















GEP 7/12/04 15:23

3:04-CV-01383 PINNOCK V. CALIFORNIA PRODUCE

1

CMP.

35004

FILED

PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD 04 JUL -9 PM 1:51

A Professional Corporation Michelle L. Wakefield, Esq. Bar 200424 David C. Wakefield, Esq. 185736

3033 Fifth Ave., Suite 410 San Diego, CA 92103

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Telephone: (619) 858-3671 Facsimile: (619) 858-3646

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

> '04 CV 1383 LAB (LSP)

MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE, SUING | Case No.: ON BEHALF OF THEODORE A. PINNOCK AND ITS MEMBERS; and THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CALIFORNIA PRODUCE; CALIFORNIA PRODUCE, INC.; TODD AL-BAYATI; SAMIYA ABDUL SATTAR KADDORY; And DOES 1 THROUGH 10, Inclusive

Defendants.

DEPUTY

CIVIL COMPLAINT: DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

[42 U.S.C. 12182(a) ET. SEQ; CIVIL CODE 51, 52, 54, 54.1]

NEGLIGENCE [CIVIL CODE 1714(a), 2338, 3333; EVIDENCE CODE 669(a)]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL [F.R.Civ.P. rule 38(b); Civ.L.R. 38.1]

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE SUING ON BEHALF OF THEODORE A. PINNOCK AND ITS MEMBERS and THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual, herein complain, by filing this Civil Complaint in accordance with rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in the Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Southern District of California, that Defendants have in the past, and presently are, engaging in discriminatory practices against

individuals with disabilities, specifically including minorities with disabilities. Plaintiffs allege this civil action and others substantial similar thereto are necessary to compel access compliance because empirical research on the effectiveness of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act indicates this Title has failed to achieve full and equal access simply by the executive branch of the Federal Government funding and promoting voluntary compliance efforts. Further, empirical research shows when individuals with disabilities give actual notice of potential access problems to places of public accommodation without a federal civil rights action, the public accommodations do not remove the access barriers. Therefore, Plaintiffs make the following allegations in this federal civil rights action:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The federal jurisdiction of this action is based on the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 United States Code 12101-12102, 12181-12183 and 12201, et seq. Venue in the Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Southern District of California is in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of Plaintiffs' claims arose within the Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Southern District of California.

SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION

2. The Judicial District of the United States District Court of the Southern District of California has supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims as alleged in this Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). The reason supplemental jurisdiction is proper

in this action is because all the causes of action or claims derived from federal law and those arising under state law, as herein alleged, arose from common nucleus of operative facts. The common nucleus of operative facts, include, but are not limited to, the incidents where Plaintiff's Member Theodore A. Pinnock was denied full and equal access to Defendants' facilities, goods, and/or services in violation of both federal and state laws when they attempted to enter, use, and/or exit Defendants' facilities as described below within this Complaint. Further, due to this denial of full and equal access, Theodore A. Pinnock and other persons with disabilities were injured. Based upon the said 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.

NAMED DEFENDANTS AND NAMED PLAINTIFFS

3. Defendants are, and, at all times mentioned herein, were, a business or corporation or franchise organized and existing and/or doing business under the laws of the State of California.

Defendant CALIFORNIA PRODUCE is located at 1736 East Plaza Boulevard, National City, California 91950. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendant CALIFORNIA PRODUCE, INC. is the owner, operator, and/or doing business as CALIFORNIA PRODUCE. Defendant CALIFORNIA PRODUCE, INC. is located at 1736 East Plaza Boulevard, National City, California 91950. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants TODD AL-BAYATI and SAMIYA ABDUL SATTAR KADDORY are the

owners, operators, and/or lessors of the property located at 1736
East Plaza Boulevard, National City, California 91950, Assessor
Parcel Number 557-420-30. Defendants TODD AL-BAYATI and SAMIYA
ABDUL SATTAR KADDORY are located at 1917 Corona Vista, El Cajon,
California 92019. The words "Plaintiffs" and "Plaintiff's Member"
as used herein specifically include the organization MANTIC
ASHANTI'S CAUSE, its Members, its member Theodore A. Pinnock and
persons associated with its Members who accompanied Members to
Defendants' facilities, as well as THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An
Individual.

