

CIVIL SERVICE 11
MAY 17 2 45
SAN DIEGO, CA
100/100
LM

1 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS, LLP
2 MARK D. POTTER, ESQ., SBN 166317
3 RUSSELL C. HANDY, ESQ., SBN 195058
4 JAMES R. BOYD, ESQ., SBN175597
5 STEVE WEDEL, ESQ. SBN 214908
6 P.O. Box 34606
7 San Diego, CA 92163-4606
8 (619) 291-7593
9 Fax: (619) 725-0720

6 Attorney for Plaintiff, CHRIS LANGER,

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

G1602039

12 CHRIS LANGER,) Case No.:
13)
14 Plaintiff,) **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND**
15 v.) **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS**
16 MICHIO HAGIO as TRUSTEE of THE) **OF: UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT;**
17 MICHIO HAGIO TRUST, created) **NEGLIGENCE; CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR**
18 and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive) **BUSINESS PRACTICE ACT.**
19 Defendants.) **DEMAND FOR JURY**

20
21 Plaintiff CHRIS LANGER, (hereinafter referred to as
22 "Plaintiff") complains of MICHIO HAGIO as TRUSTEE of THE MICHIO
23 HAGIO TRUST, created January 31, 2002; DOUG ALDRED, and DOES 1
24 through 10, inclusive, (hereinafter referred to as "Defendants") and
25 alleges as follows:

25 **INTRODUCTION:**

26 1. This is a Civil Rights action for discrimination against
27 persons with physical disabilities, of which Plaintiff is a member
28

ORIGINAL

1 of said class, for failure to remove architectural barriers
2 structural in nature at Defendants' place of business, located at
3 2531 S. Coast Highway, Cardiff, California, a place of public
4 accommodation; and for failure to modify practices and or policies
5 in order to accommodate, thereby discriminatorily denying Plaintiff
6 and the class of other similarly situated persons with physical
7 disabilities access to, the full and equal enjoyment of, opportunity
8 to participate in, and benefit from, the goods, facilities,
9 services, and accommodations thereof.

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

13 **PARTIES:**

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

16 4. Defendants, MICHIO HAGIO as TRUSTEE of THE MICHIO HAGIO
17 TRUST, created January 31, 2002; DOUG ALDRED, and DOES 1 through 10,
18 inclusive (hereinafter alternatively referred to collectively as
19 "Defendants"), are the owners and operators, lessors and/or lessees,
20 or agents of the owners, lessors and/or lessees, and/or alter egos,
21 franchisers and/or franchisees, of the building and/or buildings
22 which constitute a public facility in and of itself, occupied by the
23 above described defendants, and subject to the requirements of
24 federal and state law requiring full and equal access to public
25 accommodations and facilities.

26 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their
27 business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and
28 business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access

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

9 **PRELIMINARY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

10 6. Defendants are or were at the time of the incident the
11 owners and operators, lessors and lessees of the public facility,
12 located at 2531 S. Coast Highway, Cardiff, California. The public
13 accommodation, its path of travel, parking, restrooms and its other
14 facilities are each a "public accommodation or facility" subject to
15 the requirements of state and federal law. On information and
16 belief, each such facility has, since July 1, 1970, undergone
17 "alterations, structural repairs and additions," each of which has
18 subjected the public accommodations, and each of their facilities to
19 handicapped access requirements per the Americans with Disabilities
20 Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG) and Title 24 of California's Code of
21 Regulations.

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

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

(
1 of properly configured disabled parking; and a lack of van
2 accessible designated disabled parking.

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. Defendants knew their facilities were inaccessible and
14 continued to maintain these facilities in an inaccessible condition
15 and in doing so, knowingly continued to violate and interfere with
16 the rights of disabled persons including Plaintiff. Such conduct by
17 defendants is despicable, and was carried on by defendant with a
18 willful and conscious disregard for the rights of disabled persons,
19 including Plaintiff.

