

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RONALD WILSON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

KAYO OIL COMPANY dba CIRCLE K
#5250; TED KOBAYASHI, SUCCESSOR
TRUSTEE OF THE WALSH TRUST
AGREEMENT U/D/T DATED 5/7/86,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 06-CV-1035 BEN (AJB)

ORDER:

**(1) GRANTING DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR SANCTIONS; AND**

**(2) DISCHARGING THE COURT’S
EARLIER ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

I. INTRODUCTION

On October 25, 2007, the Court dismissed Plaintiff Ronald Wilson’s (“Plaintiff” or “Wilson”) case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The Court found that Plaintiff: (1) disregarded the Court’s previous orders determining that he did not have standing, and (2) improperly brought this action in a federal court in an attempt to extort a monetary settlement from Defendants Kayo Oil Company and Ted Kobayashi (“Defendants” or “Kayo”).

The Court retained jurisdiction to adjudicate Defendants’ Motion for Sanctions but postponed ruling on the Motion in order to hold a hearing on the matter. *See* Doc. Nos. 21, 39. On the same day, the Court issued a *sua sponte* Order to Show Cause Why Sanctions Should not Be

1 Imposed against Plaintiff and His Attorneys (“OSC”), including monetary sanctions, vexations
2 litigant sanctions, and a pre-filing order. *See* Doc. No. 39.

3 The parties had ample opportunities to address the sanctions issues, of which they took full
4 advantage: (1) by filing over 340 pages in briefing and declarations addressing sanctions, and (2)
5 by attending a hearing before this Court. *See* Doc. Nos. 21, 26, 27, 41, 42, 44. After carefully
6 reviewing the parties’ filings and giving them an opportunity to address the Court, the Court finds
7 that sanctions are warranted in this case. Therefore, the Court GRANTS Defendants’ Motion for
8 Sanctions.

9 II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

10 Plaintiff filed a Complaint with this Court on May 11, 2006, alleging that Defendant Kayo
11 Oil Company discriminated against him on the basis of his physical disability. Along with this
12 Complaint, Wilson filed five other Complaints on the same day – all making the same boilerplate
13 allegations against various Southern California businesses.¹ Specifically, Plaintiff alleged
14 violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), the California Disabled Persons Act,
15 the California Unruh Civil Rights Act, and the California Health and Safety Code. Plaintiff
16 claimed that he visited the Defendants’ gas station in San Marcos, California and encountered
17 physical and intangible barriers, which interfered with or denied him ability to use and enjoy the
18 goods, services, privileges, and accommodations offered at this facility.

19 On November 15, 2006 and again on December 15, 2006, Defendants provided informal
20 notice to Plaintiff of their intent to bring a Rule 11 Motion for Sanctions, urging Plaintiff to
21 dismiss his action voluntarily. *See* Doc. No. 21-2, at 2. Instead of dismissing this action, however,

22
23 ¹ *Wilson v. BCNM, Inc.*, 06cv1050-J-POR (filed on 05/11/2006, dismissed pursuant to a
24 settlement on 12/11/2006); *Wilson v. PFS LLC*, 06cv1046-WQH-BLM (filed on 05/11/2006,
25 dismissed on a motion for summary judgment on 08/22/2007); *Wilson v. KA Mgmt Inc.*, 06cv1037-
26 BEN-RBB (filed on 05/11/2006, dismissed pursuant to a settlement on 09/14/2006); *Wilson v.*
27 *Hometown Buffet, Inc.*, 06cv1038-IEG-AJB (filed on 05/11/2006, dismissed pursuant to a settlement
28 on 08/24/2006); *Wilson v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.*, 06cv1036-AJB (filed on 05/11/2006, dismissed
pursuant to a settlement on 02/13/2007).

1 Plaintiff filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on April 10, 2007, arguing that “there is no
2 genuine issue of material fact” and asking the Court to rule in his favor. Doc. No. 17. In response,
3 Defendants filed a Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment, urging the Court to dismiss the case for
4 lack of subject matter jurisdiction and lack of standing. Additionally, after giving a timely notice
5 to Plaintiff, Defendants filed a Motion for Sanctions on May 18, 2007, alleging, *inter alia*, that
6 Plaintiff disregarded prior rulings from this Court regarding his standing. *See* Doc. No. 21.

