

Brandon J. Sweeney (SBN: 278532)
THE SWEENEY LAW FIRM, APC
3320 W. Victory Blvd.
Burbank, CA 91505
Telephone: (818) 668-7451
Facsimile: (818) 843-1833

A6037
91367

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

MAR 16 2016

GRANT JOSEPH SAVOY, Esq. (SBN: 284077)
SHOHAM J. SOLOUKI, Esq. (SBN: 278538)
SOLOUKI & SAVOY, LLP
316 W. 2nd Street, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telephone: (213) 814-4940
Facsimile: (213) 814-2550

DEPT. 71
SUZANNE
6. BRW600A

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By Judi Lara, Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff ALTON HENRY

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - CENTRAL DISTRICT**

BC 6 13 872

ALTON HENRY, an individual, ———
Plaintiff,

Case No.: [REDACTED]

COMPLAINT FOR

vs.

KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS;
SECURITAS SECURITY SERVICES USA,
INC.; and DOES 1 TO 50, inclusive,
Defendants.

1. RACE DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. GOV'T CODE §§ 12940 ET SEQ.;
2. AGE DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. GOV'T CODE §§ 12940 ET SEQ.;
3. RETALIATION AND WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY;
4. DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940(a);
5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION [CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940(b)].

RECEIPT #: CCH20872051
DATE PAID: 03/16/16 11:15 AM
AMOUNT: \$435.00
CHECK: \$435.00
CASH: \$0.00
CHANGE: \$0.00
CARD: \$0.00

CIT/CASE: BC613872
LEA/DEF#:

-Caption Continued of Next Page-

6. FAILURE TO ENGAGE IN THE INTERACTIVE PROCESS
7. FAILURE TO PAY EARNED WAGES [CAL. LABOR CODE § 204];
8. FAILURE TO PAY COMPENSATION FOR ALL HOURS WORKED, INCLUDING OVERTIME [CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 510, 1194, 1198];
9. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL BREAKS [CAL. LABOR CODE § 226.7]
10. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST BREAKS [CAL. LABOR CODE § 226.7];
11. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS [CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 226, 226.3];

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff ALTON HENRY (hereinafter "Plaintiff" or "Mr. Henry") alleges through Counsel as follows:

I. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. This is an action for violation of California's laws concerning wage and hour laws, employee discrimination based on race, age and disability, and wrongful termination in violation public policy. SECURITAS SECURITY SERVICES USA, INC. (hereinafter "Securitas" or "Defendant"), KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS (hereinafter "Kaiser" or "Defendant"); and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, ("Defendants"): violated various wage and hour laws, discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff at his place of employment, and wrongfully terminated Plaintiff's employment in violation of public policy.

2. Specifically, Defendants violated the provisions of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), including but not limited to Government Code

03/16/2016

1 ("Gov. Code") section(s) 12900 and 12940, violated the California Labor Code ("Lab.
2 Code"), including but not limited to sections 204, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 1194, 1194, 1197
3 and 1198, and violated Plaintiff's legal and other rights.

4 3. All of these claims are the result of the intentional conduct of the Defendants
5 and their blatant disregard for the laws of the state of California. Accordingly, this civil action
6 seeks compensatory and punitive damages against Defendants for violations of Plaintiff's
7 rights as set forth herein.

8 4. Venue is proper in this Court because Defendants do substantial business in Los
9 Angeles, California, and employed Plaintiff in Los Angeles, California.

10 11 II. THE PARTIES

12 5. Plaintiff at all times herein relevant was an individual residing in the County of
13 Los Angeles, State of California.

14 6. Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS, is a California Corporation
15 doing business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. Plaintiff is informed and
16 believes that Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS is an "employer" as defined
17 by California Gov. Code sections 12926(d), 12940(a), and 12940(j)(4)(A).

18 7. Defendant SECURITAS SECURITY SERVICES USA, INC. is a Delaware
19 Corporation doing business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. Plaintiff is
20 informed and believes that Defendant SECURITAS SECURITY SERVICES USA, INC. is an
21 "employer" as defined by California Gov. Code sections 12926(d), 12940(a), and
22 12940(j)(4)(A). Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS and Defendant
23 SECURITAS SECURITY SERVICES USA, INC. and DOES 1 TO 50 are collectively
24 referred to as "Defendants." Further, at all times relevant, Defendant Kaiser and Defendant
25 Securitas has the authority to hire and fire, set wages and hours, and tell employees when and
26 where to report to work; and Defendants exercised said rights on a continuous and regular
27 basis. In addition, at all times relevant, Defendants exercised control over Plaintiff's wages,
28 hours, and working conditions, including setting Plaintiff's working hours, setting his wage

1 amount, and issuing his payroll checks.

2 8. At all relevant times herein, the conduct of Defendant Kaiser and Defendant
3 Securitas was known and/or approved and/or ratified by the other Defendants, including
4 Defendant Kaiser and Defendant Securitas, who were Plaintiff's joint employers with
5 Defendants pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2810.3 and 558.1.

6 9. At all times relevant to this complaint, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendants
7 Kaiser and Securitas. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all
8 Defendants are subject to suit under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act,
9 Government code § 12900 et seq. ("FEHA") because they regularly employ five or more
10 persons.

11 10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
12 otherwise, of defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are currently unknown
13 to Plaintiff, who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under section 474 of the
14 California Code of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
15 alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a Doe are legally responsible in
16 some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to
17 amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated
18 hereinafter as Does when such identities become known.

19 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each
20 Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as an agent of the other Defendants,
21 carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts
22 of each of the Defendants are legally attributable to the other Defendants.

23 12. At all times herein mentioned, until Plaintiff's wrongful termination on or
24 about July 2, 2014, Plaintiff was a qualified employee for, and employed as, a security guard
25 by Defendants at their Woodland Hills, California location.

26 13. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff was employed as a full-time employee by
27 Defendants. Plaintiff is of African-American/Black descent (race), and at all times herein
28 alleged, over the age of forty (40) and fifty-five (55), and disabled and/or perceived disabled

03/16/2016

1 at the time of his wrongful termination.

2 14. Beginning in or around 2014, and continuing at least through July 2, 2014, Defendants,
3 and each of them, discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's race
4 (African-American/Black) and age (over forty), and disability by the following continuous
5 actions, and conduct, among others.

