

1 **PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD**

2 A Professional Corporation  
3 Theodore A. Pinnock, Esq. Bar #: 153434  
4 David C. Wakefield, Esq. Bar #: 185736  
5 7851 Mission Center Court, Suite 310  
6 Plaza Centre  
7 San Diego, CA 92108  
8 Telephone: 619.858.3671  
9 Facsimile: 619.858.3646

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
12 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

13 **NONI GOTTI,**

14 **Plaintiff,**

15 **v.**

16 **PRESIDIO TROLLEY PLAZA LLC;**  
17 **COLORAMA PAINTS & SUPPLY**  
18 **INC; SLAMMED PIZZA INC DBA**  
19 **DOMINOS PIZZA #8245; ERICS**  
20 **MEDICAL SUPPLY INC; SAN DIEGO**  
21 **PERSONAL TRAINING; WAI KULA**  
22 **HYDROGARDENS; And DOES 1**  
23 **THROUGH 10, Inclusive**

24 **Defendants.**

Case No. 37-2008-00089816-CU-CR-CTL

**CIVIL COMPLAINT:**  
**DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN**  
**PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS**  
[42 U.S.C. 12182(a) ET. SEQ; CIVIL  
CODE 51, 52, 54, 54.1, 54.3]

**UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE -**  
**PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

25 **NAMED DEFENDANTS AND NAMED PLAINTIFF**

26 1. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are, and, at all times  
27 mentioned herein, were, a business or corporation or franchise organized and existing and/or  
28 doing business under the laws of the State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes and  
thereon alleges that Defendants PRESIDIO TROLLEY PLAZA LLC; COLORAMA PAINTS &  
SUPPLY INC; SLAMMED PIZZA INC DBA DOMINOS PIZZA #8245; ERICS MEDICAL  
SUPPLY INC; SAN DIEGO PERSONAL TRAINING; WAI KULA HYDROGARDENS are the

1 owner, operator, and/or lessor/lessee of the real property and the public accommodation located  
2 thereon at the Property Address: 5261-5401 LINDA VISTA RD SAN DIEGO, CA 92110-2604  
3 Assessor's Parcel Number: 436-350-21; 436-350-20; 436-350-22. Defendant PRESIDIO  
4 TROLLEY PLAZA LLC c/o Registered Agent: THOMAS F MULVANEY is located at  
5 4014 TILDEN LN, LAFAYETTE, CA 94549-2738. Defendant COLORAMA PAINTS &  
6 SUPPLY INC is located at 5261 Linda Vista Road, San Diego, CA 92110. Defendant  
7 SLAMMED PIZZA INC DBA DOMINOS PIZZA #8245 is located at 5265 LINDA  
8 VISTA RD # 202, SAN DIEGO, CA 92110-2604 or 6227 LAKE ATHABASKA PL, SAN  
9 DIEGO, CA 92119-3522. Defendant ERICS MEDICAL SUPPLY INC is located at 5267 Linda  
10 Vista Rd, San Diego, CA 92110-2604; (619) 298-9640. Defendant SAN DIEGO PERSONAL  
11 TRAINING is located at 5277 Linda Vista Rd, San Diego, CA 92110; (619) 294-2668.  
12 Defendant WAI KULA HYDROGARDENS is located at 5297 Linda Vista Rd, San Diego, CA  
13 92110-2604; (619) 299-7299.

14 2. The words Plaintiff and Plaintiffs as used herein specifically include NONI GOTTI.

15 3. Defendants Does 1 through 10, were at all times relevant herein subsidiaries, employers,  
16 employees, agents, of Defendants PRESIDIO TROLLEY PLAZA LLC; COLORAMA PAINTS  
17 & SUPPLY INC; SLAMMED PIZZA INC DBA DOMINOS PIZZA #8245; ERICS MEDICAL  
18 SUPPLY INC; SAN DIEGO PERSONAL TRAINING; WAI KULA HYDROGARDENS.

19 Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through  
20 10, inclusive, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will pray  
21 leave of the court to amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the Does  
22 when ascertained.

