ANDREW J. SOKOLOWSKI (SBN 226685) 1 THE LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW J. SOKOLOWSKI 2276 Torrance Boulevard 2 Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles Torrance, California 90501 Tel.: (424) 254-8817 3 Fax: (866) 489-0330 JAN 22 2014 andrew@sokolawfirm.com 4 Sherri R. Carter, Exacutive Officer/Clerk By Myers Office Deputy NAREG S. KITSINIAN (SBN 236732) 5 KITSINIAN LAW FIRM Myrna Beltran 6739 Odessa Avenue 6 Van Nuys, California 91406 Tel.: (818) 786-5777 7 Fax: (818) 786-5778 info@kitsinianlaw.com 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff Raffy Kopalian 9 [Additional Counsel Listed On Signature Page] D-308 JANE C. JOHNSON 10 11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 12 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 13 BC533846 RAFFY KOPALIAN, Individually and CASE NO.: 14 on Behalf of All Others Similarly **CLASS ACTION** Situated, 15 COMPLAINT FOR: 16 Plaintiff, (1) VIOLATIONS OF THE 17 vs. **CONSUMER LEGAL REMEDIES** ACT (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750 et seq.) 18 RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY; and (2) UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES 19 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq.; 20 Defendant. (3) FALSE ADVERTISING (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500 et seq.; and 21 (4) BREACH OF EXPRESS 22 WARRANTY (Cal. Comm. Code § LEA/DEF# 2313) 23 유민은; DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL 24 25 26 27 28

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Raffy Kopalian ("Plaintiff" or "Kopalian") brings this consumer class action on behalf of himself and other similarly situated consumers throughout the State of California, against Defendant Ralph's Grocery Company ("Ralphs" or "Defendant"). Plaintiff alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This action seeks to remedy Defendant's unfair, deceptive, and unlawful business practices regarding the marketing and sales of Defendant's "decaf classic" brand decaffeinated coffees (the "Decaf Coffee Products"). Defendant manufactures, sells, and/or distributes the Decaf Coffee Products using a marketing and advertising campaign including the Decaf Coffee Products' own packaging that claims that the Decaf Coffee Products are "without caffeine." However, Defendant's advertising and marketing campaign was false and misleading because the Decaf Coffee Products at all times did, in fact, contain caffeine.
- 2. Plaintiff relied on Defendant's misrepresentations that the Decaf Coffee Products were without caffeine when purchasing them. Plaintiff purchased the Decaf Coffee Products over comparable competitor products that did not claim to be "without caffeine." Plaintiff lost money and was injured as a result of his reliance on Defendant's misrepresentation that the Decaf Coffee Products were "without caffeine" when he purchased the Decaf Coffee Products.
- 3. Defendant's conduct of falsely advertising that the Decaf Coffee Products are without caffeine constitutes unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent conduct, is likely to deceive members of the public, is unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous and/or substantially injurious to consumers, and violates California's legislatively declared policy against misrepresenting the characteristics of goods and services.
- 4. As such, Defendant's advertising practices violate California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civil Code §1750, et seq. ("CLRA"), California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et. seq. ("UCL"), California's False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, et. seq., ("FAL"), and California Commercial Code § 2313. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks restitution under the UCL and damages under the CLRA.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was a resident of Los Angeles County, California.
- 6. Defendant Ralphs owns and operates numerous grocery stores in the State of California, including in Los Angeles County where Plaintiff purchased the Decaf Coffee Products. On information and belief, Ralphs' corporate headquarters are located in Los Angeles County at 1100 W. Artesia Boulevard, Compton, California 90220.
- 7. All events alleged in this Complaint, including Plaintiff's purchase of the Decaf Coffee Products, occurred in Los Angeles County, California.

PARTIES

- 8. Plaintiff is a citizen and resident of California and an individual consumer. Relying on Defendant's representation that the Decaf Coffee Products were "without caffeine," Plaintiff purchased the Ralphs brand "decaf classic" coffee on or about January 2013 at a Ralphs grocery store in Chatsworth, California.
- 9. Defendant Ralphs owns and operates numerous grocery stores in the State of California, including in Los Angeles County where Plaintiff purchased the Decaf Coffee Products. On information and belief, Ralphs is an Ohio corporation with its corporate headquarters in Los Angeles County at 1100 West Artesia Boulevard, Compton, California 90220.
- 10. The true names and capacities of Defendants named as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to Plaintiff. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint, setting forth the true names and capacities of these fictitious Defendants if and when they are ascertained. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that each of these fictitious Defendants participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint.
- 11. On information and belief, at all relevant times, each Defendant, whether named or fictitious, was the agent of each other and participating in the acts alleged in this Complaint. On information and belief, each Defendant was a member of, and engaged in, a joint venture, partnership, or common enterprise with the other Defendant, and acted with in the course and scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership, or common enterprise.

