Case4:04-cv-01694-SBA Document1 Filed04/30/04 Page1 of 21

II	Case4:04-cv-01694-SBA Document1 Fil	ed04/30/04 Page1 of 21				
1	JAMES B. CHANIN (SBN# 76043) Law Offices of James B. Chanin 3050 Shattuck Avenue					
2	Berkeley, California 94705 Telephone: (510) 848-4752					
3	Facsimile: (510) 848-5819					
4	JOHN L. BURRIS (SBN 69888) LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS					
5	Airport Corporate Centre 7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1120					
6	Oakland, California 94621 Telephone: (510) 839-5200					
7	Facsimile: (510) 839-3882					
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
9						
10	UNITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT				
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT	OF CALIFORNIA				
12	TYRONNE DAVIS,	CASE NO.				
13	THOMAL DAVIS,)				
14 15	Plaintiff,) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES) (42 U.S.C. §§1983; and) pendent tort claims)				
16)				
17	VS.) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED				
18	CITY OF OAKLAND, a municipal corporation; RICHARD WORD,))				
19	individually and in his capacity as Chief of Police for the))				
20	City of Oakland; RYAN GILL, individually and in))				
21	his capacity as a police officer for the City of Oakland;))				
22	DOES 1-100, inclusive,))				
23	Defendants.))				
24						
25						
26						
27						
_ ′						
28	COMPLAINT 1					

COMPLAINT

JURISDICTION

 This action arises under 42 U.S.C. §§1983, 1985, and 1986. Jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

2. The claims alleged herein arose in the City of Oakland, State of California. Therefore, venue and assignment lies in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco or Oakland Divisions. 28 U.S.C. Section 1391(b)(2).

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff, TYRONNE DAVIS, is an African American male citizen of the United States.
- 4. Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a municipal corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.
- 5. Defendant RICHARD WORD (hereinafter, Defendant WORD), is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the Chief of Police for the CITY OF OAKLAND. Defendant WORD is sued in his individual and official capacities. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant WORD was the policy-maker for Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND on the matters alleged herein related to the customs, policies, practices, of the CITY OF OAKLAND Police Department, including, but not limited to, customs, policies and practices related to the training, supervision, hiring and discipline of police officers and with respect to the management and supervision of the CITY OF OAKLAND Police Department. Defendant

6

9

12

10

1314

1516

17

18

1920

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

COMPLAINT

WORD is sued herein in his official and individual capacities.

- 6. Defendant RYAN GILL (hereinafter Defendant GILL) was at all times herein mentioned, a Police Officer for the CITY OF OAKLAND and is sued herein in his individual and official capacities.
- Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and/or 7. capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and upon such information and belief alleges that each of the Doe defendants is legally responsible and liable for the incident, injuries and damages hereinafter set forth, and that each of said defendants proximately caused said incidents, injuries and damages by reason of their negligence, breach of duty, negligent supervision, management or control, battery, violation of constitutional rights, violation of public policy, false arrests, or by reason of other personal, vicarious or imputed negligence, fault, or breach of duty, whether severally or jointly, or whether based upon agency, employment, ownership, entrustment, custody, care or control or upon any other act or Plaintiff will ask leave to amend this complaint to insert further charging allegations when such facts ascertained.
- 8. In doing the acts alleged herein, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the course and scope of their employment for Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND.

8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

In doing the acts and/or omissions alleged herein, 9. Defendants, and each of them, acted under color of authority and/or under color of law.

10. In doing the acts and/or omissions alleged herein, Defendants, and each of them, acted as the agent, servant, employee and/or in concert with each of said other Defendants herein.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the CITY OF OAKLAND Police Department maintained customs, policies and/or practices wherein Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND Police Officers were encouraged, authorized and/or otherwise permitted to engage in repeated civil rights violations against African American citizens living, traveling and/or visiting in the City of Oakland and were also encouraged, authorized and/or otherwise permitted to prepare and file false police reports, fabricate evidence, subject such persons to excessive force and otherwise maliciously arrest numerous individuals for crimes they did not commit.

12. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that the abuses in question were the product of a CITY culture of tolerance within the OF OAKLAND Police This culture is rooted in the deliberate Department. indifference of high ranking City Officials, including, but not limited to Defendants WORD, DOES 1-100, and/or other high ranking Police Department officials and/or supervisors, and each of them, individually and/or acting in concert with one another, who have

COMPLAINT

1

456

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

COMPLAINT

routinely acquiesced in the misconduct and otherwise failed to take necessary measures to prevent and curtail such misconduct.