6 15. During the course of his employment, Plaintiff regularly worked eight (8) or more
7 hours per day, with no break or meal time periods provided. Furthermore, Defendants lacked
8 any policy with regard to provision of 10 minute rest periods as required by California's
9 Labor Code.

10 16. Defendants did not allow Plaintiff to take his ten (10) minute rest periods or thirty (30)
11 meal periods.

12 17. Plaintiff worked overtime both beyond his eight (8) hour shifts and over forty (40)
13 hours per week.

14 18. Defendants told Plaintiff he could not take breaks unless his work was finished.
15 However, Defendants were so demanding that Defendants did not make rest and meal period
16 breaks available to Plaintiff because they always had work for him to do and there was never
17 enough time to complete all assignments in the day and/or week.

18 19. Plaintiff was not an exempt employee. Plaintiff's duties and responsibilities did not
19 involve the management of the enterprise in which he was employed or of a customarily
20 recognized department or subdivision thereof.

21 20. Plaintiff did not customarily and regularly direct the work of two or more other
22 employees at his workplace with Defendants.

23 21. During his work with Defendants, Plaintiff did not have the authority to hire or fire
24 other employees

25 22. Plaintiff's potential suggestions and recommendations as to the hiring or firing and as
26 to the advancement and promotion or any other change of status of other employees was
27 never given particular weight with Defendants.

28 23. Plaintiff did not customarily and regularly exercise discretion and independent

03/16/2016

1 judgment during his work with Defendants.

2 24. Plaintiff's duties and responsibilities did not include office work directly related to
3 management policies or general business operations of Defendants or Defendants' customers,
4 or functions in the administration of a school system, or educational establishment or
5 institution, or of a department or subdivision thereof, in work directly related to the academic
6 instruction or training carried on therein.

7 25. Plaintiff did not regularly exercise discretion and independent judgment.

8 26. Plaintiff did not regularly and directly assist a proprietor, or an employee employed in
9 a bona fide executive or administrative capacity.

10 27. Plaintiff did not perform, under only general supervision, work along specialized or
11 technical lines requiring special training, experience, or knowledge in the area of
12 administration.

13 28. Plaintiff did not execute, under only general supervision, special assignments and
14 tasks.

15 29. Any decision making power on the part of Plaintiff during his employment with
16 Defendants was of little consequence and especially along the lines of administration.

17 30. Plaintiff was entitled to meal and rest breaks under California Labor Code § 512 and
18 the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission wage order.

19 31. Therefore, as described hereinabove, Plaintiff was not an exempt employee.

20 32. On or about July 2, 2014, Defendants wrongfully terminated Plaintiff in retaliation for
21 Plaintiff's complaint to Defendants as described above.

22 33. Within thirty (30) days of terminating Plaintiff, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all
23 wages due.

24 34. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants violated the Cal.
25 Labor Code and Applicable Wage Orders.

26 35. Defendants employed Plaintiff for work periods of four hours or major fraction thereof
27 without rest periods of ten minutes net rest time and failed to compensate Plaintiff for these
28 missed rest periods.

1 36. In addition, Defendants violated the Lab. Code by not providing Plaintiff with pay
2 stubs which accurately state the number of regular and overtime hours worked.

3 I.

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **RACE DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION**

6 **[CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940]**

7 **(Against all Defendants)**

8 37. As will be explained herein, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendants. He worked
9 for/under Defendants. Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff on account of his race,
10 starting in and around 2014. Defendants further retaliated against Plaintiff by terminating his
11 employment on account of his race (African American/Black). Moreover, Defendants, and its
12 supervisors and/or managing agents, continued to discriminate against Plaintiff on account of
13 his race and national origin, by continuing to treat him differently than other similarly
14 situated non-African American/Black employees. Defendant then terminated Plaintiff's
15 employment on or about July 2, 2016 on account of race and national origin in violation of
16 the *California Fair Employment and Housing Act* ("FEHA"). This action was known,
17 approved and/or ratified by Defendants and its officers and/or directors.

18 38. In and around 1990, Plaintiff was hired by Defendants as a Security Guard at their
19 Woodland Hills, California Hospital. Plaintiff's duties included securing the premises,
20 working the checkout area of the hospital's main lobby, patrolling the property, monitoring
21 surveillance, inspecting the location and buildings, and permitting entry of the public.

22 39. From 1990 until June 2, 2014, Plaintiff, was competently performing his job duties for
23 Defendants. Plaintiff had received no write-ups and/or reprimands during this time. In fact,
24 Plaintiff received numerous above average and exceptional performance evaluations during
25 his employment with Defendants. However, in and around 2014, Plaintiff began to be
26 subjected to race discrimination by one or more of Defendants employees and/or managing
27 agents. This conduct was known, approved and ratified by Defendants. During his
28 employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was treated differently than those similarly situated

03/16/2016

1 non-African American/Black employees.

2 40. After Plaintiff complained to Defendants, Defendants' managing agents began to
3 unfairly scrutinize Plaintiff's work as compared to other similarly situated non-African
4 American/Black employees. Shortly after Plaintiff began to complain of such treatment, he
5 was pretextually terminated.

6 41. On June 2, 2014, Plaintiff was sitting at this post when his chair broke, thereby
7 sustaining a serious back injury. Plaintiff immediately reported the incident to Defendants;
8 however, Plaintiff did not seek immediate medical attention fearing he would be further
9 retaliated against on account his disability. Shortly after Plaintiff's industrial injury, Plaintiff
10 was in severe pain, which was noticeable by Defendants' managing agents, making his
11 disability perceived by Defendants.

12 42. After Plaintiff's industrial injury and his perceived disability by Defendants',
13 Defendants discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff for the false and/or exaggerated
14 and/or pretextual reason(s) that Plaintiff was "sleeping on the job." On or about July 2, 2014,
15 Defendants discriminated against, retaliated against and wrongfully terminated Plaintiff for
16 the false and/or exaggerated and/or pretextual reason(s) that Plaintiff was "sleeping on the
17 job."

18 43. Defendants, discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's race,
19 African-American/Black, by the following continuous actions and conduct, among others:

- 20 a. Discriminating and retaliating against Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's race;
21 b. Refusing to investigate claims of race discrimination and further reprimanding
22 Plaintiff for making reports of such disparate treatment;
23 c. Failing to re-hire Plaintiff.