12

10

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

25

24

26 27

28

12. On information and belief, at all relevant times each Defendant ratified each act or omission of the other Defendants and aided, abetted, and consented to the acts and omissions in proximately causing the injuries and harm alleged.

Plaintiff Purchased the Decaf Coffee Products in Reliance on Defendant's

Misrepresentations

- 13. In or about January 2013, Plaintiff purchased a container of the Ralphs-brand "decaf classic" Decaf Coffee Product at a Ralphs store in Chatsworth, California. The packaging of the "decaf classic" coffee container that Plaintiff purchased was prominently labeled as being "without caffeine." Defendant's "decaf classic" ground coffee is a specific brand of coffee that is unique to Defendant Ralphs.
- 14. Plaintiff, relying on the label's representation that the Decaf Coffee Product was "without caffeine," purchased this product over alternative decaffeinated coffee brands that did not make such claims.
- 15. Defendant's Decaf Coffee Products, including the "decaf classic" product Plaintiff purchased, are not, in fact, "without caffeine." On the contrary, the Decaf Coffee Products contain caffeine.
- 16. Defendant sold and/or distributed the decaf classic ground coffee with the falsely labeled advertising that it is "without caffeine" on the face of the coffee can. A true and correct copy of a photo of the decaf classic coffee container Plaintiff purchased - which includes the "without caffeine" labeling - is attached as Exhibit A.
- 17. Unbeknownst to Plaintiff at the time of purchase, on the back side of the coffee label in small print, Defendant represents that the coffee is only 99.7% caffeine free.
- 18. Plaintiff purchased Defendant's Decaf Coffee Product over comparable decaffeinated coffee brands in reliance on Defendant's advertising and packaging, and believing that the Decaf Coffee Products were 100% without caffeine.

<u>Defendant's Packaging is Misleading and Falsely Claims the Decaf Coffee Products are</u> "Without Caffeine"

- 19. At least as early as 2012, Defendant made certain representations in its labeling, marketing, and advertising that are false and misleading. Specifically, Defendant's packaging claims that the Decaf Coffee Products are "without caffeine" when they, in fact, do contain caffeine. Thus the packaging misleads consumers into believing that the Decaf Coffee Products are without caffeine, when, in fact, they contain caffeine.
- 20. In addition, the Decaf Coffee Products' labeling and packaging is likely to confuse and mislead consumers for additional reasons. Defendant's caffeine-free claims are a central component of its product description, thus representing that the product as a whole is without caffeine. The back of the label states, in very small print, that the product is only 99.7% caffeine free, while the larger statement that the Decaf Coffee Products are "without caffeine" on the front in large font leads the consumer to falsely believe that the product is free of caffeine when, in fact, it contains caffeine.
- 21. Moreover, given that the product contains caffeine, the "without caffeine" labeling on the Decaf Coffee Products is false.
- 22. Plaintiff relied on Defendant's claims that the Decaf Coffee Products were "without caffeine" when he decided to purchase the product in or about January 2013.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 23. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 and Civ. Code § 1781 on behalf of the following "Class":
 - All persons in California who purchased Defendant's "decaf classic" ground coffee bearing the "without caffeine" representation on the product packaging at any time within four years preceding the filing of this Complaint through the date of class certification.
- 24. This Class is sufficiently numerous, as it likely includes at least hundreds of people throughout California who purchased the Decaf Coffee Products. Thus, joinder of such persons in a single action or bringing all members of the Class before the Court is impracticable. The question is one of a general or common interest of many persons and it is impracticable to bring

them all before the Court. The disposition of the claims of the members of the Class in this class action will substantially benefit both the parties and the Court. The members of the Class are readily ascertainable from Defendant's records and other appropriate discovery. Further, the class definition provides an objective description of the class that will allow people to identify whether they are class members based on objective criteria.