- 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon allege that Plaintiff suffered the violation of his constitutional rights as a result of customs, policies, patterns and/or practices of Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND, Defendants WORD, DOES 1-100, and each of them, including, but not limited to, deliberate indifference in the hiring, supervision, training, and discipline of members of the Oakland Police Department, including, but not limited to, Defendants GILL, DOES 1-100, and/or each of them.
- 14. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and alleges that he suffered the violation of thereon his constitutional rights as alleged herein as a result of customs, policies and/or practices of Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD, DOES 1-100, and/or each of them, including customs, policies and/or practices of failing to ensure that officers were not encouraged by their training officers, in the academy and elsewhere to engage in acts of misconduct against citizens and to falsify reports and evidence; of failing to fully and/or fairly investigate alleged misconduct by its police officers; of failing to appropriately monitor or otherwise track complaints of misconduct against its police officers so that appropriate and timely disciplinary action and/or training could be taken when officer(s) were shown to have a history of complaints; and/or of failing to promptly remove or terminate officers who repeatedly violated the rights of citizens and/or engaged in the type of

misconduct alleged herein.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the aforementioned incidents were caused by the deliberate indifference of Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD, DOES 1-100, and/or other high ranking Police Department officials and/or supervisors, with regard to the need for more or different training and/or supervision and/or discipline of its police officers, including, but not limited to, Defendants GILL, DOES 1-100, and/or each of them.

- 16. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that he suffered the violation of his constitutional rights as a result of customs, policies, or practices of Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD, DOES 1-100, and each of them, individually and/or acting in concert with one another, including, but not limited to, customs, policies or practices which encouraged, authorized or condoned false arrests, fabrication of evidence, falsification of police reports and/or other misconduct which foreseeably would result in the violation of the rights of citizens.
- 17. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that as a result of Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND's policy of indifference, a custom or practice developed within the Oakland Police Department whereby it was accepted practice for police officers to abide by a "Code of Silence." Under this Code, police officers charged with upholding the law routinely ignored or otherwise failed to report or take action against fellow police officers who engaged in misconduct, including, but

not limited to, Defendants GILL, DOES 1-100 and/or each of them.

- 18. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD, DOES 1-100, and/or each of them, tacitly or directly ratified, approved, condoned and/or otherwise encouraged a pattern, practice, custom or policy of misconduct and/or civil rights violations by his subordinates, such as occurred in the instant case.
- 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that prior to the subject incident, Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD, DOES 1-100 and/or other high ranking members of the City of Oakland Police Department were on actual notice of problems with the accountability of City of Oakland Police Officers, including, but not limited to, problems with the ability of the Professional Standards Division of the Oakland Police Department in fully, fairly, and objectively investigate citizens' complaints concerning misconduct of members of the City of Oakland Police Department.
- 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that as a result of customs, policies, practices and/or the lack thereof, Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD and/or other policy makers and/or high ranking supervisors of the City of Oakland Police Department (DOES 1-100) have encouraged, authorized, ratified, condoned and/or have failed to remedy continuing acts of misconduct and civil rights violations, including, but not limited to, those which have resulted in the damage as alleged herein to the Plaintiff.
 - 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon

COMPLAINT

alleges that the subject incident was the result of a custom, policy, pattern and/or practice of Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND and/or other members of the City of Oakland Police Department (DOES 1-100 and/or each of them) whereby African American males, such as the Plaintiff, were singled out for disparate treatment and subjected to excessive force, false arrests and/or false imprisonments because of their race, gender and/or age.

22. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that despite having notice of customs, policies, patterns and/or practices by members of the City of Oakland Police Department wherein African American men were repeatedly subjected to excessive force, unreasonable searches and seizures, false arrests, false imprisonments and false charges of drug possession and/or sale, Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD and/or other high ranking officials of the CITY OF OAKLAND and/or CITY OF OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT (DOES 1-100 and/or each of them) have failed to take any or appropriate remedial action to prevent continuing misconduct by members of the City of Oakland Police Department.

ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING THE PLAINTIFF'S INCIDENT

- 23. On or about May 8, 2003, Plaintiff was arrested without reasonable or probable cause to believe Plaintiff committed any crime by a City of Oakland Police Officer whom Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges was Defendant RYAN GILL OR DOE 1.
- 24. During the course of said arrest, Defendant GILL OR DOE 1 subjected the Plaintiff to excessive and unreasonable

28 COMPLAINT

force, including, but not limited to, throwing Plaintiff to the ground, punching and kicking the Plaintiff in and about the head and face

- 25. As a result of said use of force by Defendant GILL OR DOE 1, Plaintiff was taken to Highland Hospital for emergency medical treatment. Plaintiff received medical treatment for his injuries at Highland Hospital which included, but was not limited to, stitches in his face and lip
- 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant GILL OR DOE 1 falsely accused Plaintiff of crimes, including, but not limited to, loitering with the intent to sell drugs and violating PC 148. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said charges were later dismissed.
- 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant GILL OR DOE 1'S supervisor(s) (DOES 2-100) were notified of Defendant GILL OR DOE 1'S use of force on the Plaintiff and that photographs were taken of the Plaintiff while he was at Highland Hospital.
- 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant GILL OR DOE 1'S acts and/or omissions as alleged herein were motivated by racial animus and/or subjected the Plaintiff to disparate treatment on account of Plaintiff's race, gender and/or age.
- 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that notwithstanding the fact that Defendant GILL OR DOE 1 subjected Plaintiff to excessive force and falsely

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

claimed that the Plaintiff had committed the aforementioned crimes, no disciplinary or other remedial action and/or Defendant GILL OR DOE 1'S conduct was ratified by his supervisor(s) (DOES 2-100), Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD and/or other high ranking City of Oakland Police Department officials (DOES 2-100) and/or each of them.

30. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he suffered the violation of his constitutional rights as a result of customs, policies, or practices of Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD and/or DOES 2-100, and/or each of them, individually and/or while acting in concert with one another, including, but not limited to, customs, policies or practices which encouraged, ratified, authorized or condoned the use of excessive force which foreseeably resulted in the violation of the rights of the Plaintiff; customs, policies and/or practices of inadequate and/or inappropriate training in the use of force and/or in handling situations such as occurred in this case; customs, policies and/or practices of conducting searches and/or seizures in violation of the United States and California Constitutions; customs, policies and/or practices of inadequate and/or inappropriate supervision, control and/or discipline with respect to the use of force; customs, policies and/or practices of subjecting African Americans in Oakland to unnecessary and excessive force, false arrests, unreasonable searches and/or seizures and/or disparate treatment because of their race, gender and/or age, and/or other customs, policies and practices that caused and/or contributed to the cause of

27

COMPLAINT

the violation of the constitutional rights and/or other wrongful conduct that occurred in this case subject to continuing discovery

- 31. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that the CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD and/or DOES 2-100 and/or each of them, tacitly or directly ratified, approved and/or condoned the acts and/or omissions of Defendant GILL OR DOE 1 and/or his supervisor(s) (DOES 2-100) and/or failed to take any or appropriate remedial action in response to this incident despite having actual or constructive notice of its occurrence.
- 32. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD and/or DOES 2-100 and/or each of them, knew or reasonably should have known in the exercise of reasonable diligence that Defendant GILL OR DOE 1 engaged in prior similar acts and/or omissions, yet Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD and/or DOES 2-100 and/or each of them, failed to take any or appropriate remedial action to ensure that Defendant GILL OR DOE 1 would not continue to engage is said acts and/or omissions.
- 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon allege that the acts and/or omissions of Defendants WORD, GILL, and/or DOES 1-100 and/or each of them, was or may have been intentional, malicious, oppressive and/or was or may have been done with a conscious or callous disregard for the safety and/or constitutional rights of the Plaintiff which may thereby justify an award of punitive or exemplary damages in amounts to

1	be determined according to proof.
2	CLAIMS FOR RELIEF
3	FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
4	(42 U.S.C. SECTION 1983) (AGAINST DEFENDANTS GILL, DOES 1-100)
5	34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-
6	alleges herein Paragraphs 1 through 33.
7	35. In doing the acts complained of herein,
8	Defendants GILL, DOES 1 through 100, individually and/or while
9	acting in concert with one another, did act under color of
10	state law to deprive Plaintiff as alleged heretofore of certain
11	constitutionally protected rights, including, but not limited
12	to:
13	(a) the right not to be deprived of liberty without Due
14	Process of Law;
15	(b) the right to be free from unreasonable search or
16	seizure; and/or
17	(c) the right to equal protection of the law.
18	36. Said rights are substantive guarantees under
19	the Fourth and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the United States
20	Constitution.
21	37. As a result of the violation of his
22	constitutional rights, Plaintiff sustained the damages and
23	injuries alleged in this Complaint.
24	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as hereinafter set
25	forth.
26	SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
27	(42 U.S.C. SECTION 1983) (AGAINST DEFENDANTS CITY OF OAKLAND, DOES 2-100)
28	COMPLAINT 12