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

1 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore alleges
2 that Defendants and each of them (1) caused the subject improved
3 real properties which constitute the subject public accommodation to
4 be constructed, altered and maintained in such a manner that persons
5 with physical disabilities were denied full and equal access to,
6 within and throughout said improved real property(s); (2) that the
7 Defendants have had actual and constructive notice that the
8 facilities were not legally accessible to persons with disabilities;
9 (3) that despite being informed of such effect on Plaintiff and
10 other persons with physical disabilities due to the lack of
11 accessible facilities, Defendants, and each of them, knowingly and
12 willfully refused to take any steps to rectify the situation and to
13 provide full and equal access for Plaintiff and other persons with
14 physical disabilities to the subject public accommodation. Said
15 defendants, and each of them, have continued such practices, in
16 conscious disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff and other
17 persons with physical disabilities. Said conduct, with knowledge of
18 the effect it was and is having on Plaintiff and other persons with
19 physical disabilities, constitutes despicable conduct in conscious
20 disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff and of other
21 similarly situated persons, justifying the imposition of punitive
22 and exemplary damages per Civil Code section 3294.

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

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

28 16. California Civil Code § 52 provides that a party that

1 discriminates against a plaintiff in violation of Civ. Code § 51
2 shall be liable for actual damages, up to three times actual damages
3 but not less than \$4000 for each such offense, and any attorney's
4 fees incurred by the plaintiff.

5 **Count One:**

6 17. The Defendants have not ensured that their facilities
7 comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the
8 California Building Code as it applies to physical access for
9 persons with disabilities and failed to ensure that disabled persons
10 have "full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities,
11 privileges, or services" to the facilities identified above.

12 **Count Two:**

13 18. The Defendants have not complied with the Americans with
14 Disabilities Act of 1990.

15 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE**

16 (On behalf of the Plaintiff and Against All Defendants)

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

20 20. Defendants had a duty to exercise ordinary care, i.e.,
21 comply with the various accessibility laws and ensure that their
22 property was safely configured.

23 21. Defendants failed to exercise ordinary care in that they
24 failed to ensure that their facilities complied with the
25 accessibility guidelines or that their facilities were configured to
26 promote safe and effective use by persons with wheelchairs.

27 22. As the actual and proximate result of Defendants' failure
28

1 to exercise ordinary care, Plaintiff suffered damages in an amount
2 to be determined by proof.

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

5 **III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR**
6 **BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT (On behalf of the Public and Against All**
7 **Defendants) (Cal. Bus. & Prof. § 17200 et seq.)**

8 24. 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 25. In addition to the access violations described above,
12 Defendants' facilities are in violation of California and Federal
13 law in that they do not provide required access for disabled
14 persons.

15 26. Defendants' acts and omissions alleged herein are a
16 violation of both statutory requirements and public policy and,
17 therefore, constitute a violation of Business and Professions Code
18 sections 17200 et seq.

19 27. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself/herself and the general
20 public, seeks injunctive relief requiring Defendants to remedy the
21 disability access violations present at their facilities.

22 28. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief and damages and
23 relief as hereinafter stated.

24 **PRAYER:**

25 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and
26 provide relief as follows:

27 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with
28 the Unruh Civil Rights Act.

1 ROBERT J. GUMSER
2 Attorney, State Bar # 131884
3 1629 Columbia Street
4 San Diego, California 92101
5 Telephone (619) 232-1555

6 Attorney for Defendant
7 MICHIO HAGIO

040701
2007 FEB 3 PM 12:01
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA

8774 01 05 610602039 00-03 05 11:05
00 040 1st Paper Fee \$104.00

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

9 CHRIS LANGER,) NO. GIC 802039
10 Plaintiff,) JUDGE LINDA B. QUINN
11) DEPARTMENT 74
12 MICHIO HAGIO as TRUSTEE OF THE)
13 MICHIO HAGIO TRUST, created) ANSWER OF DEFENDANT
14 January 31, 2002, DOUG ALDRED,) MICHIO HAGIO as TRUSTEE
15 and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive) OF THE MICHIO HAGIO
16 Defendants.) TRUST, created January 31,
17) 2002

18 COMES NOW defendant, MICHIO HAGIO as TRUSTEE OF THE MICHIO
19 HAGIO TRUST, created January 31, 2002, and answers or otherwise
20 responds to plaintiffs complaint as follows:

21 Pursuant to the provisions of Section 431.30 of the
22 California Code of Civil Procedure, respondent denies generally
23 and specifically each and every cause of action, and each and
24 every allegation set forth therein, and that damages were
25 sustained in the sum or sums alleged, or in any sum, or at all, by
26 reason of any act, breach or omission on the part of respondent,
27 its agents, servants or employees.

28 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

The pleading referred to herein fails to state facts
sufficient to constitute a cause or causes of action against this
respondent.