24 44. The acts and conduct of Defendants, as aforesaid, was in violation of California
25 Government Code § 12940 et seq. Said statutes impose certain duties upon Defendants,
26 concerning discrimination and retaliation against persons, such as Plaintiff, on the basis of
27 race and/or national origin and the prohibition of race and/or national origin discrimination
28 and retaliation. Said statutes were intended to prevent the type of injury and damage set

1 forth. Plaintiff was, at all times material hereto, an employee of African-American/Black
2 race, and within the protected class covered by California Government Code § 12940,
3 prohibiting race discrimination and retaliation in employment.

4 45. By the acts and conduct described above, Defendants, in violation of said statutes,
5 knew about, or should have known about, and failed to investigate and/or properly
6 investigate, prevent or remedy the race discrimination and retaliation. The acts of
7 discrimination and retaliation described herein were sufficiently sever and/or pervasive so as
8 to alter the conditions of employment, and created an abusive working environment. When
9 Plaintiff was discriminate and retaliated against, Plaintiff's race and/or complaints about the
10 unlawful conduct was a substantial factor motivating Defendant's conduct, and/or a
11 motivating reason in Defendant's conduct.

12 46. Plaintiff filed timely charges and complaints of race and national origin discrimination
13 and retaliation with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing and has
14 received Notice(s) of Right to sue in California Superior court pursuant to California
15 Government Code § 12965(b). Plaintiff has therefore exhausted Plaintiff's administrative
16 remedies under the California Government Code. Attached hereto and incorporated herein as
17 Exhibit 1 are said Complaints and Right to Sue Notice(s) and by reference hereto are made a
18 part hereof.

19 47. By the aforesaid acts and conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff has directly and legally
20 caused to suffer actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code §3333, including but not
21 limited to, a substantial reduction in past and current income and future income potential in
22 sums as may be shown according to proof; a substantial injury and damage to his occupation
23 and professional reputation in a sum as may be shown according to proof; and Extreme
24 humiliation, embarrassment, depression, sleeplessness, emotional pain, emotional distress,
25 mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life and other loses from the date of said acts all to
26 Plaintiff's damage in a sum as may be shown according to proof.

27 48. Defendants committed the acts herein allegedly maliciously, fraudulently and
28 oppressively with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, from an improper and evil

1 motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. As a result
2 of these and other actions, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages.

3 49. In addition, as a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff is
4 entitled to attorneys' fees and prejudgment interest.

5 50. Pursuant to California Government Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff requests the award of
6 attorneys' fees against Defendants under this cause of action.

7 II.

8 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

9 AGE DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION

10 [CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940]

11 (Against all Defendants)

12 51. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each
13 and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 50, inclusive, of this Complaint to the
14 extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.

15 52. Plaintiff is, and was, over the age of forty (40) and fifty five (55) at the time of his
16 wrongful termination.

17 53. Beginning in or around 2014, and continuing at least through July 2, 2014, and
18 continuing, Defendant and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them, discriminated and retaliated
19 against Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's age, over-40, by the following continuous actions, and
20 conduct, among others:

21 a. Supervisory and/or Managerial Personnel of Defendants began to discriminate
22 against Plaintiff, and other older employees, as compared to other similarly-situated
23 employees and/or employees under forty and/or substantially younger employees, especially
24 non-African American/Black employees. Plaintiff, on account of his age, over forty, was
25 further discriminated and retaliated against when she complained about the treatment.

26 b. On or about July 2, 2014, Defendants discriminated and retaliated against
27 Plaintiff, for the false and/or exaggerated and/or pretextual reason(s) that Plaintiff was
28 sleeping on the job. On or about July 2, 2014, Defendants discriminated against, retaliated

1 against and wrongfully terminated Plaintiff for the false and/or exaggerated and/or pretextual
2 reason(s) that Plaintiff was sleeping on the job.

3 54. Defendants, discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's age, by
4 the following continuous actions and conduct, among others:

- 5 a. Discriminating and retaliating against Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's race;
- 6 b. Discriminating and retaliating against Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's disability;
- 7 c. Discriminating and retaliating against Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's age, over forth
8 (40);
- 9 d. Failing to re-hire Plaintiff;

10 55. The acts and conduct of Defendants, as aforesaid, was in violation of California
11 Government Code § 12940 et seq. Said statutes impose certain duties upon Defendants,
12 concerning discrimination and retaliation against persons, such as Plaintiff, on the basis of
13 age and the prohibition of age discrimination and retaliation. Said statutes were intended to
14 prevent the type of injury and damage set forth. Plaintiff was, at all times material hereto, an
15 employee over forty (40), and within the protected class covered by California Government
16 Code § 12940, prohibiting age discrimination and retaliation in employment.

17 56. By the acts and conduct described above, Defendants, in violation of said statutes,
18 knew about, or should have known about, and failed to investigate and/or properly
19 investigate, prevent or remedy the age discrimination and retaliation. The acts of
20 discrimination and retaliation described herein were sufficiently sever and/or pervasive so as
21 to alter the conditions of employment, and created an abusive working environment. When
22 Plaintiff was discriminate and retaliated against, Plaintiff's age and/or complaints about the
23 unlawful conduct was a substantial factor motivating Defendants' conduct, and/or a
24 motivating reason in Defendants' conduct.

25 57. Plaintiff filed timely charges and complaints of age discrimination and retaliation with
26 the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing and has received Notice(s) of
27 Right to sue in California Superior court pursuant to California Government Code § 12965(b).
28 Plaintiff has therefore exhausted Plaintiff's administrative remedies under the California

1 Government Code.

2 58. By the aforesaid acts and conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff has directly and legally
3 caused to suffer actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code §3333, including but not
4 limited to, a substantial reduction in past and current income and future income potential in
5 sums as may be shown according to proof; a substantial injury and damage to her occupation
6 and professional reputation in a sum as may be shown according to proof, and extreme
7 humiliation, embarrassment, depression, sleeplessness, emotional pain, emotional distress,
8 mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life and other losses from the date of said acts all to
9 Plaintiff's damage in a sum as may be shown according to proof.