- 25. There are questions of law and fact common to the class, including whether the representations on Defendant's labels and packaging for the Decaf Coffee Products include false representations and/or representations that are likely to mislead or confuse consumers. Thus, there is a well-defined community of interest with common questions of law and fact involved in this action and affecting the parties.
- 26. Plaintiff asserts claims that are typical of the claims of the entire Class. Plaintiff and all members of the Class have been subjected to the same wrongful conduct because they purchased the Decaf Coffee Products with labeling or packaging that contained the same or substantially similar representations. Plaintiff relied on Defendant's misrepresentations in purchasing this product and lost money or property as a result.
- 27. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of the other members of the Class. Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to those of the members of the Class. Plaintiff is committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action and has retained counsel experienced in litigation of this nature to represent him. Plaintiff anticipates no difficulty in the management of this litigation as a class action.
- 28. Class certification is appropriate because Defendant engaged in a common course of conduct generally applicable to all Class members. Such conduct includes selling, manufacturing, and or distributing Decaf Coffee Products labeled as "without caffeine" when, in fact, the Decaf Coffee Products contained caffeine. Further, class certification is appropriate because common questions of law and fact predominate over any questions that may affect only individual members of the Class. Among these common questions of law and fact are:
 - a. whether the Decaf Coffee Products are without caffeine;

- b. whether the Decaf Coffee Products' packaging and/or other marketing contains false statements:
- c. whether Defendant knew that the representations made on the Decaf Coffee
 Products' packaging and/or other marketing were false but continued to make them;
- d. whether Defendant's representations regarding the Decaf Coffee Products are true, misleading, or reasonably likely to deceive the Class;
- e. whether Defendant's conduct is unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, and/or substantially injurious to consumers;
- f. whether Defendant's conduct in advertising and marketing the Decaf Coffee Products constitutes a violation of the FAL;
- g. whether Defendant's conduct constitutes fraudulent, unfair, or unlawful conduct as defined by the UCL
- h. whether Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to equitable relief;
- i. whether Defendant's representations concerning the Decaf Coffee Products constitute express warranties; and
- whether Defendant breached the express warranties it made with regard to the Decaf Coffee Products.
- 29. Proceeding as a class action provides substantial benefits to both the parties and the Court because this is the most efficient method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. Class members have suffered and will suffer irreparable harm and damages as a result of defendant's wrongful conduct. Because of the nature of the individual Class members' claims, few, if any, could or would otherwise afford to seek legal redress against defendant for the wrongs complained of herein, and a representative class action is therefore the appropriate, superior method of proceeding, and essential to the interests of justice insofar as the resolution of Class members' claims is concerned.

30. Absent a class action, members of the Class would continue to suffer losses for which they would have no remedy, and Defendant would unjustly retain the proceeds of their ill-gotten gains. Even if separate actions could be brought by individual members of the Class, the resulting multiplicity of lawsuits would cause undue hardship, burden, and expense for the Court and the litigants, as well as create a risk of inconsistent rulings, which might be dispositive of the interests of the other members of the Class who are not parties to the adjudications and/or may substantially impede their ability to protect their interests.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

- 31. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 32. Under Business & Professions Code § 17200, any business act or practice that is likely to deceive members of the public constitutes a fraudulent business act or practice.
- 33. Defendant has engaged, and continues to engage, in conduct that is likely to deceive members of the public. This conduct includes, but is not limited to, misrepresenting that the Decaf Coffee Products were without caffeine.
- 34. After reviewing the packaging for the Decaf Coffee Products, Plaintiff purchased a container of coffee in reliance on Defendant's misrepresentations that the Decaf Coffee Products were without caffeine. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Decaf Coffee Products at all if he had known the truth about Defendant's misrepresentations. Plaintiff has thus suffered injury in fact and lost money or property as a direct result of Defendant's material misrepresentations and omissions.
- 35. Defendant misrepresented the caffeine content of the Decaf Coffee Products despite the fact that it knew or should have known that the representations were false, misleading, and/or likely to deceive consumers.
- 36. By committing the acts alleged above, Defendant has engaged in fraudulent business acts and practices, which constitute unfair competition within the meaning of Business & Professions

Code § 17200. As a result of Defendant's practices, reasonable consumers and members of the public were likely to be deceived regarding the caffeine content of the Decaf Coffee Products.