7 On October 25, 2007, the Court dismissed this case, finding that Wilson lacked standing to
8 bring the instant lawsuit. The Court retained jurisdiction to adjudicate Defendants’ Motion for
9 Sanctions. *See Branson v. Nott*, 62 F.3d 287, 293 n.10 (9th Cir. 1995). Additionally, the Court
10 issued a *sua sponte* ruling, ordering Plaintiff and his attorneys to show cause why Wilson should
11 not be declared a vexations litigant, and why the Court should not impose a pre-filing order against
12 Plaintiff’s attorneys – Lynn Hubbard III and Scotlynn J. Hubbard IV (“the Hubbards”). *See* Doc.
13 No. 39. On January 28, 2008, the Court held a hearing on the sanctions issue, where attorneys for
14 both sides presented oral arguments. The Court thus afforded Plaintiff and his attorneys adequate
15 notice and an opportunity to be heard, as it must do prior to deciding whether to impose sanctions.
16 *See Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1063 (9th Cir. 2007).

17 III. DISCUSSION

18 After reviewing numerous filings and conducting a hearing on the matter, the Court finds
19 that sanctions are warranted. Specifically, and as discussed in detail below, the Court imposes
20 sanctions pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 11 and pursuant to its own authority,
21 based on the following improper conduct: (1) exaggerated claims of Wilson’s physical disability;
22 (2) Wilson’s material misrepresentations to the Court; (3) breach of the duty of candor; (4)
23 attorneys’ misrepresentations to the Court; (5) violations of local rules; (6) omissions of the dates
24 from the Complaint to circumvent dismissal; (7) waste of judicial resources; (8) using the ADA for
25 oppressive reasons; and (9) bad-faith actions in bringing this lawsuit.

26 The Court notes that it did not need to rely on *all* of these violations to impose sanctions.
27 Significantly, only one or several of these violations such as, for example, misrepresentations made
28 to the Court are sufficient to impose sanctions in this case. Therefore, even if Plaintiff acted
properly in bringing this action in a federal court, the Court would still impose sanctions based on

1 this bad-faith conduct.

2 Defendants asked for \$112,122.50 in sanctions, which represents the amount of the
3 attorney's fees and costs incurred by Defendants in this litigation. *See* Doc. No. 42-1, at 4.
4 Defendants have engaged in modest discovery, making every effort to reduce the attorney's fees.
5 Furthermore, after reflecting on the quality of work of the Defendants' counsel, the Court finds his
6 hourly rate and his fees to be reasonable. Nevertheless, the Court finds it appropriate to award a
7 smaller amount in monetary sanctions in this case, as the circumstances and the nature of this case
8 call for reduced sanctions. Accordingly, the Court awards \$25,000 in sanctions to Defendants, to
9 be payable by Wilson and the Hubbards, jointly and severally. This amount represents
10 approximately twenty percent of Defendants' attorney's fees and costs and is sufficient to deter
11 further frivolous litigation and improper litigation conduct.

12 **A. Sanctions under the ADA**

13 Section 12205 of the ADA provides that the Court may, in its discretion, award attorney's
14 fees, litigation expenses, and costs to the "prevailing party" in an ADA lawsuit. 42 U.S.C.
15 § 12205. In their moving papers, Defendants requested attorney's fees, while properly
16 acknowledging that they may not be a "prevailing party" in this litigation because this case was
17 dismissed on summary judgment. *See* Doc. 42-1, at 3:24-28. As Defendants appear to
18 acknowledge, the Court's hands are tied. In this jurisdiction, a "grant of summary judgement
19 based on lack of standing is not a judgment on the merits." *Feezor v. Lopez De-Jesus*, 439 F.
20 Supp. 2d 1109, 1111 (citing *Pilkington PLC v. Perelman*, 72 F.3d 1396, 1397 (9th cir. 1995)).
21 Accordingly, the Court must DENY Defendants' request for attorney's fees and costs pursuant to
22 the ADA fee-shifting provision.

23 Mindful of the possible inapplicability of the ADA fee-shifting provision, Defendants point
24 out that there are three additional ways in which the Court may still sanction Plaintiff and his
25 attorneys: (1) by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1927; (2) under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil
26 Procedure ("Rule 11"); and (3) pursuant to the Court's inherent power to vindicate justice and the
27 purposes of Rule 11. The Court will address each of them in order.
28

1 **B. Sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1927**

2 Defendants raise 28 U.S.C. § 1927 as an alternative ground for sanctions for the first time
3 in their response to the Court’s OSC. This statute provides:

4 Any attorney or other person admitted to conduct cases in any court of the United States or
5 any Territory thereof who so multiplies the proceedings in any case unreasonably and
6 vexatiously may be required by the court to satisfy personally the excess costs, expenses,
7 and attorneys’ fees reasonably incurred because of such conduct.

8 28 U.S.C. § 1927. “Section 1927 sanctions must be supported by a finding of subjective bad
9 faith,” which “is present when an attorney knowingly or recklessly raises a frivolous argument, or
10 argues a meritorious claim for the purpose of harassing an opponent.” *B.K.B. v. Maui Police*
11 *Dept.*, 276 F.3d 1091, 1107 (9th Cir. 2002) (citation omitted).