23 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants and each of them  
24 herein were, at all times relevant to the action, the owner, lessor, lessee, franchiser, franchisee,  
25 general partner, limited partner, agent, employee, representing partner, or joint venturer of the  
26 remaining Defendants and were acting within the course and scope of that relationship. Plaintiff  
27 is further informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each of the Defendants herein gave  
28

1 consent to, ratified, and/or authorized the acts alleged herein to each of the remaining Defendants.

2 **CONCISE SET OF FACTS**

3 5. Plaintiff NONI GOTTI (hereinafter "Plaintiff") has physical and mental impairments and  
4 due to these impairments she has successfully learned to walk with a service animal. Plaintiff  
5 said physical and mental impairments substantially limit one or more of the following major life  
6 activities including but not limited to: walking and clinical depression. Plaintiff has a long  
7 history of mental impairments.

8 6. Plaintiff has physical and mental impairments because their conditions affect one or more  
9 of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, and/or  
10 cardiovascular.

11 7. Further, Plaintiff said physical impairments substantially limits one or more of the  
12 following major life activities.

13 8. In addition, Plaintiff cannot perform one or more of the said major life activities in the  
14 manner, speed, and duration when compared to the average person. Moreover, Plaintiff has a  
15 history of or has been classified as having a physical impairment as required by 42 U.S.C. §  
16 12102(2)(A).

17 9. On July 11, 2008, Plaintiff NONI GOTTI desired to visit Defendants' public  
18 accommodation facilities located at Property Address: 5261-5401 LINDA VISTA RD SAN  
19 DIEGO, CA 92110-2604; Assessor's Parcel Number: 436-350-21; 436-350-20; 436-350-22 to  
20 utilize their goods and/or services. When Plaintiff NONI GOTTI desired to patronize  
21 Defendants' public accommodation facilities, she was unable to use and/or had difficulty using  
22 the public accommodations' facilities including but not limited to the barriers to access listed  
23 herein and said facilities were not accessible because they failed to comply with ADA Access  
24 Guidelines For Buildings and Facilities (hereafter referred to as "ADAAG" and codified in 28  
25 C.F.R. Part 36, App. A) and/or California's Title 24 Building Code Requirements. Defendants  
26 failed to remove barriers to equal access within their public accommodation facilities as required.

27 10. Plaintiff NONI GOTTI personally experienced difficulty with said access barriers as listed  
28

1 herein to the present Complaint at Defendants' public accommodation facilities located on the  
2 Property and/or has knowledge of said access barriers and is presently deterred from accessing  
3 the public accommodation. Plaintiff alleges that these known barriers to access are not an  
4 exhaustive list of the barriers to access that exist at Defendants' facilities.

5 11. The Plaintiff went to the property and encountered access violations. For example, there  
6 is no accessible route from public sidewalk to businesses (2 out of 4 entrances), there's no tow  
7 away disability signage at parking lot entrances (Napa St.), there's 1 out of every 25 parking  
8 spaces is not an accessible space (98 parking), there's 1 out of every 8 accessible spaces is not  
9 van accessible (6 handicapped), there's no signage for handicapped parking (1 faded sign, side  
10 lines are white not blue, access aisle white not blue) and two (2) bathrooms at end of center or  
11 outside. The Colorama Paints & Supply Inc has no International symbol of accessibility at the  
12 entrance, the entrance doorknob is not a lever, there are loose mats and the interior accessible  
13 route is less than 36 inches. The Dominos Pizza's entrance doorknob is not a lever and there are  
14 loose mats. The Eric Medical Supply has no International symbol of accessibility at the entrance,  
15 the entrance doorknob is not a lever, there are loose mats and the interior accessible route is less  
16 than 36 inches. The San Diego Personal Training has no International symbol of accessibility at  
17 the entrance, the entrance doorknob is not a lever and the interior accessible route is less than 36  
18 inches. And the Wai Kula Hydrogardens has no International symbol of accessibility at the  
19 entrance, the entrance doorknob is not a lever, there are loose mats, the counter exceeds 36 inches  
20 and the interior accessible route is less than 36 inches.