- 4. Defendants Does 1 through 10, were at all times relevant herein subsidiaries, employers, employees, agents, of CALIFORNIA PRODUCE; CALIFORNIA PRODUCE, INC.; TODD AL-BAYATI; and SAMIYA ABDUL SATTAR KADDORY. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will pray leave of the court to amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the Does when ascertained.
- 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants and each of them herein were, at all times relevant to the action, the owner, lessor, lessee, franchiser, franchisee, general partner, limited partner, agent, employee, representing partner, or joint venturer of the remaining Defendants and were acting within the course and scope of that relationship.

 Plaintiffs are further informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each of the Defendants herein gave consent to, ratified,

Defendants.

3

5

6 7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

and/or authorized the acts alleged herein to each of the remaining

CONCISE SET OF FACTS

- Plaintiff MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE is an organization that advocates on the behalf of its members with disabilities when their civil rights and liberties have been violated. Plaintiff's member THEODORE A. PINNOCK is a member of Plaintiff Organization and has an impairment in that he has Cerebral Palsy and due to this impairment he has learned to successfully operate a wheelchair.
- On May 27, 2004, Plaintiff's member THEODORE A. PINNOCK went to Defendants' CALIFORNIA PRODUCE facilities to utilize their goods and/or services. When Plaintiff's member patronized Defendants' CALIFORNIA PRODUCE facilities, he was unable to use and/or had difficulty using the public accommodations' disabled parking, exterior path of travel, entrance, and interior path of travel facilities at Defendants' business establishment because they failed to comply with ADA Access Guidelines For Buildings and Facilities (hereafter referred to as "ADAAG") and/or California's Title 24 Building Code Requirements. Defendants failed to remove access barriers within the disabled parking, exterior path of travel, entrance, and interior path of travel facilities of Defendants' CALIFORNIA PRODUCE establishment.
- Plaintiff's member personally experienced difficulty with said access barriers at Defendants' CALIFORNIA PRODUCE facilities. For example, the parking facility of Defendants' establishment is inaccessible. There are two (2) entryways into the parking lot,

2 3 5 7 10 11 entrance, as members of the disability community are forced to 12 traverse through vehicular traffic without the benefit of a marked 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

path of travel.

both of which fail to have the required signage warning motorists that anyone illegally parking in a disabled parking space would be towed/fined or both. The parking facility has a total of seventeen (17) parking spaces, none of which are a disabled parking space. It is required that there is at least one (1) "van accessible" disabled parking space that is eighteen feet (18') long, nine feet (9') wide and has an access aisle that is eight feet (8') wide. The exterior path of travel of the Defendants' establishment is inaccessible. There fails to be a safe and accessible path of travel from the public sidewalk to the primary accessible

The entrance to the Defendants establishment is inaccessible, as there are parking spaces painted directly in front of the entrance, which causes said entrance to be inaccessible to disabled patrons when vehicles are parked there. The entrance door fails to have the required disability signage.

The seating in the bar area is inaccessible. There are twelve (12) seats located in the bar area, all of which have a knee clearance depth of only fourteen inches (14"). It is required that five percent 5% of all seats have a knee clearance depth of at least nineteen inches (19").

12. The interior path of travel of the Defendants' establishment is inaccessible, as it is as narrow as twenty-seven inches (27"), when it is required to be at least thirty-six inches (36") if items are displayed on one side of the aisle and forty-four inches (44") if items are displayed on both sides of the aisle.

13. Pursuant to federal and state law, Defendants are required to remove barriers to their existing facilities. Further, Defendants had actual knowledge of their barrier removal duties under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Civil Code before January 26, 1992. Also, Defendants should have known that individuals with disabilities are not required to give notice to a governmental agency before filing suit alleging Defendants failed to remove architectural barriers.

Plaintiffs believe and herein allege Defendants' facilities have access violations not directly experienced by Plaintiff's Member which preclude or limit access by others with disabilities, including, but not limited to, 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. Accordingly, Plaintiffs allege Defendants are required to remove all architectural barriers, known or unknown. Also, Plaintiffs allege 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.

