

County Of Los Angeles

MAR 18 2015

Sherri K. Linici, Executive Utilicet/Cleri
By Vrustan Wyss., Deputy Kristina Vargas

I.DONALD WEISSMAN (Bar No. 67980) dweissman@idwlaw.com WEISSMAN LAW FIRM 5567 Reseda Boulevard, Suite 118 Tarzana, California 91356 Telephone: (818) 704-5151 Facsimile: (818) 705-2634

Attorneys for Plaintiff, ALVAŘO CORTES

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

ं23

₂₅

J26

D-32 Mary H. Strokel superior court of the state of California

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STANELY MOSK COURTHOUSE

ALVARO CORTES, an individual

Plaintiffs,

VS.

JEREMY LeCLAIR, an individual, MICHELLE KENEN SEWARD, an individual, WINDSOR PICTURE, LLC and DOÉS 1 through 250, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.

BC 575500

COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. COMPLAINT FOR FRAUD IN THE INDUCEMENT;
- 2. VIOLATIONS OF **CORPORATIONS CODE §25401** (FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFER AND SALE OF SECURITIES);
- 3. VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CODE §17200;
- 4. BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY;
- 5. CONVERSION;
- 6. BREACH OF THE COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR **DEALING**;

7. FRAUD

27

⊢25

FOR A FIRST CAUSE FO ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS, AND EACH OF THEM FOR FRAUD, PLAINTIFF ALLEGES:

- 1. At all times herein relevant, Plaintiff Alvaro Cortes was and is a resident in the County of Los Angeles, California.
- 2. Defendant Windsor Pictures, LLC ("Windsor Pictures") is a California limited liability company with its principal place of business at 237 N. Windsor Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90004.
- of Los Angeles County, California. At all times relevant hereto, Seward conducted business in the county of Los Angeles and elsewhere in California, including in the following capacities: Seward was the chief executive officer, president, secretary, chief financial officer, director and registered agent of Protégé Financial; chief executive officer, manager and registered agent of Saxe-Coburg; executive producer and partner in Skyline Pictures; the manager of Not Forgotten' and the chief executive officer and executive producer of Windsor Pictures. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Seward, at all relevant times hereto, was also an undisclosed "control" person of both Not Forgotten and Windsor Pictures within the meaning of sections 160, subdivision (a), and 25403. Pursuant to §160(a), "control means the possession, direct or indirect, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of a corporation." Seward is a California Department of Insurance licensed insurance agent, license number OB17932.
 - 4. Defendants Does 1 through 24, inclusive, are persons, employees, agents; affiliates, affiliated persons, professional practitioners, and professional consultants of the

⊕ 25 ∪⊓

Defendants, and the attorneys and others who participated with them, who have done, or will do acts otherwise alleged in the Complaint. The true names and capacities of Defendants Does 1 through 24, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants under such fictitious names, pursuant to the provisions of the *Code of Civil Procedure* §474. Plaintiff will seek leave of the Court to amend the Complaint and allege the true names and capacities of such Defendants at such time as the same have been ascertained.

- 5. At all times herein, plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon allege that defendant Jeremy LeClair was a resident in and/or worked in the County of Los Angeles. Further, said defendant was the brother of defendant Seward, a fact never disclosed. Further, said defendant had a financial interest in the companies and entities he represented or sought investments from plaintiff to be placed therein; a fact not disclosed to plaintiff.
- 6. Defendant Does 25 through 50, inclusive, are corporations, limited liability companies, partnerships, or other entities who have done or will do acts otherwise alleged in the Complaint. The true names and capacities of Defendants Does 25 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants under such fictitious names, pursuant to the provisions of the *Code of Civil Procedure* §474. Plaintiff will seek leave of the Court to amend the Complaint and allege the true names and capacities of such Defendants at such time as the same have been ascertained.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges that, at all times herein mentioned, the defendants named as officers, directors, agents or employees, acted in such capacities in connection with the acts, practices and schemes of the business as set forth below.