10 59. Defendants committed the acts herein allegedly maliciously, fraudulently and
11 oppressively with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, from an improper and evil
12 motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. As a result
13 of these and other actions, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages.

14 60. In addition, as a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff is
15 entitled to attorneys' fees and prejudgment interest.

16 61. Pursuant to California Government Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff requests the award of
17 attorneys' fees against Defendants under this cause of action.

18 **III.**

19 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **RETALATION AND WRONGFUL TERMINATION**

21 **(Against all Defendants)**

22 62. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and
23 every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive, of this Complaint to the
24 extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.

25 63. At all times herein mentioned the public policy of the State of California, as codified,
26 expressed and mandated in California Government Code § 12940 was to prohibit employers
27 from discriminating and retaliating against any individual based on their race. This public
28 policy of the State of California is designed to protect all employees and to promote the

03/16/2016

1 welfare and well-being of the community at large. Accordingly, the actions of Defendants,
2 and each of them, in discriminating, retaliating and terminating Plaintiff on the grounds of
3 stated above, or for complaining about such discrimination and retaliation was wrongful and
4 in contravention and violation of the express public policy of the State of California, to wit,
5 the policy set forth in California Government Code § 12940 et seq., and the laws and
6 regulations promulgated thereunder.

7 64. At all times herein mentioned the public policy of the State of California, as codified,
8 expressed and mandated in California Government Code § 12940 was to prohibit employers
9 from discriminating and retaliating against any individual based on their national origin. This
10 public policy of the State of California is designed to protect all employees and to promote
11 the welfare and well-being of the community at large. Accordingly, the actions of
12 Defendants, and each of them, in discriminating, retaliating and terminating Plaintiff on the
13 grounds of stated above, or for complaining about such discrimination and retaliation was
14 wrongful and in contravention and violation of the express public policy of the State of
15 California, to wit, the policy set forth in California Government Code § 12940 et seq., and the
16 laws and regulations promulgated thereunder.

17 65. There is a public policy in this state and in this country in favor of employees not
18 being subjected to retaliation for reporting and/or complaining about violation of State and
19 Federal Law. California Labor Code Section 1102.5 prohibits any employer from taking any
20 action against any employee out of fear that the employee will report any violation of the
21 Labor Code to any state or federal government agency. Defendants have also violated the
22 public policy of this state set forth in Labor Code Section 98.6 by retaliating against Plaintiff
23 for his complaints regarding Defendants' illegal activities as pled herein and in violation of
24 Plaintiffs rights under the California Labor Code

25 66. At all times herein mentioned the public policy of the State of California, as codified,
26 expressed and mandated in California Government Code § 12940 and 12941 was to prohibit
27 employers from discriminating and retaliating against any individual based on their national
28 origin. This public policy of the State of California is designed to protect all employees and

1 to promote the welfare and well-being of the community at large. Accordingly, the actions of
 2 Defendants, and each of them, in discriminating, retaliating and terminating Plaintiff on the
 3 grounds of stated above, or for complaining about such discrimination and retaliation was
 4 wrongful and in contravention and violation of the express public policy of the State of
 5 California, to wit, the policy set forth in California Government Code § 12940 and 12941 et
 6 seq., and the laws and regulations promulgated thereunder.

7 67. By the aforesaid acts and conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff has directly and legally
 8 caused to suffer actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code §3333, including but not
 9 limited to, a substantial reduction in past and current income and future income potential in
 10 sums as may be shown according to proof; a substantial injury and damage to his occupation
 11 and professional reputation in a sum as may be shown according to proof; and Extreme
 12 humiliation, embarrassment, depression, sleeplessness, emotional pain, emotional distress,
 13 mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life and other losses from the date of said acts all to
 14 Plaintiff's damage in a sum as may be shown according to proof.

15 68. Defendants committed the acts herein allegedly maliciously, fraudulently and
 16 oppressively with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, from an improper and evil
 17 motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. As a result
 18 of these and other actions, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages.

19 69. In addition, as a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff is
 20 entitled to attorneys' fees and prejudgment interest.

21 70. Pursuant to California Government Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff requests the award of
 22 attorneys' fees against Defendants under the cause of action.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 IV.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION
[CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940 (a)]
(Against all Defendants)

71. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 70, inclusive, as set forth above.

72. California Government code § 12940(a) makes it illegal for an employer "because of...physical disability...to bar or to discharge a person from employment...or to discrimination against the person in compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment."

73. Plaintiff is and was at all times relevant suffering from a physical condition within the meaning of California Government Code § 12940(k) because Plaintiff suffered from a medical condition and/or disability that limited one or more life activities.

74. During Plaintiff's employment, Defendant and its agents engaged in actions intentionally that resulted in Plaintiff being treated less favorably because of actual and/or perceived disability. Plaintiff was barred and discharged from employment and discriminated against in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment on the basis of her medical disability and/or Plaintiff's medical disability was a motivating factor even though other factors may have contributed to Defendant's actions, in violation California Government Code § 12940(a).

75. At all material points described herein, Plaintiff was treated differently than similarly situated employee and/or otherwise subjected to unlawful discriminatory employment practices as prohibited by the laws of California. The conduct, statements and acts described herein were an ongoing part of a continuing scheme and course of conduct. Defendant, in engaging in the aforementioned conduct, discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of her disability.

76. Defendant knew the substance of the above-described facts and circumstances and ratified the wrongs and injuries mentioned herein when it was their ability to prevent, remedy

1 and/or correct these wrongs. Defendant further intentionally and willfully failed to ensure
2 that their employees were informed of the law relevant to their duties to ensure that
3 employees would not be required to participate in illegal conduct.

4 77. Defendant has continued to ratify and have refused to remedy or correct the
5 aforementioned conducting during and since Plaintiff's employment, notwithstanding the fact
6 that company officials knew or reasonably should have known of the conduct and its
7 unlawfulness.

8 78. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned violations of statute and public
9 policy, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer:

- 10 a. A substantial reduction in past and current income and future income potential
11 in sums as may be shown according to proof;
12 b. A substantial injury and damage to her occupation and professional reputation
13 in a sum as may be shown according to proof; and
14 c. Extreme humiliation, embarrassment, depression, sleeplessness, emotional pain,
15 emotional distress, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life and other losses
16 from the date of said acts all to Plaintiff's damage in a sum as may be shown
17 according to proof.