- 37. Defendant's business practices, as alleged in this Complaint, are unfair and misleading because the harm caused to the public as a result of such practices far outweighs any conferred benefit. There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendant's legitimate business interests, other than the conduct alleged in this Complaint.
- 38. Defendant's business practices, as alleged in this Complaint, are unlawful within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* because they constitute violations of California Business and Professions Code section 17500 *et seq.*, the Consumer Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code section 1750, and the California Commercial Code section 2313.
- 39. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent acts, Plaintiff and Class members have suffered injury in fact and lost money.
- 40. On information and belief, Defendant may have changed the labeling on its Decaf Coffee Products' packaging to eliminate the "without caffeine" representation, and replaced it with "smooth and satisfying." However, Defendant may in the future resume this conduct and fail and refuse, to cease the unfair, fraudulent, and deceptive practices alleged in this Complaint. On information and belief, Defendant may later resume its conduct unless this Court orders it to cease and desist pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17203.
- 41. An action for injunctive relief and restitution is specifically authorized under Business & Professions Code § 17203.
- 42. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code sections 17203 and 17535, Plaintiff and the members of the Classes seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage, use, or employ its above-described practices of advertising the Decaf Coffee Products to the extent Defendant is still engaging in such conduct and/or from resuming said practices. Likewise, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class seek an order requiring Defendant to disclose such misrepresentations, and additionally request an order awarding Plaintiffs restitution of the

money wrongfully acquired by Defendant as a result of Defendant's conduct and their failure to disclose the existence and significance of their misrepresentations.

43. Plaintiff seeks restitution, injunctive relief, and all other relief the Court deems appropriate after trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FALSE ADVERTISING (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500 et seq.)

- 44. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 45. As alleged above, Defendant engaged in a systematic campaign of advertising, marketing, and labeling the Decaf Coffee Products as "without caffeine" despite the fact that the Decaf Coffee Products do contain caffeine. Defendant disseminated or caused to be disseminated this deceptive advertising through the product packaging and, on information and belief, through other means including sale papers and other advertising.
- 46. Defendant's advertising campaign thus conveyed the false and misleading claims to Plaintiff and other consumers through the labeling for the Decaf Coffee Products' labeling and packaging as well as through marketing and advertising. By this conduct, Defendant engaged in deceptive advertising in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17500 et seq.
- 47. Defendant made the misrepresentations alleged in this Complaint despite the fact that they knew or should have known that the statements were false, misleading, and/or deceptive.

 There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendant's legitimate business interests, other than the conduct alleged in this Complaint.
- 48. On information and belief, Defendant may have changed the labeling on its Decaf Coffee Products' packaging to eliminate the "without caffeine" representation, and replaced it with "smooth and satisfying." However, Defendant may in the future resume this conduct and fail and refuse, to cease the unfair, fraudulent, and deceptive practices alleged in this Complaint. On information and belief, Defendant may later resume its conduct unless this Court orders it to cease and desist pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17535.

- 49. An action for injunctive relief and restitution is specifically authorized under Business & Professions Code § 17535.
- 50. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code sections 17203 and 17535, Plaintiff and the members of the Classes seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage, use, or employ its above-described practices of advertising the Decaf Coffee Products to the extent Defendant is still engaging in such conduct and/or from resuming said practices. Likewise, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class seek an order requiring Defendant to disclose such misrepresentations, and additionally request an order awarding Plaintiffs restitution of the money wrongfully acquired by Defendant as a result of Defendant's conduct and their failure to disclose the existence and significance of their misrepresentations
- 51. Plaintiff seeks restitution, injunctive relief, a corrective advertising campaign, and all other relief the Court deems appropriate after trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSUMER LEGAL REMEDIES ACT (Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.)

- 52. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 53. The Consumers Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA") applies to Defendant's actions and conduct as alleged in this Complaint because it extends to transactions that are intended to result, or which have resulted in the sale of goods or services to consumers.
 - 54. Plaintiff and the defined Class are consumers within the meaning of the CLRA.
- 55. Plaintiff purchased the Ralphs brand "decaf classic" ground coffee for his own personal or household use.
- 56. The Decaf Coffee Products are "goods" within the meaning of California Civil Code section 1761(a).
 - 57. Defendant are either suppliers or sellers within the meaning of the CLRA.
- 58. Defendant's conduct alleged in this Complaint involves consumer transactions within the meaning of the CLRA.