∴21 ∴21 ∴22 ∴23

¹24 ⊕

- 8. Whenever any allegation is made in the Complaint to "Defendants" doing any act, the allegation shall mean the act of each Defendants acting individually, jointly, and severally and the conspiring of these Defendants to so act. Each Defendant alleged to have committed any act did so pursuant to and in furtherance of a common plan, scheme and conspiracy to defraud plaintiff, to violate the provisions of the Corporate Securities Law, or other laws and as an agent for the other Defendants.
- 9. Whenever any allegation is made in this Complaint to any of the corporate and/or limited liability company entity defendants doing any act, the allegation shall mean acts done or authorized by the officers, managers, directors, members, agents, and employees of the business entity Defendants while actively engaged in the management, direction, or control of the affairs of the business entity defendants, and while acting within the course and scope of their employment.
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges that at all times herein mentioned, each and every Defendant directly or indirectly controlled other co-Defendants by knowingly inducing, or by knowingly providing substantial assistance to, other co-Defendants to violate the provisions of the Corporate Securities Law, as alleged in the Complaint within the meaning of section 25403.
- 11. At all times herein mentioned, each defendants was the alter-ego, agent, servant, employee, employer, partner and/or joint venture of each of their co-Defendants, and, in doing the things herein alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such relationship, agency and/or employment with the advance knowledge, acquiescence or subsequent ratification of each and every remaining co-Defendants when engaged in the conduct herein alleged.

⊢22 ∞

N_24 ⊙ ⊢25

- 12. Further, at all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff is informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges that defendants control and dominate, and have controlled and dominated, Protégé Financial, Saxe-Coburg, Skyline Pictures, Not Forgotten, and Windsor Pictures.
- 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges that at all times herein mentioned there has been a unity of interest and ownership between Defendants such that any individuality and separateness between Defendants has ceased to exist. Plaintiff is also informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges that at all times herein mentioned there was such a unity of interest between Defendants because Defendants have used and continue to use their control and domination of the Defendant entities to, inter alia: (a) commingle funds between Defendants; (b) divert funds and other assets from Defendants for the personal use of Seward, Soref and Foulk; (c) fail to maintain, or adequately maintain, minutes and other corporate records; (d) fail to maintain corporate legal formalities; (e) avoid liability for their management and control of the Defendant entities; (f) use Defendants as mere "shells" and "shams" for the purposes of systematically and unjustly enriching themselves at the expense of the investors; and (g) commit violations of the Corporate Securities Law and other wrongful acts against the investors.
- 14. Seward formed and operated Protégé Financial from at least April 2004 to the present. Foulk is or was Protégé Financial's vice president. Protégé Financial is or was purportedly "one of the largest senior planning companies in the nation and they [sic] advise seniors across the country." Protégé Financial is an insurance broker licensed by the California Department of Insurance, license number OF56545.
 - 15. Seward formed and operated Saxe-Coburg from at least August 2009 to the

^U26

present. Foulk is or was Saxe-Coburg's vice president. Saxe-Coburg, represented as "a boutique insurance agency with over 18 years' experience and was built with the sole purpose of helping clients meet their sophisticated insurance and financial needs. By providing high quality financial services, truly educating and caring for our clients we can set up their financial future." Saxe-Coburg is an insurance broker licensed by the California Department of Insurance license number OG87184.

- 16. Skyline Pictures is or was Not Forgotten's and Windsor Picture's "producing partner." According to its promotional materials, Skyline Pictures' "business model employs proven financing and distribution strategies designed to minimize monetary risk while increasing upside profit potential."
- 17. Not Forgotten raised capital from investors to fund the production of an independent motion picture entitled "Not Forgotten," starring Simon Baker and Paz Vega. "Not Forgotten" is described in its promotional materials as a "classic psychological thriller about a man and his wife who must come to terms with their tortured past in order to save their kidnapped daughter." According to a letter Protégé Financial sent to investors dated on or about September 8, 2011, "Not Forgotten" failed to generate any revenue.
- 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges Windsor Pictures was formed and opened from at least June 2009 to the present. Windsor Pictures is or was "a subsidiary and a film fund of Skyline Pictures designed to produce highly successful, award winning motion pictures for the worldwide markets, at a price."
- 19. Since in or about at least November 2006, and continuing thereafter, Defendants, their agents, representatives and affiliates have engaged in and continue to engage in business in the State of California in violation of the Corporate Securities Law.

These violations consist of offering and selling unqualified, not-exempt securities to member of the public by means of fraud and conducting unlicensed investment adviser activities.

