalf of him and the
20 general public.

21 46. Pursuant to the provisions of section 17200 plaintiff seeks relief for the past acts
22 of discrimination against him and the general public and persons similarly situated as
23 he and for injunctive relief to enjoin further and future continued discrimination by
24 defendants in the denial of access to public accommodations as required under the
25 ADA, ADAAG and Title 24 of the California Building Code.

26 WHEREFORE PLAINTIFF PRAYS:

- 27 1. For general damages according to proof;
28 2. For special damages according to proof;

- 1 3. For damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code section 52, in the amount of \$4,000 for
- 2 each and every offense of California Civil Code section 51, Title 24 of the California
- 3 Building Code and the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 4 4. For Injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 12188(a); Unfair and Unlawful
- 5 Business Practices and for declaratory relief;
- 6 5. For an award of attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1988, 42 U.S.C. 12205 and
- 7 Cal. Civ. Code section 55;
- 8 6. For treble damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code 52 (a);
- 9 7. For punitive damages according to proof;
- 10 8. For a Jury Trial;
- 11 9. For costs of suit incurred herein and;
- 12 10. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

13 **DEMAND FOR JURY**

14 Plaintiff respectfully requests that the claims made herein be heard and determined by

15 a jury.

16 Respectfully submitted,

THE LAW OFFICES OF ROY L. LANDERS

17

18 Dated: 9/6/84

By: 

Attorney for Plaintiff,
Gaynor Carlock