12 As an initial matter, this section does not apply to the filing of a complaint and covers only
13 subsequent conduct. *See In re Keegan Management Co., Securities Litigation*, 78 F.3d 431, 435
14 (9th Cir. 1996); *Matter of Yagman*, 796 F.2d 1165, 1187 (9th Cir. 1986) (“Section 1927 does not
15 apply to initial pleadings, since it addresses only the multiplication of proceedings. It is only
16 possible to multiply or prolong proceedings after the complaint is filed.”). In addition, the statute
17 by its terms only applies to the person “admitted to conduct cases” and does not apply to Plaintiff
18 once he obtained legal representation.

19 Although Plaintiff and his attorneys engaged in improper litigation behavior, there is no
20 clear indication that they unduly multiplied the proceedings – a conduct, which would allow the
21 Court to impose sanctions under section 1927. Following the filing of the Complaint, the
22 proceedings in the case were not numerous. Rather, there was an average amount of docket
23 activity for a case in this District. Furthermore, the Court found no cases, and Defendants point to
24 none, where section 1927 sanctions were imposed in similar circumstances. Accordingly,
25 Defendants’ Motion for Sanctions under section 1927 is DENIED.

26 **C. Sanctions under Rule 11**

27 Under Rule 11, by signing or filing pleadings, written motions or other papers, an attorney
28 or a party certifies that, “to the best of the person’s knowledge, information, and belief, formed
after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances:”

(1) [the papers are not] being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause

1 unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation;
2 (2) the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions are warranted by existing law or by a
3 nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law or for
4 establishing new law;
5 (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will
6 likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or
7 discovery; and
8 (4) the denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence or, if specifically so
9 identified, are reasonably based on belief or a lack of information.

10 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 11(b).

11 “Rule 11 applies to a represented party who signs a pleading, motion, or other papers, as
12 well as to attorneys.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, __U.S.__ 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1988 n. 13 (2007)
13 (citation omitted). Violations of Rule 11 may result in sanctions. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c). Rule 11
14 contains a “safe harbor” provision, under which the motion must be first served on the alleged
15 violator and filed with court only if the violator does not correct the challenged papers within 21
16 days from the service. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c)(2). “The safe harbor provision gives an attorney the
17 opportunity to withdraw or correct a challenged filing by requiring a party filing a Rule 11 motion
18 to serve the motion 21 days before filing the motion.” *Retail Flooring Dealers of America, Inc. v.*
19 *Beaulieu of America, LLC*, 339 F.3d 1146, 1150 (9th Cir. 2003).

20 Defendants amply complied with the safe harbor provisions of Rule 11. First, on
21 November 15, 2006 and on December 15, 2006, they provided notice to Plaintiff of their intent to
22 bring a Rule 11 Motion for Sanctions and urged Plaintiff to dismiss his action voluntarily. *See*
23 Doc. No. 21-2, at 2. Second, Defendants served their Motion for Sanctions on Plaintiff at least 21
24 days before filing it with the Court. *See* Doc. No. 21. As discussed below, in light of the
25 circumstances of this case, the purposes of Rule 11 can be vindicated by imposing sanctions.
26 Accordingly, the Court awards sanctions pursuant to this Rule.

27 **D. Sanctions under the Inherent Power of the Court**

28 In the alternative, the Court also imposes sanctions under its inherent power. The district
court has “inherent power to levy sanctions against attorneys who abuse the litigation process.”
Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp., 500 F.3d 1047, 1054 n.1 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing *Molski v.*
Mandarin Touch Rest., 359 F. Supp. 2d 924, 928-29 (C.D. Cal. 2005)). Rules and statutes do not
displace a court’s inherent power to impose sanctions for bad-faith conduct. *Chambers v. NASCO*,

1 *Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 46-47 (1991). “At the very least, the inherent power must continue to exist to
2 fill in the interstices.” *Id.* at 46. Under the inherent power, “every federal court” may sanction
3 “abusive litigation practices.” *Marrama v. Citizens Bank of Massachusetts*, ___ U.S. ___ 127 S.Ct.
4 1105, 1112 (2007). The court may, for example, assess attorney’s fees when a party has “acted in
5 bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons.” *Chambers*, 501 U.S. at 45-46
6 (citations omitted).

7 As concluded above, the seriousness of Plaintiff and his attorneys’ abusive litigation
8 practices and their improper, bad-faith actions during these proceedings present more than
9 sufficient grounds to declare this litigation vexatious, improper, and oppressive. Accordingly,
10 sanctions under the inherent power of the court are warranted as alternative sanctions against
11 Plaintiff and his attorneys. Therefore, the Court imposes sanctions on Ronald Wilson, Lynn
12 Hubbard, and Scotlynn Hubbard under this authority as well.