- 20. Beginning in or about at least November 2006, and continuing thereafter, Defendants offered and sold unqualified, non-exempt securities in this State in the form of Not Forgotten "operating" agreements; Windsor Pictures "bridge" loans, "promissory" notes, "Class A Membership" interests, and "convertible" debentures; Protégé Financial "bridge" loans and "promissory" notes; and Saxe-Coburg "promissory" notes in issuer transactions by means of fraud, totaling in excess of \$23.2 million in approximately 215 transactions to known investors.
- 21. Defendants specifically targeted unsophisticated investors when offering and selling the above-described securities. In many instances investors, plaintiff included, entrusted their entire life savings to the Defendants with the hopes of earning substantial returns to protect them during their golden years, and to cover necessary expenses such as food, housing and medical care.
- 22. Defendants promised investors high rates of return on the above-described securities, ranging from at least 8 to 16 percent per annum. Defendants told investors that they could either opt to "accrue" monthly interest on their investment funds or receive regular monthly interest payments or "preferred" returns.
- 23. In or about August 2001, Defendants abruptly stopped paying investors their regular monthly interest payments or preferred returns.
 - 24. At no time herein were any of the Defendants licensed by the Commissioner

19

□20
□21
□22
□23
□24
□

as investor advisers to conduct business as an investment adviser in this state, nor were any of the Defendants exempt from the licensing requirements set forth in the Corporate Securities Law.

- 25. In offering and selling these securities, Defendants represented to potential and actual investors that the money raised by the sale of securities would be used to finance and produce various entertainment projects, including the development and production of independent motion pictures, such as "Not Forgotten" and a staged musical, "Twist! An American Musical." However, Defendants instead engaged in a classic Ponzi scheme whereby previous investors were repaid their investment principal using newer investors' funds.
- 26. In order to sell the operating agreements, bridge loans, promissory notes, Class A Membership interested, and convertible debentures, Defendants solicited investors by means of informational seminars and by distributing promotional and offering materials and other communications through the mail and in person without the offerings having being qualified in the State of California.
- 27. During Seward's consultations with actual and potential investors, Seward requested copies of the investor's financial information, including any and all insurance policies, annuities, IRA account statements, retirement account statements, and stock and bond portfolios/statements, and the approximate value of the investor's home. In some instances, Seward would make copies of the investor's financial documents and then return the documents at a second meeting, along with graphs and/or charts depicting how the investor's other investments were underperforming. Seward would then tell the investor how he or she could invest with her to improve the investment portfolio's performance.

- 28. During these financial consultations Protégé Financial and Seward advised actual and potential investors as to the advisability of investing in, purchasing or selling securities including without limitation operating agreements, bridge loans, promissory notes, Class A Membership interests and convertible debentures.
- 29. Le Clair, during Seward's consultations with actual and potential investors, requested copies and in private consultation with potential clients, such as Plaintiff, of the client's financial information, including any and all insurance policies, annuities, IRA account statements, retirement account statements, and stock and bond portfolios/statements, and the approximate value of the investor's home.
- 30. Defendants offered and sold operating agreements, bridge loans, promissory notes, Class A Membership interests, and convertible debentures through these financial consultations, as well as through other means.
- 31. Beginning in or about at least November 2006, defendants offered and sold securities to investors in the form of Not Forgotten operating agreements. From at least November 2006 to at least March 2010, at least \$10.4 million worth of Not Forgotten operating agreements were sold in this State in approximately 91 transactions.
- 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges, Not Forgotten diverted and commingled investor funds. Defendants paid one investor and deposited and transferred money to themselves and to entities they controlled.
- 33. Beginning in or about at least June 2009, Seward and Foulk offered and sold securities to investors in the form of Windsor Pictures bridge loans, promissory notes, Class A Membership interests and convertible debentures. From at least June 2009

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1	D. Investors would receive regular monthly interest payments or
2	preferred returns;
3	
4	E. Investors would receive a return of their investment principal at the
5	end of the investment term;
6	
7	F. Failed to disclose to investors the fact that Not Forgotten paid its sales
8	agents' commissions from investor funds Not Forgotten raised. Seward received the bulk
9	of the sales commissions paid by Not Forgotten to its sales agents;
10	
11	G. Omitted to inform investors of the risks associated with the investment
12	in Not Forgotten, despite the highly speculative nature of the investment;
13	
14	H. Told investors that Not Forgotten was a "good investment" and that
15	they should "not worry" as their investment in Not Forgotten carried "no risk;"
16	
17	I. Told investors that they would "not lose money" and that she would
18	"personally guarantee" that they would "get paid back" their investment funds in Not
19	Forgotten.
_20	
21	J. Told investors that their investment in Not Forgotten was
-22	"guaranteed;"
23	
-24	K. Told investors that she lived in a "million dollar" home and that
⊡ 25	Seward would "sell" her house before investors would "lose any money" in Not
2 6	Forgotten.
27	
28	11
	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

It is unlawful for any investment adviser to conduct business as an investment adviser in this state unless the investment adviser has first applied for and secured from the commissioner a certificate) then in effect, authorizing the investment adviser to do so or unless the investment adviser is exempted by the provisions of Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 25200) of this part or unless the investment adviser is subject to Section 25230 .1.