21 12. Plaintiff intends to return to Defendants' public accommodation facilities in the immediate  
22 future. Plaintiff was deterred and is presently deterred from returning due to her knowledge of  
23 the barriers to access that exist at Defendants' facilities.

24 13. Pursuant to federal and state law, Defendants are required to remove barriers to their  
25 existing facilities. Further, Defendants had actual knowledge of their barrier removal duties  
26 under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Civil Code before January 26, 1992. Also,  
27 Defendants should have known that individuals with disabilities are not required to give notice to  
28

1 a governmental agency before filing suit alleging Defendants failed to remove architectural  
2 barriers.

3 14. Plaintiff believes and herein alleges Defendants' facilities have access violations not  
4 directly experienced by Plaintiff which would preclude or limit access by Plaintiff potentially  
5 including but not limited to violations of the ADA, ADA Accessibility Guidelines (Codified in 28  
6 C.F.R. Part 36, App. A) and Title 24 of the California Building Code. Plaintiff alleges  
7 Defendants are required to utilize the ADA checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal  
8 approved by the United States Department of Justice and created by Adaptive Environments.  
9 Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief to remove all barriers to access that are related to her  
10 disability even those barriers that are only known to exist but are not directly experienced by  
11 plaintiff. *Doran v 7-Eleven Inc*, 2007 U.S.App.Lexis 26143 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2007).

12 15. Based on these facts, Plaintiff alleges she was discriminated against each time he  
13 patronized and/or was deterred from patronizing Defendants' facilities. Plaintiff was extremely  
14 upset due to Defendants' conduct.

15 16. Plaintiff is not required to provide notice to the defendants prior to filing a complaint  
16 and/or to recover attorney fees and costs. *Botosan v. Paul McNally Realty*, 216 F.3d 827, 832  
17 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2000). *Skaff v Meridien*, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 25516 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2007).

18 **WHAT CLAIMS ARE PLAINTIFF ALLEGING AGAINST EACH NAMED**  
19 **DEFENDANT**

20 17. Defendants PRESIDIO TROLLEY PLAZA LLC; COLORAMA PAINTS & SUPPLY  
21 INC; SLAMMED PIZZA INC DBA DOMINOS PIZZA #8245; ERICS MEDICAL SUPPLY  
22 INC; SAN DIEGO PERSONAL TRAINING; WAI KULA HYDROGARDENS and Does 1  
23 through 10 will be referred to collectively hereinafter as "Defendants."

24 18. Plaintiff avers that the Defendants are liable for the following claims as alleged below:

25 **DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS**

26 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS- Claims Under The Americans**  
27 **With Disabilities Act Of 1990**

28

1 **Claim I**

2 19. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of  
3 disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages,  
4 or accommodations of any place of public accommodation as Defendants own, lease (or lease  
5 to), or operate a place of public accommodation in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

6 **Claim II**

7 20. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff directly, or  
8 through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the  
9 individual or class to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges,  
10 advantages, or accommodations of an entity in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

11 **Claim III**

12 21. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as it is  
13 discriminatory to afford an individual or class of individuals, on the basis of a disability or  
14 disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other  
15 arrangements with the opportunity to participate in or benefit from a good, service, facility,  
16 privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is not equal to that afforded to other individuals in  
17 violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

18 **Claim IV**

19 22. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as it is  
20 discriminatory to provide an individual or class of individuals, on the basis of a disability or  
21 disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other  
22 arrangements with a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is  
23 different or separate from that provided to other individuals.