13 **D. Sanctionable Conduct**

14 In deciding to impose sanctions on Plaintiff and his attorneys, the Court has relied, in part,
15 on the following improper and bad-faith conduct. However, as mentioned above, the Court would
16 impose sanctions in this case merely based on only one or several of these violations.

17 **1. Plaintiff Exaggerated the Extent of His Disability**

18 Initially, Plaintiff claimed that he is physically disabled and “requires the use of a walking
19 device, wheel-chair and mobility-equipped van, when traveling about in public.” *See* Doc. No. 1,
20 at 3. In his subsequent filings, however, Wilson admitted that he can also move around using a
21 cane. *See* Doc. No. 17-2, at 2:26 (admitting that Wilson can use a cane *or* a wheelchair when
22 “traveling about in public”). At the hearing, Wilson’s attorney further acknowledged that Wilson
23 (1) can get around his house, (2) walk to the back of his car, and (3) take out his wheelchair – all
24 on his own, with the help of a cane. *See* Hearing Tr. 6:21-23, 7:1-2, Jan. 28, 2008.

25 More importantly, it was recently brought to the Court’s attention that, according to a 2005
26 report from Wilson’s cardiologist, Wilson “*is able to run a single flight of stairs 3 times without*
27 *breathlessness in rapid succession.*” *See* Doc. No. 42-2, Ex. F, Subpoenaed Medical Records
28 (emphasis added). The Court questioned Plaintiff’s attorneys at length regarding this issue at the

1 hearing. However, Plaintiff's attorneys did a great job of avoiding the question by claiming they
2 had never seen this report – despite the fact that this report *is a part of the record* in this and at
3 least two other cases in the Southern District.

4 The Court has no reasons to doubt the authenticity of the cardiac report. Furthermore,
5 neither Wilson nor his attorneys made any effort to dispute the statement in the report.
6 Accordingly, the Court finds that Wilson and his attorneys have repeatedly exaggerated and grossly
7 misrepresented the extent of Wilson's disability, further calling into question his standing to bring
8 this ADA lawsuit. Sanctions are appropriate for this reason alone.

9 **2. Plaintiff Made Numerous Misrepresentations to the Court**

10 The Ninth Circuit recently noted that, where “discovery shows that a party did not have a
11 good-faith basis for the general factual allegations made in a complaint, then that party will be
12 subject to sanctions[.]” *Skaff v. Meridien North America Beverly Hills, LLC*, 506 F.3d 832, 842-43
13 n.9 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing *Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1065 n. 8 (9th Cir.
14 2007) (per curiam)). In the course of this litigation, Plaintiff made numerous misrepresentations to
15 this Court. First, as discussed above, Plaintiff misrepresented the extent of his disability, thus
16 further calling into question his standing to bring this lawsuit.

17 Second, Plaintiff represented to the Court that he did not keep some of his receipts from
18 visits to Defendants' gas station. *See, e.g.*, Doc. No. 18, at 7. Meanwhile, in another ADA case
19 filed by Wilson, Wilson admitted at the deposition that he “save[s] all [his] receipts from
20 everything At least for five or six years.” *See* Doc. No. 42-1, at 9-10 (citing *Wilson v. Marie*
21 *Callender Pie Shops, Inc.*, 06-cv-1537-DFL-KJM (E.D. Cal.) (deposition transcripts)). The Court
22 finds this to be a material misrepresentation, which goes to the heart of Plaintiff's claim.

23 Third, Plaintiff claimed that his reasons for traveling to Southern California was to visit
24 friends and relatives and to meet with the members of a group called “Citizens Acting for the
25 Rights of the Disabled” (“CARD”). *See, e.g.*, Doc. No. 22-3, at 2-3. However, he never named a
26 single living friend or relative or a CARD member in the area of Defendants' establishment. In
27 fact, at a deposition in another case, Wilson admitted that he no longer meets with the CARD
28 members in person, and that those meetings are conducted by telephone. *See* Doc. No. 42-1, Ex.

1 D. Furthermore, at a deposition in another case, Wilson further contradicted the testimony given to
2 this Court when he conceded that he no longer had any living friends or relatives in the San Marcos
3 area. In Wilson's own words, he "outlived them." See Doc. No. 42-1, at 14. Although Defendants
4 pointed out these inconsistencies in their brief, Plaintiff failed to acknowledge and explain them in
5 any way – either at the hearing or by requesting supplemental briefing.