15. Based on these facts, Plaintiffs allege Plaintiff's Member

and Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock was discriminated against each

28

27

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 time he patronized Defendants' establishments. Plaintiff's Member 2 and Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock was extremely upset due to 3 Defendants' conduct. Further, Plaintiff's Member and Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK experienced pain in his legs, back, arms, shoulders and wrists when he attempted to enter, use, and exit 6 Defendants' CALIFORNIA PRODUCE establishment. 7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

WHAT CLAIMS ARE PLAINTIFFS ALLEGING AGAINST EACH NAMED DEFENDANT

16. CALIFORNIA PRODUCE; CALIFORNIA PRODUCE, INC.; TODD AL-BAYATI; SAMIYA ABDUL SATTAR KADDORY; and Does 1 through 10 will be referred to collectively hereinafter as "Defendants."

17. Plaintiffs aver that the Defendants are liable for the following claims as alleged below:

DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS- Claims Under The Americans With Disabilities Act Of 1990

CLAIM I AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Denial Of Full And Equal Access

18. Based on the facts plead at \P 6-15 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff's Member was denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations. Plaintiffs allege Defendants are a public accommodation owned, leased and/or operated by Defendants. Defendants' existing facilities and/or services failed to provide full and equal access to Defendants' facility as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Thus, Plaintiff's Member was subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188 because Plaintiff's

28

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

١ Member was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities. 2 Plaintiff's member Theodore A. Pinnock has physical impairments as alleged in ¶ 6 above because his conditions affect one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, and/or cardiovascular. Further, Plaintiff's member Theodore A. Pinnock's said physical impairments substantially limits one or more of the following major life activities: walking. In addition, Plaintiff's member Theodore A. Pinnock 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's member Theodore A. Pinnock has a history of or has been classified as having a physical impairment as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2)(A). CLAIM II AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Failure To Make Alterations In Such A Manner That The Altered Portions Of The Facility Are Readily Accessible And Usable By Individuals With Disabilities Based on the facts plead at \P 6-15 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff's Member Theodore A. Pinnock 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 Defendants. Defendants altered their facility in a manner that affects or could affect the usability of the facility or a part of the facility after January 26, 1992. In performing the alteration, Defendants failed to make the alteration in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with

disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs, in

violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183(a)(2).

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

21. Additionally, the Defendants undertook an alteration that affects or could affect the usability of or access to an area of the facility containing a primary function after January 26, 1992. Defendants further failed to make the alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities in violation 42 U.S.C. §12183(a)(2). 22. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12183(a), this failure to make the alterations in a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities constitutes discrimination for purposes of 42 U.S.C. §12183(a). Therefore, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff's Member Theodore A. Pinnock in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Thus, Plaintiff's Member Theodore A. Pinnock was subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a), 42 U.S.C. §12182(a) and 42 U.S.C. §12188 because said Member Theodore A. Pinnock was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities.

CLAIM III AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Failure To Remove Architectural Barriers

24. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-15 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff's Member 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 Defendants. Defendants failed to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

remove barriers as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thus allege that architectural barriers which are structural in nature exist within 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. Title III requires places of public accommodation to remove architectural barriers that are structural in nature to existing facilities. [See, 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).] 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 discrimination. [See 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).] Thus, Plaintiff's Member was subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188 because said Member was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities. CLAIM IV AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Failure To Modify Practices,