24 **Claim V**

25 23. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendants  
26 failed to afford to an individual with a disability in the most integrated setting appropriate to  
27 the needs of the individual in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.  
28

1 Claim VI

2 24. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendants  
3 utilized standards or criteria or methods of administration that have the effect of discriminating on  
4 the basis of disability; or that perpetuate the discrimination of others who are subject to common  
5 administrative control in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

6 Claim VII

7 25. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as it is  
8 discriminatory to exclude or otherwise deny equal goods, services, facilities, privileges,  
9 advantages, accommodations, or other opportunities to an individual or entity because of the  
10 known disability of an individual with whom the individual or entity is known to have a  
11 relationship or association in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182. See *Niece v. Fitzner* 922 F. Supp.  
12 1208 (1996)

13 Claim VIII

14 26. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendants  
15 engaged in the specific prohibitions as stated in 42 U.S.C. §12182.

16 Claim IX

17 27. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendant  
18 failed to demonstrate that the removal of a barrier is not readily achievable, and made such goods,  
19 services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations available through alternative  
20 methods in a segregated manner in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182. Plaintiff is entitled to  
21 injunctive relief to remove all barriers to access that are related to his disability even those  
22 barriers that are only known to exist but are not directly experienced by plaintiff. *Doran v 7-*  
23 *Eleven Inc*, 2007 U.S.App.Lexis 26143 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2007).

24 Claim X

25 28. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendants  
26 altered the use of their establishment in a manner that affected or could have affected the usability  
27 of the facility or part thereof and failed to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum  
28

1 extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by  
2 individuals with disabilities in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183.

3 29. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff pray for judgment and relief as hereinafter set forth.  
4

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

7 **CLAIM I: Denial Of Full And Equal Access**

8 30. Based on the facts plead above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff was denied full  
9 and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
10 accommodations within a public accommodation owned, leased, and/or operated by Defendants  
11 as required by Civil Code Sections 54 and 54.1.

12 **CLAIM II: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures**

13 31. Based on the facts plead above and elsewhere herein this complaint, Defendants failed and  
14 refused to provide a reasonable alternative by modifying its practices, policies, and procedures in  
15 that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and/or others similarly situated  
16 in entering and utilizing Defendants' services as required by Civil Code § 54.1. Thus, Plaintiff  
17 was subjected to discrimination in violation of Civil Code § 54.1.

18 **CLAIM III: Violation Of The Unruh Act**

19 32. Based on the facts plead above and elsewhere herein this complaint and because  
20 Defendants violated the Civil Code § 51 by failing to comply with 42 United States Code §  
21 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2), Defendants did and continue to knowingly  
22 discriminate against Plaintiff and persons similarly situated in violation of Civil Code §§ 51, 52,  
23 and 54.1. Plaintiff alleges the access violations alleged here are so obvious as to implicate at least  
24 a prima facie case of discriminatory intent.

25 33. Based on the facts plead above, Claims I, II, and III of Plaintiffs' Second Cause Of  
26 Action above, and the facts elsewhere herein this complaint, Plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm  
27 unless Defendants are ordered to remove architectural, non-architectural, and communication  
28 barriers at Defendants' public accommodation. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' discriminatory

1 conduct is capable of repetition, and this discriminatory repetition adversely impacts Plaintiff and  
2 a substantial segment of the disability community. Plaintiff alleges there is a state and national  
3 public interest in requiring accessibility in places of public accommodation. Plaintiff has no  
4 adequate remedy at law to redress the discriminatory conduct of Defendants. Plaintiff desires to  
5 return to Defendants' places of business in the immediate future. Accordingly, the Plaintiff  
6 alleges that a structural or mandatory injunction is necessary to enjoin compliance with state civil  
7 rights laws enacted for the benefit of individuals with disabilities.

