

1 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP  
MARK D. POTTER, ESQ., SBN 166317  
2 RUSSELL C. HANDY, ESQ., SBN 195058  
JAMES R. BOYD, ESQ., SBN175597  
3 STEVE WEDEL, ESQ. SBN 214908  
P.O. Box 34606  
4 San Diego, CA 92163-4606  
(619) 291-7593  
5 Fax: (619) 725-0720

001/199  
OFFICE 13  
2002 JUL 18 P 12:08

6 Attorney for Plaintiff, CHRIS LANGER,

3026 01 07 GIC 792466  
02 001 New CIVIL

7  
8  
9 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
10 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
11

12 CHRIS LANGER, ) Case No.: GIC 792466  
13 )  
14 Plaintiff, ) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND  
15 ) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS  
16 v. ) OF: UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT;  
17 ) CALIFORNIA'S DISABLED PERSON ACT;  
18 ESCONDIDO INVESTMENT, LLC; WGM ) NEGLIGENCE; CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR  
19 BEVERAGE CORPORATION, and DOES 1 ) BUSINESS PRACTICE ACT.  
through 10, inclusive )  
20 Defendants. ) DEMAND FOR JURY  
21 )  
22 )  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )  
28 )

20 Plaintiff CHRIS LANGER, (hereinafter referred to as  
21 "Plaintiff") complains of ESCONDIDO INVESTMENT, LLC; WGM BEVERAGE  
22 CORPORATION, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, (hereinafter referred  
23 to as "Defendants") and alleges as follows:

24 INTRODUCTION:

25 1. This is a Civil Rights action for discrimination against  
26 persons with physical disabilities, of which Plaintiff is a member  
27 of said class, for failure to remove architectural barriers  
28

ORIGINAL  
ACCOUNTING

1 structural in nature at Defendants' place of business, located at  
2 1881 S. Escondido Blvd., Escondido California, a place of public  
3 accommodation; and for failure to modify practices and or policies  
4 in order to accommodate, thereby discriminatorily denying Plaintiff  
5 and the class of other similarly situated persons with physical  
6 disabilities access to, the full and equal enjoyment of, opportunity  
7 to participate in, and benefit from, the goods, facilities,  
8 services, and accommodations thereof.

9 2. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and damages for  
10 violations of civil rights and for damages flowing from such  
11 violations.

12 **PARTIES:**

13 3. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical  
14 disabilities who uses a wheelchair to travel about in public.

15 4. Defendants, ESCONDIDO INVESTMENT, LLC; WGM BEVERAGE  
16 CORPORATION, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive (hereinafter  
17 alternatively referred to collectively as "Defendants"), are the  
18 owners and operators, lessors and/or lessees, or agents of the  
19 owners, lessors and/or lessees, and/or alter egos, franchisers  
20 and/or franchisees, of the building and/or buildings which  
21 constitute a public facility in and of itself, occupied by the above  
22 described defendants, and subject to the requirements of federal and  
23 state law requiring full and equal access to public accommodations  
24 and facilities.

25 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their  
26 business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and  
27 business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access  
28 violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and

1 common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and  
2 believes that each of the Defendants herein, including DOES 1  
3 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the  
4 events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining  
5 appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true  
6 names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the  
7 Defendants and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

8 **PRELIMINARY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

9       6. Defendants are or were at the time of the incident the  
10 owners and operators, lessors and lessees of the public facility,  
11 located at 1881 S. Escondido Blvd., Escondido California. The public  
12 accommodation, its path of travel, parking, restrooms and its other  
13 facilities are each a "public accommodation or facility" subject to  
14 the requirements of state and federal law. On information and  
15 belief, each such facility has, since July 1, 1970, undergone  
16 "alterations, structural repairs and additions," each of which has  
17 subjected the public accommodations, and each of their facilities to  
18 handicapped access requirements per the Americans with Disabilities  
19 Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG) and Title 24 of California's Code of  
20 Regulations.

21       7. On at least once occasion within the statutory period  
22 preceding the filing of this complaint, Plaintiff was an invitee and  
23 customer at the subject public accommodation.