81/22/14

- 59. Defendant conducts was intended to deceive Plaintiff and members of the Class and resulted, and will continue to result, in damages to Plaintiff and members of the Class.
- 60. Defendant's conduct violated and continue to violate the CLRA in at least the following respects.
 - a. In violation of Section 1770(a)(5) of the CLRA, Defendant's acts and practices constitute representations that the Decaf Coffee Products have characteristics, uses and/or benefits which they do not;
 - In violation of Section 1770(a)(7) of the CLRA, Defendant's acts and practices
 constitute representations that the Decaf Coffee Products are of a particular
 quality which they are not; and
 - c. In violation of Section 1770(a)(9) of the CLRA, Defendant's acts and practices constitute the advertisement of the goods in question, the Decaf Coffee Products, without the intent to sell them as advertised.
- 61. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff and the Class members have suffered damages.
- 62. In compliance with the provisions of the California Civil Code § 1782, on January 15, 2013, Plaintiff provided written notice to defendant informing his intention to seek damages under the CLRA unless defendant offers appropriate consideration or another remedy to all affected consumers. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's January 15, 2013 letter is attached as Exhibit B.
- 63. Defendant responded to Plaintiff on February 20, 2013 by denying the allegations and threatening to seek sanctions against Plaintiff if he pursued further action. A true and correct copy of Defendant's letter dated February 20, 2013 is attached as Exhibit C.
- 64. Under California Civil Code section 1780(a)(2), Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to an order enjoining the above-described wrongful acts and practices of defendant, and ordering the payment of costs and attorney's fees and any other relief deemed appropriate and proper by the Court.

D 1 / 2 2 / 10

]

65. Under California Civil Code section 1780, Plaintiff also seeks, on behalf of the class, damages, restitution, punitive damages, and any other relief that the Court may deem proper.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY (Cal. Commercial Code § 2313)

- 66. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 67. Defendant's representations that the Decaf Coffee Products are without caffeine constitute affirmations of fact made with regard to the products as well as descriptions of the products.
- 68. Defendant's representations that the Decaf Coffee Products are without caffeine are made on the product label and packaging, and are thus part of the basis of the bargain between Defendant and Plaintiff and other Class members.
- 69. As set forth in the paragraphs above, Defendant's representations concerning the Decaf Coffee Products being "without caffeine" are false.
- 70. As such, the Decaf Coffee Products did not meet the quality and/or characteristics of the description Defendant provided on the Decaf Coffee Products' packaging.
- 71. Plaintiff took reasonable steps to notify Defendant within a reasonable time that the Decaf Coffee Product he purchased was not as Defendant represented by sending the January 15, 2013 letter to Defendant that is detailed above and which is attached as Exhibit B.
- 72. Defendant received Plaintiff's notice, and responded in a letter dated February 20, 2013, which is attached as Exhibit C, that threatened to seek sanctions against Plaintiff if he took further action and indicated that it would not provide relief to Plaintiff or any other consumer.
- 73. Plaintiff and members of the Class suffered damages as a result of Defendant's conduct because they paid for a product with represented qualities and benefits that Defendant promised but which Plaintiff and the Class members failed to receive.
- 74. The failure of the Decaf Coffee Products to have the quality and characteristics

 Defendant's represented on its packaging namely, being free of caffeine was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

75. Defendant has thus breached its express warranties concerning the Decaf Coffee Products in violation of California Commercial Code § 2313.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

- A. that the Court certify this case as a class action, appoint Plaintiff as the class representative, and his attorneys as Class Counsel;
- B. that the Court permanently enjoin Defendant from conducting its business through the unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business acts or practices, untrue and misleading labeling and advertising and other violations of law described in this Complaint;
- C. that the Court order Defendant to conduct a corrective advertising and information campaign advising consumers that the Decaf Coffee Products do not have the characteristics, uses, benefits, and quality Defendant has claimed.
- D. that the Court order Defendant to implement whatever measure is necessary to remedy the unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business acts or practices, untrue and misleading advertising, and other violations of law described in this Complaint.
- E. that the Court order Defendant to provide reasonable notice to Class members so that they may obtain damages and/or restitution from Defendant;
- F. that the Court order Defendant to pay restitution to restore to all affected persons all funds acquired by means of any act or practice declared by the Court to be an unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice, untrue or misleading advertising, plus pre- and post judgment interest;
- G. that the Court award damages to Plaintiff and the Class to compensate them for Defendant's breach of the express warranties created with regard to the Decaf Coffee Products;
- H. That the Court award punitive damages under California Civil Code section 1780;

25

J. that the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all causes of action so triable. Rhett T/Francisco ANDREW J. SOKOLOWSKI (SBN 226685) THE LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW J. SOKÓLOWSKI NAREG S. KITSINIAN (SBN 236732) KITSINIAN LAW FIRM RHETT T. FRANCISCO (SBN 232749) THE LAW OFFICES OF RHETT T. FRANCISCO 5350 Topanga Canyon Boulevard Woodland Hills, California 91364 Rhett francisco law@yahoo.com PAWEL R. SASIK (SBN 240672) THE LAW OFFICES OF PAWEL R. SASIK 5350 Topanga Canyon Boulevard Woodland Hills, California 91364