18 79. Defendants committed the acts herein allegedly maliciously, fraudulently and
19 oppressively with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, from an improper and evil
20 motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. As a result
21 of these and other actions, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages.

22 80. In addition, as a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendant, Plaintiff is
23 entitled to attorneys' fees and prejudgment interest.

24 81. Pursuant to California Government Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff requests the award of
25 attorneys fees against Defendants under this cause of action.

26 ///

27 ///

28 V.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**FAILURE TO PROVIDE A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION****[CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940(k)]****(Against all Defendants)**

82. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 81, inclusive, of this Complaint to the extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.

83. California Government Code §12940(m) makes it unlawful for an employer to "fail to make reasonable accommodation for the known physical or mental disability of an applicant or employee."

84. At all relevant times herein, Defendants knew that Plaintiff had a medical condition and physical disability within the meaning of California Government Code § 12926(k). However, Defendant did not attempt to reasonably accommodate Plaintiff's medical disability.

85. Making a reasonable accommodation includes allowing Plaintiff to take off work to obtain medical treatment for her condition and not terminating Plaintiff's employment with Defendants as a result of Plaintiff taking leave to treat her medical disability. This would not have created an undue hardship on Defendant. Such a small accommodation would not have required significant difficulty or expense, as none would be expended to accommodate Plaintiff's needs. The conduct, statements and acts described herein were an ongoing part of a continuing scheme and course of conduct. Defendants knew of the above described facts and circumstances and ratified the wrongs and injures mentioned herein when it was their ability to prevent theses wrongs. Defendants further intentionally and willfully failed to ensure that their employees were informed of the law relevant to their duties to ensure that employees would not be required to participate in illegal conduct.

86. Defendants have continued to ratify and have refused to remedy or correct the aforementioned conducting during and since Plaintiff's employment, notwithstanding the fact that company officials knew or reasonably should have known of the conduct and its

1 unlawfulness.

2 87. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned violations of statute and public
3 policy, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer:

- 4 a. A substantial reduction in past and current income and future income potential
5 in sums as may be shown according to proof;
- 6 b. A substantial injury and damage to her occupation and professional reputation
7 in a sum as may be shown according to proof; and
- 8 c. Extreme humiliation, embarrassment, depression, sleeplessness, emotional pain,
9 emotional distress, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life and other losses
10 from the date of said acts all to Plaintiff's damage in a sum as may be shown
11 according to proof.

12 88. Defendants committed the acts herein allegedly maliciously, fraudulently and
13 oppressively with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, from an improper and evil
14 motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. As a result
15 of these and other actions, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages.

16 89. In addition, as a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of Defendant, Plaintiff is
17 entitled to attorneys fees and prejudgment interest.

18 90. Pursuant to California Government Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff requests the award of
19 attorneys fees against Defendant under this cause of action.

20 **VI.**

21 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO ENGAGE IN THE INTERACTIVE PROCESS**

23 **(Against all Defendants)**

24 91. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and
25 every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 90, inclusive, of this Complaint to the
26 extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.

27 92. Plaintiff was physically disabled within the meaning of FEHA, all as aforepleaded.
28 Alternatively, the Defendants perceived Plaintiff as being physically disabled.

93. Government Code Section 12940(n) requires an employer to engage in a good faith interactive process with a disabled employee to ascertain effective reasonable accommodations with an employee who requests same or needs such accommodations. The employer's failure to do so is a separate violation of FEHA.

94. The Defendants violated Government Code Section 12940(n) by failing to engage in said good faith interactive process with Plaintiff when he notified Defendants of his industrial injury and need for medical attention. Instead, Defendants decided to terminate Plaintiff immediately after Plaintiff's notified Defendant of his back injury and intent to seek treatment and care for his disability. Additionally, Plaintiff suffered from a physical disability for which he sought a reasonable accommodation. As a proximate result of the said violation of FEHA, Plaintiff has suffered mental anguish and emotional suffering in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this court and according to proof.

95. As a further proximate result of said violation of FEHA as aforepleaded, Plaintiff has suffered a loss of tangible employment benefits including lost wages and fringe benefits in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of the court and according to proof.

96. As a further proximate result of the Defendants' violation of FEHA, Plaintiff was required to and did retain attorneys, and is accordingly entitled to an award of attorney's fees according to proof.

97. As a further proximate result of said violation of FEHA, Plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur medical expenses in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

98. The aforepleaded conduct constitutes malice, oppression, or fraud, thereby entitling Plaintiff to an award of punitive damages. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such conduct was taken by an officer or managing agent of the Defendants, or alternatively, authorized, ratified or approved by an officer or managing agent of the Defendants.

///

///

VII.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO COMPENSATE FOR ALL HOURS

[CAL. LABOR CODE § 204]

(Against all Defendants)

99. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 98, inclusive, of this Complaint to the extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.

100. Section 204 of the California Labor Code states that all wages, other than those mentioned in 201, 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays.

101. As described hereinabove, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff per pay period any and all wages due in a timely manner.

102. Defendants therefore owe damages in the amount of any remaining unpaid wages in addition to penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 210 in the amount of \$100 for each failure to pay Plaintiff.

VIII.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION

[CAL. LABOR CODE § 510]

(Against all Defendants)

103. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 102, inclusive, of this Complaint to the extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.

104. Under California Labor Code § 510(a), "Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall

1 be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an
2 employee.”

3 105. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants on numerous occasions, Defendants
4 requested that Plaintiff work and Plaintiff actually worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one
5 workday and in excess of 40 hours in one workweek. On such occasions, Defendants failed to pay
6 Plaintiff at least one and one-half times his regular rate of pay for overtime hours worked.

7 106. Defendants to this date have not paid Plaintiff for the overtime hours he worked.

8 107. As a proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff overtime, pursuant to the
9 provisions of California Labor Code § 510(a), Plaintiff suffered losses in earnings, and other
10 employment benefits along with other incidental and consequential damages and losses, all in an
11 amount to be proven at trial.

12 108. As a proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff overtime, pursuant to the
13 provisions of California Labor Code § 510(a), Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer
14 economic damages in the form of lost retirement benefits in an amount to be proven at trial.

15 109. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.5, Plaintiff requests that the court award
16 reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in this action.