6 Fourth, Plaintiff claimed that he visits Defendants' gas station because he is loyal to this
7 brand. However, as the Court has already determined, Wilson visited *four different* branded gas
8 stations on the day of alleged violations, making token purchases at each one of them. In this
9 Court's view, this negates Wilson's claim that he drives such a long distance specifically to visit
10 his "favorite" gas station.

11 Fifth, Wilson claimed that he sent a letter to Defendants on January 19, 2006, discussing
12 the perceived ADA violations at the gas station. See Doc. No. 18, at 7. However, there is no
13 evidence Plaintiff had actually sent such a letter. Defendants noted in their briefs that they have no
14 record of ever receiving such a letter from Plaintiff. Plaintiff – who claims to diligently document
15 everything – presented no receipts or evidence of any kind suggesting this letter was mailed to
16 Defendants. Furthermore, Plaintiff claimed that this letter was accompanied by four pages of
17 violations, but he failed to produce a copy of these four pages.

18 Finally, as discussed in detail in this Order, Plaintiff misrepresented his past patronage and
19 failed to identify any credible reason to be in San Marcos. Accordingly, the Court finds that
20 Plaintiff is not credible, and that his misrepresentations to the Court warrant sanctions.

21 **3. Wilson's Attorneys Violated Their Duty of Candor to the Court**

22 Plaintiffs attorneys also violated their "continuing duty to inform the Court of any
23 development which may conceivably affect the outcome" of the litigation. See *Bd. of License*
24 *Com'rs of Town of Tiverton v. Pastore*, 469 U.S. 238, 240 (1985) (internal citations omitted); see
25 also *Hargrave v. Fibreboard Corp.*, 710 F.2d 1154, 1164 (5th Cir. 1983) ("The party opposing
26 summary judgment has a duty to inform the district court of the reasons why summary judgment is
27 not appropriate."); *Cleveland Hair Clinic, Inc. v. Puig*, 200 F.3d 1063, 1068-69 (7th Cir. 2000).

28 Specifically, counsel failed to inform the Court that a pending appeal with the Ninth Circuit

1 Court of Appeals in another case – *in which they were counsel of record* – involved similar issues
2 and could affect the disposition of this case. *See Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.*, 506 F.3d 1191 (9th Cir.
3 2007).² Rather, the Hubbards engaged in unethical litigation techniques by waiting and only
4 notifying the Court about the *Doran* appeal *after* determining that the outcome was favorable to
5 them. By failing to inform the Court about the pending appeal in *Doran*, Plaintiff’s attorneys
6 violated their duty before the Court.

7 Furthermore, the Hubbards may have violated California Rules of Professional Conduct,
8 which provide that the attorneys should not mislead the judge regarding factual and legal issues.
9 *See* Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-200(B); *Hendon v. Ramsey*, 2007 WL 1120375, at *10 n.3
10 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 12, 2007); *United States v. Wunsch*, 84 F.3d 1110, 1114 (9th Cir. 1996) (noting that
11 “an attorney admitted to a particular bar may be disciplined for conduct that violates that bar’s
12 local rules of professional conduct”).³

13 Finally, Plaintiff and his attorneys failed to inform the Court of a case in this jurisdiction,
14 which was directly adverse to Wilson on the issue of standing. Specifically, a decision from the
15 Southern District of California, issued before Wilson filed the instant lawsuit, adversely
16 adjudicated Wilson’s personal standing in a similar case. *See Wilson v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*,

17
18 ² Plaintiff filed a Motion for Summary Judgment in this case on April 10, 2007. In his Reply,
19 addressing the issue of standing – a determinative issue in this case – “Wilson concede[d] that the
20 [500-mile] distance of his residence in Dixon, California, does indeed work against him.” *See* Doc.
21 No. 22, 4:19-20. On October 25, 2007, the Court dismissed this case on summary judgment for lack
22 of standing. Apparently, at that time, the Hubbards had already completed the briefing and oral
23 arguments before the Ninth Circuit in *Doran v. 7-Eleven*, a case, which Hubbards now argue is directly
24 controlling on the issue of standing. *See* Doc. No. 41-1, 3:5-6. Nevertheless, at no point did they
25 inform the Court about the pending appeal in *Doran*, despite its obvious relevance to this litigation.

26 ³ At the sanctions hearing, Scott Hubbard apologized for failing to notify the Court about the
27 pending *Doran* appeal. However, this does not change the fact that the Hubbards’ failure to notify the
28 Court of this pertinent information deprived the Court of an opportunity to consider the Ninth Circuit’s
guidance on the issue of standing prior to dismissing this case.

1 426 F. Supp. 2d 1115 (S.D. Cal. 2006). Wilson had a duty to inform the Court about this ruling
2 but failed to do so, only addressing the adverse decision after Defendants brought it to the Court's
3 attention.