- 48. Section 25009 defines investment adviser as "any person who, for compensation, engages in the business of advising others, either directly or through publications or writings, as to the value of securities or as to the advisability of investing in, purchasing or selling securities . . ."
- 49. Since in or about at least November 2006, and continuing thereafter, defendants have engaged in the business of advising others, either directly or through publications or writings, as to the value of securities or as to the advisability of investing in, purchasing or selling securities.
- 50. Defendants gave such advice through international and promotional brochures and through direct communications, including the investment Seminars described above.
- 51. As detailed in the Statement of Facts, defendants conducted "free" Seminars entitled "Senior Financial Seminar" and would inform investors on "How can [they could] make higher interest on [their] investments . . ."
- 52. At the Seminars, actual and potential investors were provided with informational materials, including a two-page copy of an article concerning defendant Seward that appeared in Elite Magazine entitled, "Business Woman Extraordinaire," a

one-page biography about Seward entitled, "Senior Retirement Specialists, "a one-page interview with Seward that appeared in WOW Magazine, Seward's Protégé Financial business card with a "CSA" (certified senior adviser) designation appearing next to her name, and a Protégé Financial worksheet entitled "Discover The Five Evils of Financial Destruction Which Confronts Every Senior!".

53. After Seward's presentation, actual and potential investors were given appointments to meet with Seward at Protégé Financial's offices for a private financial consultation. Seward also met with investors in their homes. During these financial consultations, Protégé Financial and Seward advised actual and potential investors as to the advisability of investing in, purchasing or selling securities, including without limitation operating agreements, bridge loans, promissory notes, Class A Membership Interests, and conveltible debentures.

- 54. Since at least in or about at least November 2006, and continuing thereafter, Protégé Financial and Seward have conducted business as investment advisers in this State, as defined by section 25009. Neither Protégé Financial nor Seward have applied for and secured from the commissioner certificates authorizing them to conduct business as investment advisers.
- 55. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' acts and omissions, plaintiff has been damaged in a sum of not less than \$450,000.00, plus prejudgment interest for _____, plus attorneys fees.

FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS, AND EACH OF THEM FOR NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION, PLAINTIFF ALLEGES:

- 56. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 1through 55 herein as though fully set forth at length.
- 57. Defendants, and each of them, made a series of representations to plaintiff to induce him to invest, bring investors, provide time, expertise and experience to further their personal interests, as herein and hereinabove alleged.
- 58. In making these representations, defendants, and each of them, failed to conduct reasonable investigations, fully and fairly disclose the information available to them or correct misrepresentations which they knew or should have known had been made. As such, defendants, and each of them, negligently represented or failed to represent the truth to plaintiff and potential investors.
- 59. As a result, plaintiff suffered general and special damages in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.

FOR A FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS, AND EACH OF THEM FOR BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY, PLAINTIFF ALLEGES:

- 60. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by this reference each and every allegation in Paragraphs 1 through 59 of this Complaint.
- 61. As officers of the various corporate and partnership entities, defendant owed a fiduciary duty to the investors.
- 62. As a fiduciary to investors, defendants owed a duty of loyalty to refrain from participating in any transaction where they received a personal financial benefit not equally shared with the investors of those entities and from unjustly enriching themselves at the expense of their investors.
- 63. Defendants also had a duty of care to the investors to manage, conduct, supervise and direct the business and affairs of the various entities in accordance with applicable contracts, laws, rules, regulations and company by-laws. In addition, defendants had a duty of care to maintain the goodwill of these entities, supervise press releases and other dissemination of company information so as to make a full and accurate disclosure of all material facts.
- 64. By engaging in the conduct described hereinabove, defendants have consistently and repeatedly violated their fiduciary duties of loyalty and care owed to plaintiff and other investors. Further, they attempted to hide the funds received and shelter themselves from liability through the use of alter ego entities. All of these defendants conspired to harm plaintiffs in all of

oppression and/or malice, and acted with willful and conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive and exemplary damages against defendants in an amount appropriate to punish defendants for their conduct and to deter similar future conduct.