CLAIM IV AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures

25. Based on the facts plead at $\P\P$ 6-15 above and elsewhere 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's Member and/or others similarly situated in 2 entering and utilizing Defendants' services, as required by 42 3 U.S.C. § 12188(a). Thus, said Member was subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188 because said Member was denied equal access to Defendants' existing facilities. 7 Based on the facts plead at \P 6-15 above, Claims I, II, and 26. 8 III of Plaintiffs' First Cause Of Action above, and the facts elsewhere herein this complaint, Plaintiffs will suffer 10 irreparable harm unless Defendants are ordered to remove 11 architectural, non-architectural, and communication barriers at 12 Defendants' public accommodation. Plaintiffs allege that 13 Defendants' discriminatory conduct is capable of repetition, and 14 this discriminatory repetition adversely impacts Plaintiffs and a 15 substantial segment of the disability community. Plaintiffs 16 allege there is a national public interest in requiring 17 accessibility in places of public accommodation. Plaintiffs have 18 no adequate remedy at law to redress the discriminatory conduct of 19 Defendants. Plaintiff's Member desires to return to Defendants' 20 places of business in the immediate future. Accordingly, the 21 Plaintiffs allege that a structural or mandatory injunction is 22 necessary to enjoin compliance with federal civil rights laws 23 enacted for the benefit of individuals with disabilities. 24 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment and relief as 27. hereinafter set forth. 26 /// 27

28

///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS - CLAIMS UNDER CALIFORNIA ACCESSIBILITY LAWS

CLAIM I: Denial Of Full And Equal Access

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Based on the facts plead at \P 6-15 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff's Member 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 Defendants as required by Civil Code Sections 54 and 54.1. Defendants' facility violated California's Title 24 Accessible Building Code by failing to provide access to Defendants' facilities due to violations pertaining to the 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.

29. These violations denied Plaintiff's Member full and equal access to Defendants' facility. Thus, said Member was subjected to discrimination pursuant to Civil Code §§ 51, 52, and 54.1 because Plaintiff's Member was denied full, equal and safe access to Defendants' facility, causing severe emotional distress.

CLAIM II: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures

30. Based on the facts plead at $\P\P$ 6-15 above and elsewhere herein this complaint, Defendants failed and refused to provide a reasonable alternative by modifying its practices, policies, and

24

26

27

28

procedures in that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff's Member and/or others similarly situated in entering and utilizing Defendants' services as required by Civil Code § 54.1. Thus, said Member was subjected to discrimination in violation of Civil Code § 54.1.

CLAIM III: Violation Of The Unruh Act

31. Based on the facts plead at $\P\P$ 6-15 above and elsewhere herein this complaint and because Defendants violated the Civil Code § 51 by failing to comply with 42 United States Code § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2), Defendants did and continue to discriminate against Plaintiff's Member and persons similarly situated in violation of Civil Code §§ 51, 52, and 54.1. Based on the facts plead at $\P\P$ 6-17 above, Claims I, II, and III of Plaintiffs' Second Cause Of Action above, and the facts elsewhere herein this complaint, Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable harm unless Defendants are ordered to remove architectural, non-architectural, and communication barriers at Defendants' public accommodation. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' discriminatory conduct is capable of repetition, and this discriminatory repetition adversely impacts Plaintiffs and a substantial segment of the disability community. Plaintiffs allege there is a state and national public interest in requiring accessibility in places of public accommodation. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to redress the discriminatory conduct of Defendants. Plaintiff's Member desires to return to Defendants' places of business in the immediate future. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs allege that a structural or mandatory injunction is

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

necessary to enjoin compliance with state civil rights laws enacted for the benefit of individuals with disabilities.

33. Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for damages and relief as hereinafter stated.

Treble Damages Pursuant To Claims I, II, III Under The California Accessibility Laws

Defendants, each of them respectively, at times prior to and including, the month of May, 2004, and continuing to the present time, knew that persons with physical disabilities were denied their rights of equal access to all potions 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 thereby suffered by Plaintiff's Member THEODORE A. PINNOCK and other similarly situated persons with Defendants, and each of them, have failed and disabilities. refused to take action to grant full and equal access to persons with physical disabilities in the respects complained of Defendants, and each of them, have carried out a hereinabove. course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or correct complaints about, denial of disabled access and have refused to comply with their legal obligations to make Defendants' CALIFORNIA PRODUCE facilities accessible pursuant to the Americans With Disability Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG) and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (also known as the California Building Code). 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's Member and of other similarly

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

situated persons, justifying an award of treble damages pursuant to sections 52(a) and 54.3(a) of the California Civil Code.