24       8. During Plaintiff's visit, the subject public accommodation  
25 exhibited various violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act  
26 Accessibility Guidelines ("ADAAG") and Title 24 of the California  
27 Code of Regulations including but not limited to: there was a lack  
28 of properly configured disabled parking; a lack of van accessible

1 designated disabled parking; and inaccessible public restroom  
2 facilities.

3 9. On information and belief, other portions of the facility  
4 were improperly inaccessible for use by persons with physical  
5 disabilities.

6 10. On information and belief, the facilities continue to the  
7 date of filing this complaint to deny equal access to Plaintiff and  
8 other persons with physical disabilities.

9 11. As a result of the inaccessible facilities, Plaintiff was  
10 humiliated, embarrassed and frustrated, suffering emotional  
11 injuries. Moreover, as a result of the inaccessible facilities,  
12 Plaintiff, suffered bodily and physical injury.

13 12. Plaintiff would like to return and use the Defendants'  
14 public accommodations but because of Defendants' violations,  
15 Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities are unable to  
16 use public facilities such as those owned and operated by Defendants  
17 on a "full and equal" basis unless such facility is in compliance  
18 with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act  
19 Accessibility Guidelines and state accessibility law as pled herein.  
20 Plaintiff has, therefore, been deterred from returning and using the  
21 Defendants' public accommodations.

22 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore alleges  
23 that Defendants and each of them (1) caused the subject improved  
24 real properties which constitute the subject public accommodation to  
25 be constructed, altered and maintained in such a manner that persons  
26 with physical disabilities were denied full and equal access to,  
27 within and throughout said improved real property(s); (2) that the  
28 Defendants have had actual and constructive notice that the

1 facilities were not legally accessible to persons with disabilities;  
2 (3) that despite being informed of such effect on Plaintiff and  
3 other persons with physical disabilities due to the lack of  
4 accessible facilities, Defendants, and each of them, knowingly and  
5 willfully refused to take any steps to rectify the situation and to  
6 provide full and equal access for Plaintiff and other persons with  
7 physical disabilities to the subject public accommodation. Said  
8 defendants, and each of them, have continued such practices, in  
9 conscious disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff and other  
10 persons with physical disabilities. Said conduct, with knowledge of  
11 the effect it was and is having on Plaintiff and other persons with  
12 physical disabilities, constitutes despicable conduct in conscious  
13 disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff and of other  
14 similarly situated persons, justifying the imposition of punitive  
15 and exemplary damages per Civil Code section 3294.

16 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT**  
17 (On behalf of Plaintiff and Against All Defendants) (Cal Civ §  
18 51 et seq.)

18 14. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if  
19 fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior  
20 paragraphs of this complaint.

21 15. California Civil Code § 52 provides that a party that  
22 discriminates against a plaintiff in violation of Civ. Code § 51  
23 shall be liable for actual damages, up to three times actual damages  
24 but not less than \$4000 for each such offense, and any attorney's  
25 fees incurred by the plaintiff.

26 **Count One:**

27 16. The Defendants have not ensured that their facilities  
28 comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the

1 California Building Code as it applies to physical access for  
2 persons with disabilities and failed to ensure that disabled persons  
3 have "full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities,  
4 privileges, or services" to the facilities identified above.

5 Count Two:

6 17. The Defendants have not complied with the Americans with  
7 Disabilities Act of 1990.

8  
9 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S DISABLED**  
10 **PERSONS ACT, (On Behalf of Plaintiff and Against All**  
**Defendants) (California Civil Code § 54 et seq.)**

11 18. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference as if  
12 fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior  
13 paragraphs of this complaint and incorporates them herein as if  
14 separately repled.

15 19. California Civil Code §55 provides that a person aggrieved  
16 under §54 of the Civil Code may bring an action to enjoin such  
17 violation and shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorney's  
18 fees.

19 Count One:

20 20. The Defendants have not ensured that their facilities  
21 comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the  
22 California Building Code as it applies to physical access for  
23 persons with disabilities and have failed to ensure that disabled  
24 persons have full and equal access to public accommodations and/or  
25 other places that the general public is invited and that disabled  
26 persons enjoy the same accommodations, advantages, facilities, and  
27 privileges to the facilities identified above.