FOR A SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS, AND EACH OF THEM FOR UNJUST ENRICHMENT, PLAINTIFF ALLEGES:

- 71. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by this reference each and every allegation in Paragraphs 1 through 70 of this Complaint.
- 72. Defendants' have been unjustly enriched by improperly converting the benefits of the investment monies and other sums collected form plaintiff and others. Moreover, Defendants will be further unjustly enriched if they are able to invest funds based upon the assets taken from Plaintiff. Given defendants' misrepresentations and breaches, defendants are not entitled to any of the benefits gained through its Agreements, particularly at the expense of Plaintiff.
- 73. As a result of Defendants failure to abide by any of their promises, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 74. Further, in engaging in the above-described conduct, Defendants were guilty of fraud, oppression and/or malice, and were acting with willful and conscious disregard of the rights of plaintiff. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive and exemplary damages against Defendants in an amount appropriate to punish them for their conduct and to deter similar

future conduct.

FOR AN EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS, AND EACH OF THEM FOR VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTIONS 17200 ET. SEQ., PLAINTIFF ALLEGES

- 75. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by this reference each and every allegation in Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by this reference each and every allegation in Paragraphs 1 through 74 of this Complaint.
- 76. The above-described wrongful conduct of Defendants constituted unfair, unlawful and fraudulent business acts and practices under California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. These violations have caused Plaintiff to sustain substantial losses.
- 77. As a result of these statutory violations, Plaintiff is entitled to restitution against all defendants. Plaintiff is entitled to restoration of all assets misappropriated by defendants and the lost value of such assets.

FOR A NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING

- 78. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by this reference each and every allegation in Paragraphs 1 through 77 of this Complaint.
 - 79. The Agreements referred to above, contain the implied covenant of good faith and

85. Plaintiff has performed all conditions, covenants and promises required by him to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of said contract, except for performance which has been excused.

- 86. Defendants breached said agreements by failing to pay or repay any sums, plus interest thereon, which sum remains due and owing. Plaintiff demanded, at various times Defendants, and each of them, perform their obligation under the contracts. Defendants, and each of them, failed to perform their obligation under the contracts and remain in breach of said contracts by their continued failure and refusal to remit to Plaintiff said sums.
- 87. As a proximate result of Defendants' breaches of said contracts, Plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of \$450,000, plus interest thereon at the highest rate allowed by law from and according to proof at trial, plus attorneys fees and costs, as stated in Exhibits "1" and.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against all Defendants, as follows:

- 1. General damages in a sum of not less than \$450,000,000.00 and according to proof;
- 2. General, consequential and incidental damages, according to proof;
- 3. Punitive damages in a sum not less than \$5,000,000.000 and according to proof:
- 4. Prejudgment interests;
- 5. Attorneys fees:

6.	For such other and fur	her relief as this Court	may deem necessary
proper.			
DATED: Mai	rch 17, 2015	WEISSMAN LAW FIR	M
		//	
		1. 1/ 0	
		BV: / Muldi	WEISSMAN
·		Attornevs for	
		•	
	·		
		·	
		•	
		•	
			•
11			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	23 LAINT FOR DAMAGES	

FOR COURT USE ONLY

WEISSMAN LAW FIRM 5567 Reseda Blvd., Suit Tarzana, California 913 TELEPHONE NO.: (818) 704-51 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Alvaro Corte SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill MAILING ADDRESS: Same CITY AND ZIP CODE: LOS Angeles, (BRANCH NAME: Central Distri	te 118 356 51 FAXNO: (818) 705-2634 es Los Angeles l Street California 90012	Superior Court of California County Of Los Angeles MAR 18 2015 Sherri H. Cauch, Locustic Ouncer/Clerk By Victorial Ligas, Deputy Kristina Vargas
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET Unlimited Limited	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBE BC 5 7 5 5 0 0
(Amount (Amount demanded demanded demanded demanded demanded is	Counter Joinder	JUDGE:
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT.:
	5 below must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).
Check one box below for the case type t Auto Tort	hat best describes this case: Contract	Parada and la Complex Chall Listers to a
Auto Tolt Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Other collections (09) Insurance coverage (18)	Construction defect (10) Mass tort (40)
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30) Insurance coverage claims arising from the
Medical malpractice (45) Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)
Business tort/unfair business practice (0		Enforcement of Judgment Enforcement of judgment (20)
Civil rights (08) Defamation (13)	Unlawful Detainer Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19) Professional negligence (25)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Judicial Review	Miscellaneous Civil Petition
<u>Em</u> ployment	Asset forfeiture (05) Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21) Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36) Other employment (15)	Writ of mandate (02) Other judicial review (39)	
2. This case is is is not factors requiring exceptional judicial mar a. Large number of separately rep b. Extensive motion practice raisin issues that will be time-consumic. Substantial amount of documen 3. Remedies sought (check all that apply) 4. Number of causes of action (specify): 6. This case is is is not 6. If there are any known related cases, file Date: 3/9/2015	nagement: resented parties d. Large number reg difficult or novel e. Coordination wing to resolve in other counting tary evidence f. Substantial positions: a. X monetary b. nonmonetary; pec	rith related actions pending in one or more courts states, or countries, or in a federal court stjudgment judicial supervision laratory or injunctive relief c.
I.Donald Weissman		racelessiv-
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(SIGN	IATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the state of the state	NOTICE the first paper filed in the action or proceeding or Welfare and Institutions Code), (Cal. Rules	(except small claims cases or cases filed sof Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result