35. Defendants', and each of their, actions have also been oppressive to persons with physical disabilities and of other members of the public, and have evidenced actual or implied malicious intent toward those members of the public, such as Plaintiff's Member and other persons with physical disabilities who have been denied the proper access to which they are entitled by law. Further, Defendants', and each of their, refusals on a day-to-day basis to correct these problems evidence despicable conduct in conscious disregard for the rights of Plaintiff's Member THEODORE A. PINNOCK and other members of the public with physical disabilities.

36. Plaintiffs pray for an award of treble damages against Defendants, and each of them, pursuant to California Civil Code sections 52(a) and 54.3(a), in an amount sufficient to make a more profound example of Defendants and encourage owners, lessors, and operators of other public facilities from willful disregard of the rights of persons with disabilities. Plaintiffs do not know the financial worth of Defendants, or the amount of damages sufficient to accomplish the public purposes of section 52(a) of the California Civil Code and section 54.3 of the California Civil Code.

37. Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for damages and relief as hereinafter stated.

||///

|///

PLAINTIFF THEODORE A. PINNOCK'S THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS- Negligence as to Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK only

38. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 6-15 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Defendants owed Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock a statutory duty to make their facility accessible and owed

Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock a duty to keep Plaintiff Theodore A. Pinnock reasonably safe from known dangers and risks of harm.

This said duty arises by virtue of legal duties proscribed by various federal and state statutes including, but not limited to, ADA, ADAAG, Civil Code 51, 52, 54, 54.1 and Title 24 of the California Administrative Code and applicable 1982 Uniform Building Code standards as amended.

- 39. Title III of the ADA mandates removal of architectural barriers and prohibits disability discrimination. As well, Defendants' facility, and other goods, services, and/or facilities provided to the public by Defendants are not accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities as required by Health and Safety Code § 19955 which requires private entities to make their facility accessible before and after remodeling, and to remove architectural barriers.
- 40. Therefore, Defendants engaged in discriminatory conduct in that they failed to comply with known duties under the ADA, ADAAG, Civil Code 51, 52, 54, 54.1, 54.3, ADAAG, and Title 24, and knew or should have known that their acts of nonfeasance would cause Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK emotional, bodily and personal injury. Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK alleges that there was bodily injury in this matter because when Plaintiff THEODORE A.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

PINNOCK attempted to enter, use, and exit Defendants' establishment, Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK experienced pain in his legs, back, arms, shoulders, and wrists. Plaintiffs further allege that such conduct was done in reckless disregard of the probability of said conduct causing Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK to suffer bodily or personal injury, anger, embarrassment, depression, anxiety, mortification, humiliation, distress, and fear of physical injury. Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual, alleges that such conduct caused THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual, to suffer the injuries of mental and emotional distress, including, but not limited to, anger, embarrassment, depression, anxiety, mortification, humiliation, distress, and fear of physical injury. Plaintiff THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual, additionally alleges that such conduct caused THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual, to suffer damages as a result of these injuries.

41. Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for damages and relief as hereinafter stated.

DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT FOR RELIEF:

- A. For general damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52, 54.3, 3281, and 3333;
- B. For \$4,000 in damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 for each and every offense of Civil Code § 51, Title 24 of the California Building Code, ADA, and ADA Accessibility Guidelines;
- C. In the alternative to the damages pursuant to Cal. Civil
 Code § 52 in Paragraph B above, for \$1,000 in damages pursuant to
 Cal. Civil Code § 54.3 for each and every offense of Civil Code §