Form Adapted for Mandafory Use Judicial Council of California CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007] 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.

```
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 Injuryi 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/VD Tort (35)

Employment

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

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 Contract (37)

Contractual Fraud

Other Contract Dispute

Other Coverage

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 (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

Page 2 of 2

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER
KOPALIAN V. RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY	CASE NUMBER BC533846

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

	(CERTII	FICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE	LOCATION)
		suant to LASC Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los A	Angeles Superior Court.
		earing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:	
Item il Step the left Step Step For an	Select the correct dis 1: After first completir margin below, and, to 2: Check one Superio 3: In Column C, circle y exception to the cou Applicab 1: Class Actions must be file 2: May be filed in Central (C) 3: Location where cause of 4: Location where bodily inj 5: Location where performance	Action? Yes Limited Case? Yes Time estimated for trial 15 trict and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", sking the Civil Case Cover Sheet Form, find the main civil case cover sheet in the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected or Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action art location, see Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0. Ille Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. Other county, or no Bodily Injury/Property Damage). See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District. See Column C belowed in the County Courthouse Column C belowed in the County Courthouse Courthouse Column C belowed in the County Courthouse Courthouse Column C belowed in the Courthouse Column C belowed in the Courthouse Courthouse Courthouse C	heading for your case in ed. e of this case. you have checked. w) nanently garaged vehicle. sides. respondent functions wholly. of the parties reside.
Step		on requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration	
Ę	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto Tart	Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Au	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.
Prope	Product Liability (24)	☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
al Injury ngful De	Medical Malpractice (45)	☐ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons ☐ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	 ☐ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) ☐ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) ☐ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress ☐ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death 	1., 2., 4. 1., 2., 4. 1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 4.
erty i Tort	Business Tort (07)	☑ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	① 2., 3.
//Prop Death	Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Injur, ngful	Defamation (13)	☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
sonal /Wro	Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort			

Damage/	_
Injury/Property	Death Tort (Cont'd)
Non-Personal Injury/Pr	Wronoful Dez

Employment

Contract

Real Property

Judicial Review Unlawful Detainer

をある数と地

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER
KOPALIAN v. RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY	

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons -See Step 3 Above
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 (06) (not insurance)	 □ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not Unlawful Detainer or wrongful eviction) □ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) □ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) □ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) 	2., 5. 2., 5. 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. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Commercial (31)	☐ 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- Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.
Asset Forfeiture (05) Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case ☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 6. 2., 5.

	_
SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER
KOPALIAN V. RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY	
	<u></u>

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above	
	☐ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus	2., 8.	
Writ of Mandate	A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter	2.	
(02)	☐ 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.	
Enforcement	☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.	
of Judgment	☐ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2., 9.	
(20)	☐ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2., 8.	
	☐ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax		
	☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8. 2., 8., 9.	
RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.	
	☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.	
Other Complaints	☐ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.	
(Not Specified Above)	☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.	
(42)	☐ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.	
Partnership Corporation Governance(21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.	
	☐ A6121 Civil Harassment	2., 3., 9.	
	☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9.	
	A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.	
Other Petitions (Not Specified Above)	☐ A6190 Election Contest	2.	
	☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.	
(43)	☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 4., 8.	
		1 4-c; ∨ c; T;; V.	

Judicial Review (Cont'd.)

Provisionally Complex Litigation

Enforcement of Judgment

Miscellaneous Civil Complaints

Miscellareous Civil Petitions

SHORT TITLE: KOPALIAN V.	RALPHS	GROCERY	COMPANY	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 NUMBER UNDER COLUMN C WHICH APPLIES IN THIS CASE ☑1. □2. □3. □4. □5. □6. □7. □8. □9. □10.			ADDRESS: 1100 West Artesia Boulevard
CITY: Compton	STATE: CA	ZIP CODE: 90220	

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 Stanley Mosk courthouse in the Central
District of the Los Angeles Superior Court (Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and LASC Local Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)).

Dated: January 22, 2014

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE 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 form CM-010.
- 4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form LACIV 109 (Rev. 01/07), LASC Approved 03-04.
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- Signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, JC form FL-935, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age, or if required by Court.
- 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.