17 110. Plaintiff also seeks damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(f) and
18 California Labor Code § 558.

19
20 **IX.**

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL BREAKS**

23 **[CAL. LABOR CODE § 226.7]**

24 **(Against all Defendants)**

25 111. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and
26 every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 110, inclusive, of this Complaint to the
27 extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.
28

112. California Labor Code § 226.7 requires an employer to pay an additional hour of compensation for each required meal period the employer fails to provide. Employees are entitled to a meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes per five (5) hour work period. Plaintiff consistently worked over five (5) hours shifts. Pursuant to the Labor Code and Wage Order 9-2001, Plaintiff was entitled to a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to exceeding five (5) hours of employment.

113. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with either timely meal breaks of not less than thirty (30) minutes, or to provide Plaintiff with an additional hour of compensation for each meal period missed as required during the time that Plaintiff was employed with Defendants.

114. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff is entitled to damages of one (1) hour of wages per missed meal break, in a sum to be proven at trial.

115. Plaintiff also seeks damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(f) and California Labor Code § 558.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS

[CAL. LABOR CODE § 226.7]

(Against all Defendants)

116. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 115, inclusive, of this Complaint to the extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.

117. California Labor Code § 226.7 requires an employer to pay an additional hour of compensation for each workday where an employee fails to receive a rest period for each consecutive four (4) hour shift worked. Employees are entitled to a net rest period of at least ten (10) minutes per each consecutive four (4) hour work period or major fraction thereof, after the first three and one-half (3½) hours worked in a workday. Plaintiff consistently worked four (4) hour shifts. Pursuant to the California Labor Code and Wage Order 9-2001, Plaintiff was entitled to a rest period of not less than ten (10) minutes for each consecutive

03/16/2016

four (4) hour shift worked or major fraction thereof.

118. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with either timely rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes, or to provide Plaintiff with an additional hour of compensation for each day when said rest period was missed, as required during the time period Plaintiff was employed with Defendants.

119. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff is entitled to damages of one (1) hour of wages per missed rest break, in a sum to be proven at trial.

120. Plaintiff also seeks damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(f) and California Labor Code § 558.

XI.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

[CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 226 ET SEQ.]

(Against all Defendants)

121. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by this reference, as if set forth in full, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 120, inclusive, of this Complaint to the extent such allegations related to this Cause of Action.

122. The allegations of every other paragraph of this Complaint are hereby incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in full.

123. Defendants, and each of them, were obligated under Labor Code § 226 et seq., to keep an accurate record of the hours of labor worked by Plaintiff and to prepare and submit to Plaintiff with each payment of wages an itemized statement accurately showing the total hours worked by Plaintiff.

124. Defendants, and each of them, failed to keep precise records of Plaintiff's hours worked, and further failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements with each payment of wages to Plaintiff as required by law. Instead, Defendants issued false or incorrect or fraudulent or no wage statements to certain employees, including without limitation Plaintiff.

125. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff is entitled to a penalty of \$50.00 for the first

1 violation and \$100.00 per pay period for each subsequent violation of this section, according
2 to proof, up to a maximum amount of \$4,000.00.

3 126. In this instance, Defendants, and each of the, either prepared and submitted to Plaintiff
4 inaccurate wage statements or did not prepare and submit any wage statements to Plaintiff
5 during the relevant statutory period and during the entire term of Plaintiff's employment with
6 Defendants.

7 ///

8 ///

9 ///

10 ///

11 ///

12 ///

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

03/16/2016

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendant, as follows:

1. For general damages in an amount according to proof;
2. For special damages in an amount according to proof;
3. For compensatory damages including but not limited to lost wages, overtime compensation, damages for lost meal and rest periods, lost employee benefits, bonuses mental and emotional distress, medical and related expenses, expenses of seeking substitute employment, and other special, general and compensatory damages in an amount according to proof;
4. For punitive and exemplary damages in an amount according to proof;
5. For statutory penalties;
6. For attorneys fees under the Cal. Gov't Code;
7. For attorneys fees under Cal. Labor Code;
8. For interest as allowed by law;
9. For costs of suit; and
10. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: March 11, 2016


THE SWEENEY LAW FIRM, APC

BRANDON J. SWEENEY, ESQ.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ALTON HENRY

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

DATED: March 11, 2016

Respectfully submitted,


THE SWEENEY LAW FIRM, APC

BRANDON J. SWEENEY, ESQ.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ALTON HENRY

Courthouse News Service

03/16/2016

EXHIBIT 1



STATE OF CALIFORNIA | Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency

GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
800-884-1684 | TDD 800-700-2320
www.dfeh.ca.gov | email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

AMENDED

April 21, 2015

Brandon Sweeney
3320 W. Victory Blvd.
Burbank California 91505

RE: Notice to Complainant or Complainant's Attorney
DFEH Matter Number: 183258-155923
Right to Sue: Henry / KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS

Dear Complainant or Complainant's Attorney:

Attached is a copy of your complaint of discrimination filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Government Code section 12900 et seq. Also attached is a copy of your Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue. Pursuant to Government Code section 12962, DFEH will not serve these documents on the employer. You or your attorney must serve the complaint. If you do not have an attorney, you must serve the complaint yourself. Please refer to the attached Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue for information regarding filing a private lawsuit in the State of California.

Be advised that the DFEH does not review or edit the complaint form to ensure that it meets procedural or statutory requirements.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

03/16/2016



STATE OF CALIFORNIA | Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency

GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
800-884-1684 | TDD 800-700-2320
www.dfeh.ca.gov | email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

AMENDED

April 21, 2015

RE: Notice of Filing of Discrimination Complaint

DFEH Matter Number: 183258-155923

Right to Sue: Henry / KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS

To All Respondent(s):

Enclosed is a copy of a complaint of discrimination that has been filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) in accordance with Government Code section 12960. This constitutes service of the complaint pursuant to Government Code section 12962. The complainant has requested an authorization to file a lawsuit. This case is not being investigated by DFEH and is being closed immediately. A copy of the Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue is enclosed for your records.

Please refer to the attached complaint for a list of all respondent(s) and their contact information.