4 **4. Plaintiff's Attorneys Made Misrepresentations to the Court**

5 Additionally, after holding the hearing on the matter, the Court finds that Plaintiff's
6 attorneys made numerous misrepresentations to the Court. First – in response to the Court's
7 questions regarding other OSC hearings in which the Hubbards were involved – Scotlynn Hubbard
8 claimed that Judge Whelan discharged his OSC “when we presented the evidence, the same
9 evidence that we presented to this Court.” *See* Hearing Tr. 9:7-9, Jan. 28, 2008. In making this
10 claim, counsel attempted to suggest that Judge Whelan discharged his OSC after being persuaded
11 by the evidence presented by the Hubbards. However, the Court's independent review of Judge
12 Whelan's order revealed that the OSC was discharged because the Hubbards had quickly settled
13 the case before Judge Whelan had an opportunity to hold a hearing and to issue a ruling on the
14 OSC. This directly contradicts the Hubbards' contention that Judge Whelan was persuaded by the
15 evidence they had presented.

16 Second, the Hubbards falsely claimed that they had never seen the report of Wilson's
17 cardiologist. *See* Hearing Tr. 20:14, 20:21, Jan. 28, 2008. The attorneys are presumed to have
18 reviewed the record in their case, including the briefs and exhibits filed by the opposing party.
19 Indeed, they have a duty to do so. In this case, the cardiologist's report appeared in Defendant's
20 reply to the Court's OSC on two separate occasions – (1) a lengthy discussion in Defendant's brief,
21 and (2) as an exhibit attached to the Defendant attorney's declaration. *See* Doc. No. 42-2, Ex. F;
22 42-1, at 22-23. Furthermore, this information appeared in at least two other cases filed by Wilson.
23 *See Wilson v. PFS LLC*, 06cv1046-WQH-BLM (S.D. Cal.), Doc. No. 98, at 2; *Wilson v. Marie*
24 *Callender Pie Shops, Inc.*, 06-cv-1537-DFL-KJM (E.D. Cal.) (deposition subpoena transcripts
25 attached to Exhibit F in the instant case). Importantly, Hubbards represented Wilson in all these
26 cases. Accordingly, the Court finds that Hubbards' claims that they had “never seen that
27 document” to be a willful misrepresentation to the Court – conduct subject to sanctions. *See*
28 *Hearing Tr. 20:21, Jan. 28, 2008.*

1 Third, in falsely claiming they had not seen the report, the Hubbards failed to address the
2 Court's concerns regarding evidence on the record, which suggests that Plaintiff exaggerated the
3 extent of his disability. Although the Court repeatedly inquired into this issue at the hearing,
4 Plaintiff's attorneys made deliberate efforts to avoid answering the Court's questions.

5 Finally, counsel claimed at the hearing that the reason they failed to respond to Defendant's
6 "report" and "documents" was because the Court did not give Plaintiff an opportunity to do so.
7 According to Mr. Hubbard: "I said to the Court, in their briefing schedule, 'give us room to
8 respond to this,' and you did not." See Hearing Tr. 20:10-11, Jan. 28, 2008. After reviewing the
9 record, however, the Court finds no instances where counsel's request for supplemental briefing
10 was denied.

11 **5. Plaintiff's Attorneys Violated Local Court Rules**

12 Plaintiff's attorneys also violated the local rules by filing oversized briefs without obtaining
13 permission from the Court. See Local Rule 7.1(h). As the Ninth Circuit recognized in *Smith v.*
14 *Frank*, the "local rules open the door to control of the business of the court, such as limitations on
15 the length of pleadings or paper size, to avoid an unnecessary burden on the court." 923 F.2d 139,
16 142 (9th Cir. 1991). The district court may impose sanctions for violations of the local rules. *Id.*;
17 Local Rule 83.1(a).

18 In this case, the Court does not base its decision to impose monetary sanctions on counsel's
19 violation of the local rules alone. However, the Court finds it important to caution Wilson's
20 attorneys regarding their failure to comply with local rules and to inform them of the possibility of
21 sanctions for similar violations before this Court in the future. Local rules are of paramount
22 importance in that they allow the Court to carry out its functions, and the Court has "broad
23 discretion in interpreting and applying their local rules." See *Delange v. Dutra Const. Co., Inc.*,
24 183 F.3d 916, 919 n.2 (9th Cir. 1999) (internal citations omitted); *Fish v. Watkins*, 2006 WL
25 411302, at *1 (D. Ariz. Feb. 17, 2006) ("Compliance with the Local Rules . . . is of paramount
26 importance.").