28 Count Two:

1           21. The Defendants have not complied with the Americans with  
2 Disabilities Act of 1990.

3           22. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages as  
4 hereinafter stated.

5  
6 **III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE**  
(On behalf of the Plaintiff and Against All Defendants)

7  
8           23. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if  
9 fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior  
10 paragraphs of this complaint.

11           24. Defendants had a duty to exercise ordinary care, i.e.,  
12 comply with the various accessibility laws and ensure that their  
13 property was safely configured.

14           25. Defendants failed to exercise ordinary care in that they  
15 failed to ensure that their facilities complied with the  
16 accessibility guidelines or that their facilities were configured to  
17 promote safe and effective use by persons with wheelchairs.

18           26. As the actual and proximate result of Defendants' failure  
19 to exercise ordinary care, Plaintiff suffered damages in an amount  
20 to be determined by proof.

21           27. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages and  
22 relief as hereinafter stated.

23 **IV. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR**  
24 **BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT** (On behalf of the Public and Against All  
25 Defendants) (Cal. Bus. & Prof. § 17200 et seq.)

26           28. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if  
27 fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior  
28 paragraphs of this complaint.

          29. In addition to the access violations described above,

1 Defendants' facilities are in violation of California and Federal  
2 law in that they do not provide required access for disabled  
3 persons.

4 30. Defendants' acts and omissions alleged herein are a  
5 violation of both statutory requirements and public policy and,  
6 therefore, constitute a violation of Business and Professions Code  
7 sections 17200 et seq.

8 31. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself/herself and the general  
9 public, seeks injunctive relief requiring Defendants to remedy the  
10 disability access violations present at their facilities.

11 32. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages and  
12 relief as hereinafter stated.

13 **PRAYER:**

14 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and  
15 provide relief as follows:

16 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with  
17 the Unruh Civil Rights Act, and California's Disabled Person Act,  
18 which order will include the removal of barriers and the  
19 implementation of reasonable modifications in policies, practice,  
20 eligibility criteria and procedures so as to afford full access to  
21 the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and  
22 accommodations being offered.

23 2. General, Special and Penalty damages in an amount to be  
24 determined by proof;

25 3. Reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs of  
26 suit, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52,55, and Cal. Civ. Proc. §  
27 1021.5;  
28



1           4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem  
2 proper.

3 Dated: May 9, 2002

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP

5  
6 By: 

MARK D. POTTER  
RUSSELL C. HANDY  
JAMES R. BOYD  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

7  
8  
9 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

10 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury for all claims for which a jury  
11 is permitted.

12  
13 Dated: May 9, 2002

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP

14  
15 By: 

16 MARK D. POTTER  
17 RUSSELL C. HANDY  
18 JAMES R. BOYD  
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 JOHN M. HARMATA SB#131668  
2 DIANNE K. HARMATA SB# 163412  
3 HARMATA & ASSOCIATES  
4 110 West "C" Street, Suite 2100  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: (619) 233-4711  
Fax: (619) 231-1389

CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE 10  
CENTRAL DIVISION

040/392  
2002 SEP -9 P 3:18

CLERK  
COURT  
SAN DIEGO, CA

5 Attorneys for Defendants

5440 01 09 GIC792466 09/10/02 10:46  
02 040 1st Paper Fee \$392.00

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

11 CHRIS LANGER,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 ESCONDIDO INVESTMENT, LLC; WGM  
15 BEVERAGE CORPORATION; and DOES 1  
through 10, inclusive,

16 Defendants.

) CASE NO: GIC 792466

) ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

17 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
18 Defendants ESCONDIDO INVESTMENT, LLC and WGM BEVERAGE CORPORATION

19 answer, deny and allege as follows:

20 Under the provisions of the California Code of Civil Procedure §431.30, these answering  
21 defendants deny both generally and specifically, in the conjunctive and disjunctive, each and every  
22 allegation contained in the complaint, and the whole thereof, and each and every alleged cause of  
23 action thereof.

24 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

25 As a separate and affirmative defense, these answering Defendants allege that each purpose of  
26 cause of action in Plaintiff's complaint on file herein fails to state sufficient facts to constitute a  
27 cause of action against these answering Defendants.  
28