8 34. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for damages and relief as hereinafter stated.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT FOR RELIEF:  
17

- 18 A. For injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a).  
19 B. For general damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52 or 54.3;  
20 C. For \$4,000 in damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 for each and every offense of  
21 Civil Code § 51, Title 24 of the California Building Code, ADA, and ADA Accessibility  
22 Guidelines (Codified in 28 C.F.R. Part 36, App. A);  
23 D. In the alternative to the damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 in Paragraph C above,  
24 for \$1,000 in damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 54.3 for each and every offense of Civil  
25 Code § 54.1, Title 24 of the California Building Code, ADA, and ADA Accessibility Guidelines;  
26 E. For treble damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52(a) or 54.3(a);  
27  
28 F. For attorneys fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988, 42 U.S.C. § 12205, and Cal. Civil Code  
§ 52; 54.3;

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

G. A Jury Trial and;

H. For such other further relief as the court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted:

Dated: August 11, 2008

**PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD, A.P.C.**

By: TP

THEODORE A. PINNOCK, ESQ.  
DAVID C. WAKEFIELD, ESQ.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, state bar n., and address)  
 Theodore A. Pinnock, Esq. Bar #: 153434; David C. Wakefield, Esq. Bar #: 185736  
 Michelle L. Wakefield, Esq. Bar #: 200424  
 7851 Mission Center Court, Suite 310 Plaza Centre, San Diego, CA 92108  
 TELEPHONE NO: 619.858.3671 FAX NO: 619.858.3646  
 E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional):  
 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): **PLAINTIFF**  
**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**  
 STREET ADDRESS 330 West Broadway  
 MAILING ADDRESS  
 CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Diego, California 92101  
 BRANCH NAME Hall of Justice  
 PLAINTIFF/ PETITIONER: **NONI GOTTI**  
 DEFENDANT/ RESPONDENT: **PRESIDIO TROLLEY PLAZA LLC; ET AL**  
**ORDER ON APPLICATION FOR WAIVER OF COURT FEES AND COSTS**

FOR COURT USE ONLY  
 7:00 AM 8/12/08  
 CASE NUMBER  
**37-2008-00089816-CU-CR-CTL**

- The application was filed on (date): 08-14-08  A previous order was issued on (date):
- The application was filed by (name): **NONI GOTTI**
- IT IS ORDERED that the application is granted  in whole  in part (complete item 4 below).
  - No payments.** Payment of all the fees and costs listed in California Rules of Court, rule 985(i), is waived. The applicant shall pay all the fees and costs listed in California Rules of Court, rule 985(i), EXCEPT the following:
 

(1) <input type="checkbox"/> Filing papers.	(6) <input type="checkbox"/> Sheriff and marshal fees.
(2) <input type="checkbox"/> Certification and copying.	(7) <input type="checkbox"/> Reporter's fees* (valid for 60 days).
(3) <input type="checkbox"/> Issuing process and certification.	(8) <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone appearance (Gov. Code, § 68070.1
(4) <input type="checkbox"/> Transmittal of papers.	(9) <input type="checkbox"/> (c) Other (specify code section):
(5) <input type="checkbox"/> Court-appointed interpreter.	

Reporter's fees are per diem pursuant to Code Civ. Proc., §§ 269, 274c, and Gov. Code, §§ 69947, 69948, and 72195.
  - Method of payment.** The applicant shall pay all the fees and costs when charged, EXCEPT as follows:
 

(1)  Pay (specify): \_\_\_\_\_ percent. (2)  Pay: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per month or more until the balance is paid.
  - The clerk of the court, county financial officer, or appropriate county officer is authorized to require the applicant to appear before and be examined by the court no sooner than four months from the date of this order, and not more than once in any four-month period.  The applicant is ordered to appear in this court as follows for review of his or her financial status:
 

Date:	Time:	Dept.:	Div.:	Room:
-------	-------	--------	-------	-------
  - The clerk is directed to mail a copy of this order only to the applicant's attorney or to the applicant if not represented.
  - All unpaid fees and costs shall be deemed to be taxable costs if the applicant is entitled to costs and shall be a lien on any judgment recovered by the applicant and shall be paid directly to the clerk by the judgment debtor upon such recovery.**
- IT IS ORDERED that the application is denied  in whole  in part for the following reasons (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 985):
  - Monthly household income exceeds guidelines (Gov. Code, § 68511.3(a)(6)(B); form 982(a)(17)(A)).
  - Other (Complete line 4b on page 2).
  - The applicant shall pay any fees and costs due in this action within 10 days from the date of service of this order or paper filed by the applicant with the clerk will be of no effect.
  - The clerk is directed to mail a copy of this order to all parties who have appeared in this action.
- IT IS ORDERED that a hearing be held.
  - The substantial evidentiary conflict to be resolved by the hearing is (specify):
  - The applicant should appear in this court at the following hearing to help resolve the conflict:
 