- 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.

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State B

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 plaintiffs 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-Pİ/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) Wronaful 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

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 (nondomestic 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 (nonharassment) 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

gt 4 +

CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]

Martin Dean's

ESSENTIAL FORMS™

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

Commissioner Appeals

Page 2 of 2

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

. 1	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 TR	RIAL? X YES CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 8 HOURS/ X DAYS) .
item II. i	Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps - If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):	
case in th	After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your he 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.	
	n Column C, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have . For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0.	
	Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)	
1 Clas	ss actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse central district	

- 2. May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).
- 3. Location where cause of action arose.
- 4. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.
- 5. Location where performance required or defendant resides.

- 7. Location where petitioner resides.
- 8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
- 9. Location where one or more of the parties reside.
- 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 (22)	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Uninsured Motorist (46)	A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death - Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Asbestos (04)	A6070 Asbestos Property Damage A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
Medical Malpractice (45)	A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death	A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 4. 1., 4.
(23)	A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 3. 1., 4.





SHORT TITLE:		UMBER
Cortes v. L	eClair, et al.	•

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1.,3.
Civil Rights (08)	A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Defamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	A6017 Legal Malpractice A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
Other (35)	A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2., 3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty	A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not Unlawful Detainer or wrongful eviction)	2., 5.
(06)	A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence)	2., 5.
(not insurance)	A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
Insurance Coverage (18)	A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Other Contract (37)	A6009 Contractual Fraud A6031 Tortious Interference 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)	A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Other Real Property → (26)	A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure A6032 Quiet Title A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Commercial (31)	A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Residential (32)	A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	A6020F Unlawfui Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Drugs (38)	A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE: Cortes v. LeClair, et al.		and the second of the second o	
Cortes v LeClair et al	SHORT TITLE:		NUMBER
corecs v. hectair, et al.	Cortes v. LeClair,		

Α	В	C
Civil Case Cover	Type of Action	Applicable Reasons -
Sheet Category No.	(Check only one)	See Step 3 Above
Asset Forfeiture (05)	A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
Petition re Arbitration (11)	A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Writ of Mandate	A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus	2., 8.
(02)	A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter	2.
	A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2.
Other Judicial Review (39)	A6150 Other Writ/Judicial Review	2., 8.
Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
Construction Defect (10)	A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
Securities Litigation (28)	A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	A6141 Sister State Judgment	2., 9.
	A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.
Enforcement	A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2., 9.
of Judgment	A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2., 8.
(20)	A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2., 8.
	A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8., 9.
RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Other Complaints	A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1 2 8
(Not Specified Above)	A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	1., 2., 8.
(Not opecified Above)	A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	2., 8.
ω (12)	A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
Partnership Corporation Governance (21)		2., 8.
ÇV	A6121 Civil Harassment	2., 3., 9.
Other Petitions	A6123 Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9.
(Not Specified Above)	A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.
⊡. ⁽⁴³⁾	A6190 Election Contest	2.
├	A6110 Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.
្រា	A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 4., 8.
	A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Cortes v. LeClair, et al	
	m III. Statement of Location: Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other cumstance indicated in Item II., Step 3 on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.	
uı	EASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown nder Column C for the type of action that you have selected for nis case. 1. X 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.	
	CITY: ZIP CODE: Los Angeles CA 90004	
and Ru	m IV. Declaration of Assignment: I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is trud correct and that the above-entitled matter is properly filed for assignment to the Stanley Mosk courthouse in Central District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Los lee 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)]. Inted: 3/17/2015 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)	the
	EASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY DIMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE: 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.	
3.	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.	
	en e	
	N	
	vi	