27 **6. Plaintiff Intentionally Omitted Dates in the Complaint to Avoid Dismissal**

28 In every one of his six Complains filed on May 11, 2006 – as well as in all other

1 Complaints filed by Wilson that this Court was able to review – Plaintiff intentionally omitted the
2 dates of his purported visits to the defendants’ premises. In this Court’s opinion, Plaintiff did this
3 to avoid dismissal and sanctions because listing actual dates in the Complaint would make it
4 immediately possible for the Court and Defendants to ascertain the truthfulness of Plaintiff’s
5 allegations, the availability of proof of these purported visits, and the applicability of the statute of
6 limitations.

7 The Court’s inability to determine the dates of the alleged violations made it difficult to
8 adjudicate the pending motions, forcing the Court to undertake extensive record-searching of
9 various filings made by Wilson in other cases. After reviewing motions, pleadings, and exhibits in
10 other cases, the Court was able to determine that Plaintiff made numerous visits to various
11 establishments on the same day, including visits to at least four different gas stations, making token
12 purchases at each of them. Plaintiff’s failure to include the dates of the alleged violations thus
13 placed significant burden on the Court, unnecessarily forced the expenditure of scarce judicial
14 resources, and unduly prolonged the resolution of this case.

15 **7. Plaintiff Attempted to Raise a Theory not Advanced Previously**

16 Furthermore, Plaintiff attempted to raise a theory not advanced previously – after the Court
17 had dismissed this case. Specifically, in the post-OSC filing, Plaintiff made a new claim that the
18 reason for his visits to the San Marcos area was because he has a preference for a La Quinta Inn
19 hotel located there. In this Court’s view, this argument is a deceptive claim, fabricated to fit the
20 corners of *Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.*, 506 F.3d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 2007). Although Plaintiff has
21 offered a long grocery list of reasons for visiting San Marcos in the past, he had never mentioned
22 the La Quinta hotel prior to the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Doran*. Accordingly, the Court will not
23 consider this a legitimate reason for his visits to San Marcos.

24 Additionally, Plaintiff attempted to reargue the merits of his case by claiming that the
25 decision in *Doran v. 7-11*, rendered this Court’s dismissal of his case erroneous. However,
26 Plaintiff may not now withdraw his previous admission that, in this case, the 500-mile distance
27 between Plaintiff’s residence and Defendants’ place of business works “against him.” See Doc.
28 No. 22-1, at 4. Appellate courts in other jurisdictions “have specifically refused to overturn a

1 summary judgment motion on a theory not advanced in opposition to the motion in the district
2 court.” *See, e.g., Savers Fed. Sav. & Loan Assoc. v. Reetz*, 888 F.2d 1497, 1501 (5th Cir.1989).

3 Finally, not only has Plaintiff failed to file a motion to stay or a motion for reconsideration
4 in this case, he never before advanced a theory before this Court that the four-prong standing test
5 should not be used. On the contrary, Plaintiff affirmatively *advocated* the application of this test.
6 *See* Doc. No. 22-1, at 4-9. Plaintiff cannot now attempt to reargue the merits of his claims by
7 alleging the test, which he himself suggested, is not an appropriate test for standing. Plaintiff’s
8 conduct regarding the applicable test for standing is an improper way to prolong this litigation and
9 to place further burden on the Court.

10 **8. Plaintiff and His Attorney Used ADA for Oppressive Reasons**

11 In support of their Motion for Sanctions, Defendants pointed out that, in light of a recent
12 decision from this Court dismissing another one of Wilson’s lawsuits for lack of standing, Plaintiff
13 and his attorneys “knew full well that they did not have standing to file this lawsuit.” *See Costco*
14 *Wholesale Corp.*, 426 F. Supp. 2d at 1121 (Hayes, J.). Defendants further argued that Wilson’s
15 “repetitive ADA Title III litigation history also weighs heavily in favor of finding [his] token visits
16 were designed solely to set up lawsuits.” Finally, Defendants alleged that Wilson’s five post-filing
17 visits indicate that he tried to bolster his claim for standing and damages, after learning that
18 Defendants would not quickly settle.

19 As this Court had previously concluded, some ADA plaintiffs use the Act for illegitimate
20 purposes. As it turns out, the threat of lawsuits and money damages in ADA cases is an “effective
21 inducement to settle” quickly. *Wilson v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 2005 WL 3477827, at *3 (S.D.
22 Cal. Oct. 12, 2005) (Benitez, J.) (citing *Mandarin Touch Rest.*, 347 F. Supp. 2d at 866). In fact,
23 the Hubbards conceded at the hearing that – for most defendants – it makes more economic sense
24 to settle the cases brought by the Hubbards rather than spend attorney’s fees litigating on the
25 merits. *See* Hearing Tr. 24:5-11, Jan. 28, 2008.