No response to DFEH is requested or required.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

03/16/2016



STATE OF CALIFORNIA | Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING
2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
800-884-1684 | TDD 800-700-2320
www.dfeh.ca.gov | email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH

AMENDED

April 21, 2015

Alton Henry
5714 Opal Ave.
Palmdale, California 93552

RE: Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue
DFEH Matter Number: 183258-155923
Right to Sue: Henry / KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS

Dear Alton Henry,

This letter informs you that the above-referenced complaint was filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) has been closed effective April 21, 2015 because an immediate Right to Sue notice was requested. DFEH will take no further action on the complaint.

This letter is also your Right to Sue notice. According to Government Code section 12965, subdivision (b), a civil action may be brought under the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act against the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency named in the above-referenced complaint. The civil action must be filed within one year from the date of this letter.

To obtain a federal Right to Sue notice, you must visit the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to file a complaint within 30 days of receipt of this DFEH Notice of Case Closure or within 300 days of the alleged discriminatory act, whichever is earlier.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

03/16/2016



STATE OF CALIFORNIA | Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency

GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 | Elk Grove | CA | 95758
800-884-1684 | TDD 800-700-2320
www.dfeh.ca.gov | email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

AMENDED

Enclosures

cc: SECURITAS SECURITY SERVICES USA, INC.

Courthouse News Service

03/16/2016

COMPLAINT OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION
BEFORE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING
Under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act
(Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.)

In the Matter of the Complaint of
Alton Henry, Complainant.
5714 Opal Ave.
Palmdale, California 93552

DFEH No. 183258-155923

vs.

KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS,
Respondent.
ONE KAISER PLAZA
OAKLAND, California 94612

Complainant alleges:

1. Respondent KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS is a subject to suit under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) (Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.). Complainant believes respondent is subject to the FEHA.
2. On or around July 02, 2014, complainant alleges that respondent took the following adverse actions against complainant: Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation Denied a good faith interactive process, Denied a work environment free of discrimination and/or retaliation, Denied continuation of employer-paid health care coverage while on pregnancy disability leave, Denied employment, Denied family care or medical leave, Denied reasonable accommodation, Denied reinstatement, Terminated, . Complainant believes respondent committed these actions because of their: Age - 40 and over, Color, Disability, Engagement in Protected Activity, Medical Condition - including Cancer, Race .
3. Complainant Alton Henry resides in the City of Palmdale, State of California. If complaint includes co-respondents please see below.

-5-

Complaint - DFEH No. 183258-155923

Date Filed: April 21, 2015

Date Amended: March 08, 2016

FEH 002-1

03/16/2016

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Co-Respondents:

SECURITAS SECURITY SERVICES USA, INC.

4330 Park Terrace Dr.
Westlake Village California 91361

Courthouse News Service

FEH 902-1

03/16/2016

-6-

Complaint – DFEH No. 183258-155923

Date Filed: April 21, 2015

Date Amended: March 08, 2016

Additional Complaint Details:

Complainant sustained an industrial injury on June 2, 2014. As a result, Complainant was disabled and denied a good faith interactive process and reasonable accommodation from June 2, 2014 until his wrongful termination on July 2, 2014. Complainant is also over 40 and this was known by Respondents who further retaliated, discriminated and ultimately terminated Complainant on account of his age. Complainant is a member of a protected class (African American) and was discriminated and retaliated against on account of his race and as a member of a protected category. As such, Complainant was pretextually terminated on account of his disability, age, race and for engaging in a protected activity.

Courthouse News Service

-7-

Complaint - DFEH No. 183258-155923

Date Filed: April 21, 2015

Date Amended: March 08, 2016

FEH 902-1

03/16/2016

1 VERIFICATION

2 I, Brandon Sweeney, am the Attorney for Complainant in the above-entitled complaint. I have read the
3 foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those
4 matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

5 On April 21, 2015, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
6 is true and correct.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
Burbank, California
Brandon Sweeney

Courthouse News Service

-8-

Complaint - DFEH No. 183258-155923

Date Filed: April 21, 2015

Date Amended: March 08, 2016

FEH 902-1

03/16/2016

CM-010

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Brandon J. Sweeney (SBN 278532) The Sweeney Law Firm, APC 3320 W. Victory Blvd. Burbank, California 91505 TELEPHONE NO.: (818) 668-7451 FAX NO.: ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff ALTON HENRY		FOR COURT USE ONLY FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles MAR 16 2016 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk By <u>Judi Lara</u> , Deputy	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles 90012 BRANCH NAME: Central District			
CASE NAME: Henry v. Kaiser, et al.			
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000) <input type="checkbox"/> Limited (Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)		Complex Case Designation <input type="checkbox"/> Counter <input type="checkbox"/> Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	
		CASE NUMBER: BC 618872 JUDGE: DEPT:	

Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2).

1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:

Auto Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Auto (22) <input type="checkbox"/> Uninsured motorist (46) Other PII/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Asbestos (04) <input type="checkbox"/> Product liability (24) <input type="checkbox"/> Medical malpractice (45) <input type="checkbox"/> Other PII/PD/WD (23) Non-PII/PD/WD (Other) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Business tort/unfair business practice (07) <input type="checkbox"/> Civil rights (08) <input type="checkbox"/> Defamation (13) <input type="checkbox"/> Fraud (16) <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property (19) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional negligence (25) <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-PII/PD/WD tort (35) Employment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wrongful termination (36) <input type="checkbox"/> Other employment (15)	Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Breach of contract/warranty (06) <input type="checkbox"/> Rule 3.740 collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Other collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage (18) <input type="checkbox"/> Other contract (37) Real Property <input type="checkbox"/> Eminent domain/inverse condemnation (14) <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful eviction (33) <input type="checkbox"/> Other real property (26) Unlawful Detainer <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (31) <input type="checkbox"/> Residential (32) <input type="checkbox"/> Drugs (38) Judicial Review <input type="checkbox"/> Asset forfeiture (05) <input type="checkbox"/> Petition re: arbitration award (11) <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of mandate (02) <input type="checkbox"/> Other judicial review (39)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403) <input type="checkbox"/> Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) <input type="checkbox"/> Construction defect (10) <input type="checkbox"/> Mass tort (40) <input type="checkbox"/> Securities litigation (28) <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/Toxic tort (30) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41) Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of judgment (20) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint <input type="checkbox"/> RICO (27) <input type="checkbox"/> Other complaint (not specified above) (42) Miscellaneous Civil Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership and corporate governance (21) <input type="checkbox"/> Other petition (not specified above) (43)
---	--	--