COMPLAINT

38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges herein Paragraphs 1 through 37.

and/or DOES 2-100 and/or each of them, individually and/or in their capacities as official policy-maker(s) for the CITY OF OAKLAND, the Plaintiff further alleges that the acts and/or omissions alleged in the Complaint herein are indicative and representative of a repeated course of conduct by members of the CITY OF OAKLAND Police Department tantamount to a custom, policy or repeated practice of condoning and tacitly encouraging the abuse of police authority, and disregard for the constitutional rights of citizens in Oakland.

40. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that the acts and/or omissions alleged herein are the proximate result of a custom, policy, pattern or practice of deliberate indifference by Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD, DOES 2-100 and/or each of them, to the repeated violations of the constitutional rights of citizens by CITY OF OAKLAND police officers, which have included, but are not limited to, repeated false arrests, repeated false imprisonments, the repeated use of excessive force, denial of equal protection of the law based on race, gender and/or age, and other repeated violations of the constitutional rights of citizens in Oakland.

41. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that the damages sustained as alleged herein were the proximate result customs, policies and/or practices

12 1.3

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 2.3

24

25

27

26

which included, but were not limited to, the failure to adequately or appropriately hold officers accountable for their misconduct, the failure to properly and fairly investigate complaints about officers' misconduct, the failure to enact or adopt policies to ensure adequate and/or appropriate oversight of officers to prevent continuing violations of the rights of citizens, the failure to properly train and/or discipline officers, the failure to adequately or properly supervise officers, the failure to adopt an appropriate early warning system, policies and customs which encouraged officers to target certain groups of citizens for aggressive police tactics and/or other customs, and/or policies which caused and/or contributed to, the violation of the rights of citizens by members of Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND's Police Department.

- 42. The aforementioned deliberate indifference, customs, policies or practices of Defendants CITY OF OAKLAND, WORD, DOES 2-100, and each of them, resulted in the deprivation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights including, but not limited to, the following:
- (a) the right not to be deprived of liberty without Due Process of Law;
- the right to be free from unreasonable searches and/or seizures; and/or
 - (C) the right to equal protection of the law.
- Said rights are substantive guarantees under the Fourth and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the United States

28 COMPLAINT

2

4

3

5 6

7

8 9

10

12

1.3

11

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2.3

24 25

26

27 28

COMPLAINT

Constitution.

44. As a result of the violation of his constitutional rights, Plaintiff suffered the damages and injuries alleged in this Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(NEGLIGENCE)

(AGAINST DEFENDANTS WORD, GILL, DOES 1-100, CITY OF OAKLAND)

- 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges herein Paragraphs 1 through 44.
- 46. Defendants WORD, GILL, DOES 1 through 100, individually and/or acting in concert and while acting within the course and scope of their employment for Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND, owed Plaintiff a duty to use due care at or about the times of the aforementioned incidents.
- In doing the aforementioned acts and/or omissions, said Defendants and/or each of them, individually and/or while acting in concert with one another, negligently breached said duty to use due care, directly and proximately resulting in the injuries and damages to the Plaintiff as alleged herein.
- 48. Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND is therefore liable as respondeat superior for the negligence of its employees and agents within the course and scope of their employment and agency as alleged herein.
- 49. As a result of the negligence of said Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff suffered the damages 1.5

and injuries as alleged heretofore in this Complaint. 1 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as hereinafter set 2 forth. 3 FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF 4 (FALSE ARREST/FALSE IMPRISONMENT) 5 (AGAINST DEFENDANTS GILL, DOES 1-100, CITY OF OAKLAND) Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-6 7 alleges herein Paragraphs 1 through 49. Defendants GILL, DOES 1 through 100, 8 51. 9 individually and/or acting in concert with one another, 10 arrested and imprisoned the Plaintiff without reasonable or probable cause to believe that he committed any crime. 11 The acts and/or omissions of said Defendants 12 1.3 and/or each of them, individually and/or while acting in concert with one another, as alleged herein, were done within 14 the course and scope of their employment for Defendant CITY OF 15 OAKLAND. Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND is therefore liable for 16 17 said false arrest and/or false imprisonment as respondeat 18 superior. 19 53. As a result of the false arrest by said 20 Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff suffered the damages 21 and injuries as alleged heretofore in this Complaint. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as hereinafter set 22 2.3 forth. 24 FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF 25 (BATTERY) (AGAINST DEFENDANTS GILL, CITY OF OAKLAND, DOES 1-100) 26 54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-27

COMPLAINT 16

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 2.3

24 25

26 27

28

alleges herein Paragraphs 1 through 53.