Date:	Time:	Dept.:	Div.:	Room:
-------	-------	--------	-------	-------
  - The address of the court is (specify):
 

Same as above
  - The clerk is directed to mail a copy of this order only to the applicant's attorney or to the applicant if not represented.

**NOTICE: if item 3d or item 5b is filled in and the applicant does not attend the hearing, the court may revoke or change the order or deny the application without considering information the applicant wants the court to consider.**

**WARNING: The applicant must immediately tell the court if he or she becomes able to pay court fees or costs during this action. The applicant may be ordered to appear in court and answer questions about his or her ability to pay fees or costs.**

Date: **AUG 14 2008**  
 Clerk, by A. RACE Deputy  
 JUDICIAL OFFICER

<p>ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name and Address):          BRIAN N. WINN (State Bar No. 86779)          JOHN E. GORDON (State Bar No. 180053) NAOMI S. BRICKEY (SBN 240597) JONATHAN B. KLEIN (SBN 236982) WILLIAM J. EDWARDS (SBN 241803)  <b>WINN AND SIMS, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION</b>          110 E. WILSHIRE AVE., SUITE 212, FULLERTON, CA 92832          TELEPHONE NO. (Optional): (714) 446-6686 FAX NO. (Optional): (714) 446-6680          E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): WINNSIMS@WINNSIMS.COM          ATTORNEY FOR (Name): PLAINTIFF</p>	<p><b>FOR COURT USE ONLY</b></p> <p>NOV 21 10 33 AM '07          SUPERIOR COURT          SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA</p>
<p><b>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO</b></p> <p>[ ] CENTRAL COURTHOUSE, 200 W. BROADWAY, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3409          [ ] NORTH COUNTY BRANCH, 325 S. MELROSE DR., VISTA, CA 92083-6643          [ ] EAST COUNTY COURT, 250 E. MAIN ST., EL CAJON, CA 92020-3941          [ ] RAMONA BRANCH, 1428 MONTECITO RD., RAMONA, CA 92065-5200          [ ] SOUTH BAY COURT, 500 3RD AVE., CHULA VISTA, CA 91910-5649</p>	
<p>PLAINTIFF(S) <u>CAVALRY PORTFOLIO SERVICES, LLC, AS Assignee of Cavalry SPV I, LLC, AS Assignee of Ford</u></p> <p>DEFENDANT(S)  <u>DAVID W PETERS AKA DAVID PETERS AKA DAVID WARREN PETERS</u></p>	<p>JUDGE: _____</p> <p>DEPT: _____</p>
<p><b>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (San Diego Superior Court Rules, Division II, Rule 2.5.)</b></p>	
<p>CASE NUMBER  <u>37200A00077999CLCLCTL</u></p>	

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that all defendants named in the complaint of the above-entitled case have either made a general appearance or have been properly and timely served in compliance with San Diego Superior Court Rules, Division II, Rule 2.5.

Date 11/2/07

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature

Brian N. Winn     John E. Gordon  
 Naomi S. Brickey     Jonathan B. Klein  
 William J. Edwards  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Typed or printed name

**NOTES:**

If service cannot be effected on all defendants within 60 days of filing the complaint, DO NOT USE THIS CERTIFICATE, but file the form CERTIFICATE OF PROGRESS (SDSC CIV-144) stating the reasons why service has not been effected on all parties and what is being done to effect services.

THE FILING OF A GENERAL APPEARANCE BY A DEFENDANT DOES NOT DISPENSE WITH THE PLAINTIFF'S OBLIGATION TO FILE THIS DOCUMENT.