2. This case ☐ is ☒ is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:
- | | |
|--|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of separately represented parties
b. <input type="checkbox"/> Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve
c. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial amount of documentary evidence | d. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of witnesses
e. <input type="checkbox"/> Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
f. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision |
|--|--|

3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. ☒ monetary b. ☐ nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. ☒ punitive

4. Number of causes of action (specify): 11: (6) Cal. Gov't Code sec. 12900 et seq.; (5) Cal. Labor Code

5. This case ☐ is ☒ is not a class action suit.

6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)

Date: March 11, 2016

Brandon J. Sweeney

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)

NOTICE

- Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed in sanctions).
- File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.
- If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.
- Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

Page 1 of 2

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

Auto Tort

Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death
Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort

Asbestos (04)
Asbestos Property Damage
Asbestos Personal Injury/Wrongful Death
Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24)
Medical Malpractice (45)
Medical Malpractice—Physicians & Surgeons
Other Professional Health Care Malpractice
Other PI/PD/WD (23)
Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)
Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism)
Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress
Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business Practice (07)
Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil harassment) (08)
Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13)
Fraud (16)
Intellectual Property (19)
Professional Negligence (25)
Legal Malpractice
Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)
Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

Employment

Wrongful Termination (36)
Other Employment (15)

Contract

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)
Breach of Rental/Lease
Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)
Contract/Warranty Breach—Seller
Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)
Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty
Other Breach of Contract/Warranty
Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09)
Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff
Other Promissory Note/Collections Case
Insurance Coverage (not provisionally complex) (18)
Auto Subrogation
Other Coverage
Other Contract (37)
Contractual Fraud
Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)
Wrongful Eviction (33)
Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)
Writ of Possession of Real Property
Mortgage Foreclosure
Quiet Title
Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure)

Unlawful Detainer

Commercial (31)
Residential (32)
Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise, report as Commercial or Residential)

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)
Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)
Writ of Mandate (02)
Writ—Administrative Mandamus
Writ—Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter
Writ—Other Limited Court Case Review
Other Judicial Review (39)
Review of Health Officer Order
Notice of Appeal—Labor
Commissioner Appeals

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400–3.403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)
Construction Defect (10)
Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)
Securities Litigation (28)
Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)
Insurance Coverage Claims (arising from provisionally complex case type listed above) (41)

Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20)
Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)
Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)
Sister State Judgment
Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)
Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes
Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

RICO (27)
Other Complaint (not specified above) (42)
Declaratory Relief Only
Injunctive Relief Only (non-harassment)
Mechanics Lien
Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)
Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate Governance (21)
Other Petition (not specified above) (43)
Civil Harassment
Workplace Violence
Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse
Election Contest
Petition for Name Change
Petition for Relief From Late Claim
Other Civil Petition

SHORT TITLE:

Henry v. Kaiser, et al.

CASE NUMBER

BC 6 13 87 2

**CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND
STATEMENT OF LOCATION
(CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)**

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:

JURY TRIAL? ☒ YES CLASS ACTION? ☐ YES LIMITED CASE? ☐ YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL? ☐ HOURS/ ☒ DAYS

Item II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):

Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column **A**, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.

Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column **B** below which best describes the nature of this case.

Step 3: In Column **C**, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0.

Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. | 6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle. |
| 2. May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage). | 7. Location where petitioner resides. |
| 3. Location where cause of action arose. | 8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly. |
| 4. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred. | 9. Location where one or more of the parties reside. |
| 5. Location where performance required or defendant resides. | 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office |

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6070 Asbestos Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
	Product Liability (24)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons <input type="checkbox"/> A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)	1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress <input type="checkbox"/> A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 3. 1., 4.

SHORT TITLE:

Henry v. Kaiser, et al.

CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Business Tort (07)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
	Civil Rights (08)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
	Defamation (13)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
	Fraud (16)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
	Professional Negligence (25)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6017 Legal Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
	Other (35)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2., 3.
Employment	Wrongful Termination (36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
	Other Employment (15)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case <input type="checkbox"/> A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Contract	Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) <input type="checkbox"/> A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) <input type="checkbox"/> A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) <input type="checkbox"/> A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
	Collections (09)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
	Insurance Coverage (18)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6045 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	Other Contract (37)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6009 Contractual Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> A6031 Tortious Interference <input type="checkbox"/> A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels _____	2.
	Wrongful Eviction (33)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Real Property	Other Real Property (26)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> A6032 Quiet Title <input type="checkbox"/> A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer		
Unlawful Detainer	Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE: Henry v. Kaiser, et al.	CASE NUMBER:
---	--------------

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Judicial Review	Asset Forfeiture (05)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
	Petition re Arbitration (11)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
	Writ of Mandate (02)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus <input type="checkbox"/> A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter <input type="checkbox"/> A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
	Construction Defect (10)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
	Securities Litigation (28)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6141 Sister State Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> A6160 Abstract of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) <input type="checkbox"/> A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) <input type="checkbox"/> A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax <input type="checkbox"/> A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8., 9.
	RICO (27)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6030 Declaratory Relief Only <input type="checkbox"/> A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) <input type="checkbox"/> A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) <input type="checkbox"/> A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6121 Civil Harassment <input type="checkbox"/> A6123 Workplace Harassment <input type="checkbox"/> A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case <input type="checkbox"/> A6190 Election Contest <input type="checkbox"/> A6110 Petition for Change of Name <input type="checkbox"/> A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law <input type="checkbox"/> A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8. 2., 9.

SHORT TITLE: Henry v. Kaiser, et al.	CASE NUMBER
---	-------------

Item III. Statement of Location: Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other circumstance indicated in Item II., Step 3 on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.

REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 7. <input type="checkbox"/> 8. <input type="checkbox"/> 9. <input type="checkbox"/> 10.		ADDRESS: 5601 De Soto Ave.
CITY: Woodland Hills	STATE: CA	ZIP CODE: 91367

Item IV. Declaration of Assignment: I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that the above-entitled matter is properly filed for assignment to the Los Angeles Superior courthouse in the Central District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)].

Dated: March 11, 2016

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

1. Original Complaint or Petition.
2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
4. Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.

03/16/2016