- In doing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendants GILL, DOES 1-100 and/or each of them, individually and/or while acting in concert with one another, caused Plaintiff to be subjected to non-consensual, non-privileged, offensive touching of the Plaintiff's body constituting battery.
- 56. As a result of said battery, Plaintiff suffered the damages and injuries alleged in this Complaint.
- Said battery was caused by said Defendants 57. and/or each of them, within the course and scope of their employment with Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND.
- Defendant CITY OF OAKLAND is therefore liable for said battery as respondent superior.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(CAL. CIVIL CODE SECTION 51.7) (AGAINST DEFENDANTS GILL, CITY OF OAKLAND, DOES 1-100)

- Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges herein Paragraphs 1 through 58.
- In doing the acts and/or omissions as alleged herein, Defendants GILL, DOES 1-100 and/or each of them, caused the Plaintiff to be subjected to force or violence because of his race and/or gender.
- As a result, Plaintiff is entitled to relief 61. under California Civil Code Section 51.7, including, but not limited to, compensatory damages, statutory damages, punitive COMPLAINT 17

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES

66. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-

26

27

COMPLAINT

allege herein Paragraphs 1 through 65.

- 67. As a result of the acts and/or omissions of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged herein, Plaintiff suffered damages, including, but not limited to:
- a. General damages, including, but not limited to, past, present and future damages for pain, suffering, emotional distress, and/or loss of liberty in amounts to be determined according to proof;
- b. Special damages, including, but not limited to, past, present and/or future medical and related expenses in amounts to be determined according to proof.
- 68. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the acts and/or omissions of Defendants WORD, GILL, 1-100, and/or each of them, were intentional, malicious, oppressive and/or done with a conscious or reckless disregard for the rights of the Plaintiff. Accordingly, Plaintiff prays for an award of punitive and exemplary damages in amounts to be determined according to proof.
- 69. Plaintiff will also be entitled to an award of attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to statute(s) in the event that he is the prevailing party in this action under 42 U.S.C. Sections 1983 and 1988, California Civil Code Sections 51.7, 52 and 52.1 and/or under other statutes and/or laws.
- 70. Plaintiff will also be entitled to an award of statutory damages pursuant to California Civil Code Sections 51.7, 52 and/or 52.1 in the event that he is the prevailing party in this action.

1	COMPLIANCE WITH GOVERNMENT TORT CLAIM REQUIREMENT				
	71. Prior to commencing this litigation, Plaintiff				
2	presented a timely Tort Claim to the City of Oakland pursuant				
3	to the California Tort Claims Act. Said Claim was rejected by				
4	the City of Oakland.				
5	JURY TRIAL DEMAND				
6	72. Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial.				
7	<u>PRAYER</u>				
8	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against				
9	Defendants, and each of them, as follows:				
10	1. General damages in amounts to be determined				
11	according to proof;				
12	2. Special damages in amounts to be determined				
13	according to proof;				
14	3. Statutory damages pursuant to California Civil Code				
15	Sections 51.7, 52, and/or 52.1;				
16	4. Attorneys' fees pursuant to statutes;				
17	5. Costs of suit;				
18	6. Punitive and exemplary damages in amounts to be				
19	determined according to proof as to the individual defendants				
20	7. For prejudgment interest as permitted by law;				
21	8. For such other and further relief as the Court may				
22	deem just and proper.				
23	CERTIFICATION OF INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PERSONS				
24	Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-16, the undersigned certifies that				
25	as of this date, other than the named parties, there is no such				
26	interest to report.				
27					

COMPLAINT

	Case4.04-07-01094-5BA	Document1 Filed04/30/04 Page21	01 2 1
1			
2	DATED: April 29, 2004	/s/	
3		JAMES B. CHANIN Attorney for Plai	ntiff
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	COMPLAINT	21	