26 Specifically, 99.8% of ADA lawsuits filed by Wilson’s attorney, Lynn Hubbard, settle
27 before going to trial. *Wilson v. Pier 1 Imports (US), Inc.*, 411 F. Supp. 2d 1196, 1201 (E.D. Cal.
28 2006). At the hearing, the Hubbards further acknowledged that their firm has “filed about 1,100”

1 ADA cases in this jurisdiction. *See* Hearing Tr. 10:21-24, Jan. 28, 2008. Meanwhile, only 15-16
2 of these cases went to trial. *See id.*

3 A high settlement rate, taken alone, may not necessarily indicate that the plaintiff is filing
4 lawsuits in bad faith. *Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1051-52 (9th Cir. 2007).

5 Likewise, a large volume of suits, “standing alone, does not warrant a pre-filing order.” *Id.*
6 (citation omitted). But, taken together with other factors, this evidence may “indicate an intent to
7 harass defendants into agreeing to cash settlements.” *Id.* (citation omitted). Where, as here, this
8 evidence is accompanied by other factors – such as (1) the plaintiff’s “shopping spree” to a variety
9 of establishments; (2) making petty purchases and retaining receipts as evidence; (3) visiting
10 similar establishments on the same day; and (4) traveling to a distant location for one day only to
11 spend most of that day driving around to visit gas stations, restaurants, and stores – this evidence
12 indicates that an ADA plaintiff is setting up lawsuits for improper purposes.

13 In this case, the evidence of improper acts on behalf of Plaintiff and his attorneys is
14 overwhelming. The Hubbards themselves admitted that the ADA lawsuits they bring against
15 California businesses present a difficult choice to the defendants – settle for a small sum or
16 potentially incur tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars litigating the case. The Supreme Court
17 had noted that the courts can sanctions the conduct of the parties who had “acted in bad faith,
18 vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons.” *See Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 45-
19 46 (1991) (internal citations omitted). The Court concludes that the evidence of a high settlement
20 rate, coupled with other improper conduct by Plaintiff and his attorneys, also warrant an imposition
21 of sanctions.

22 **9. Plaintiff and His Attorney Filed this Lawsuit in Bad Faith**

23 Finally, after hearing the evidence, reviewing the voluminous record in this case, and taking
24 judicial notice of other lawsuits brought by Wilson and his attorneys in this District, the Court
25 concludes that Wilson and the Hubbards brought this lawsuit in bad faith. The Court finds it
26 especially troubling that Wilson failed to present any bona-fide, legitimate reasons for his visits to
27 the San Marcos area.

28 Furthermore, Wilson failed to present any evidence, which would show that he is likely to

1 return to San Marcos in the future. The Ninth Circuit emphasized that the plaintiff in *Doran* made
2 “ten to twenty” prior visits to the location in question, and his visits were annual visits to a truly
3 unique attraction – the nearby Disneyland park. See *Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.*, 506 F.3d 1191, 1196
4 (9th Cir. 2007). Meanwhile, Wilson has not alleged any bona-fide reasons for traveling to San
5 Marcos, and the Court finds his unsupported claim to the contrary not credible. This evidence –
6 coupled with Wilson’s failure to abide by or at least to inform the Court of the decisions in this
7 jurisdiction indicating Wilson did not have standing to bring this lawsuit – presents yet another
8 independent reason to sanction Wilson and his counsel for improper conduct.


9 **IV. CONCLUSION**

10 For all the reasons above, the Court imposes sanctions on Ronald Wilson, Lynn Hubbard, and
11 Scotlynn Hubbard. This decision does not mean that ADA plaintiffs are now precluded from bringing
12 actions before this Court. On the contrary, this decision fosters the legitimate goals of the Act, while
13 applying narrowly to a pattern of abusive litigation techniques employed by one particular ADA
14 Plaintiff and his attorneys. It is important to recognize that the Court’s decision goes only as far as
15 necessary to punish and deter improper litigation conduct and does not affect legitimate ADA plaintiffs
16 who file their lawsuits in federal courts in good faith, alleging *bona fide* violations, and who do not
17 engage in improper and misleading litigation practices such as the ones discussed in this Order.

18 Accordingly, the Court orders Ronald Wilson, Lynn Hubbard, and Scotlynn Hubbard to pay
19 \$25,000 in sanctions to Defendants. The Court hereby discharges its earlier Order to Show Cause,
20 finding monetary sanctions more appropriate for this case at present. Plaintiff and his attorneys are
21 cautioned, however, to cease the vexatious practices and to take steps to ensure future lawsuits are
22 prosecuted in good faith. They are further ordered to include the dates of the alleged violations when
23 filing ADA complaints with this Court, thus reducing unnecessary burden on the Court and on the
24 defendants.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 DATED: February 29, 2008

27 
28 Hon. Roger T. Benitez
United States District Judge