Dated: July 8, 2004

> MICHELLE L. WAKEFIELD, ÉSQ. DAVID C. WAKEFIELD, ESQ. Attorneys for Plaintiffs

27 28

24

25

26

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing 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 SECOND PAGE OF THIS FORM.) DEFENDANTS CALIFORNIA PRODUCE; CALIFORNIA PRODUCE, INC.; TODD MANTIC ASHANTI'S CAUSE, SUING ON BEHALF OF AL-BAYATI; SAMIYA ABDUL SATTAR KADDORY; And DOES 1 THEODORE A. PINNOCK AND ITS MEMBERS; And THOME TO PLACE USIVE THEODORE A. PINNOCK, An Individual LERK. U.S. DISTRICT CO OTHERN DISTRICT GEGALVIO (b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED San Diego COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT **PLAINTIFF** (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) San Diego (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED DEPUTY ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN) (c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER) '04 CV 1383 SBN: 200424 LAB (LSP) Michelle L. Wakefield, Esq. SBN: 185736 David C. Wakefield, Esq. Pinnock & Wakefield, A.P.C.; 3033 Fifth Avenue, Suite 410 San Diego, CA 92103 Telephone: (619) 858-3671; Facsimile: (619) 858-3646 THE CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY) (For Diversity Cases Only) FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT PTDEF PTDEF ☑ 3 Federal Question ■ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff Citizen of This State ☐ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State (U.S. Government Not a Party) Citizen of Another State ☐2 ☐2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business ☐5 ☐5 in Another State 2U.S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III Citizen or Subject of a Foreign □3 Foreign Nation \square_6 \square_6 Country IV. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE US CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE. DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY). 42 U.S.C. Sections 12101-12102, 12181-12183, and 12201, Et. Seq. V. NATURE OF SUIT (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY) FORFEITURE/PENALTY TORTS BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES CONTRACT PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 400 State Reappointment 110 Insurance 3 610 Agriculture 🗆 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 410 Antitrust ☐ Marine 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury 620 Other Food & Drug 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS Medical Malpractice 430 Banks and Banking Miller Act 25 Drug Related Seizure 315 Airolane Product Liability Of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ Negotiable hirtrument ☐ 365 Personal Injury 20 Copyrights 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 320 Assault, Libel & Slander Product Liability 460 Deportation 330 Federal Employers' 3630 Liquor Laws 2830 Patent 150 Recovery of overpayment &Enforcement of Judgment Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury B40 Trademark 470 Racketeer Influenced and 3640 RR & Truck Corrupt Organizations SOCIAL SECURITY Product Liability 3650 Airline Regs 340 Marine 151 Medicare Act PERSONAL PROPERTY 🗖 861 HIA (13958) 660 Occupational Safety#H 🗖 810 Selective Service 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student 345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud Loan (Excl. Veterans) 90 Other 2 850 Securities/Commodities 262 Black Lung (923) LAROR Exchange 371 Truth in Lending 🔲 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 153 Recovery of Overpayment ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle 710 Fair Labor Standards Act of Veterans Benefits 380 Other Personal 2864 SSID TIBE XVI 🗖 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability Property Damage 20 Labor/Mgmt Relations 2891 Agricultural Acts 160 Stockholders Suits ☐ 865 R\$I (405(q)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 385 Property Damage 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & 892 Economic Stabilization. Act Other Contract 360 Other Personal Injury Product Liability Disclosure Act 893 Environmental Matters 🔲 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 195 Contract Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS CIVIL RIGHTS **REAL PROPERTY** 2 894 Energy Altocation Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 895 Freedom of Information Act 210 Land Condemnation 3441 Voting 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 871 IRS - Third Party 26 USC 7609 Habeas Corpus 220 Forectosure 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 900 Appeal of Fee Determination 442 Employment Under Equal Access to Justice Security Act 230 Rent Lease & Electment 443 Housing/Accommodations 530 General 950 Constitutionality of State 240 Tort to Land A44 Welfare 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Other 890 Other Statutory Actions 245 Tort Product Liability 440 Other Civil Rights 550 CMI Rights 290 All Other Real Property 555 Prisoner Condition VI. ORIGIN (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY) ☑ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removal from ☐ 3 Remanded from Appelate ☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ 5 Transferred from ☐6 Multidistrict Litigation ☐7 Appeal to District Judge from State Court Reopened another district (specify) Magistrate Judgment Court VII. REQUESTED IN Check YES only if demanded in DEMAND \$ ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT: complaint: UNDER fr.c.p. 23 To Be Determined At Trial JURYDEMAND Z YES NO VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See Instructions): JUDGE Docket Number SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD DATE July 8, 2004

105285 1500

7/9/07

TORNEY OF RECORD

7 Kichelle Lackeflk