Michael Freund SBN 99687 Law Offices of Michael Freund 1915 Addison Street Berkeley, CA 94704 Phone: (510) 540-1992 Facsimile: (510) 540-5543 E-Mail freund1@aol.com

FILED

OCT 25 2006

John A. Clark, Executive Officer/Clerk

Attorney for Plaintiff

Center for Environmental Health

Jon M MAYEDA Case assigned to Judge

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES** 

BC360876

CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,

a California non-profit corporation

CASE NO.

Plaintiff

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES

28

[Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq.]

MARVIN ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC.

and DOES I-X,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, Center for Environmental Health ("CEH") hereby alleges:

I

# INTRODUCTION

1. CEH brings this action as a private attorney general on behalf of the People

of the State of California and in the public interest pursuant to Health Safety Code section 25249.7 (d). Based on the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq) also known as "Proposition 65," this complaint seeks injunctive and declaratory relief and civil penalties based on Marvin Engineering, Inc.'s ("Marvin Engineering") failure to warn residents and workers in and around Inglewood, California, that they have been and continue to be exposed to perchloroethylene (PCE), a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, from its facility. Pursuant to Proposition 65, businesses with ten or more employees must provide persons with a "clear and reasonable warning" prior to exposing them to chemicals listed by the State to cause cancer in excess of the no significant risk level for that chemical.

#### H

#### **PARTIES**

- 2. Plaintiff CEH is a non-profit California corporation dedicated to environmental protection and enhancement. One of CEH's objectives is to prevent and reduce toxic hazards to human health and the environment, specifically from pollution of air, water and land throughout California. T hrough CEH's activities, numerous carcinogenic and reproductive chemicals listed pursuant to Proposition 65 that have been present in consumer products and emitted into the air, have been eliminated.
- 3. Marvin Engineering is a corporation licensed to do business in the State of California. Marvin Engineering manufactures missile launchers, ejector racks, test equipment, and other hardware for military customers and companies in the aerospace and defense industries. Marvin Engineering operates its facility at 251-260 West Beach Ave in Inglewood, California 90302.
- 4. Defendants DOES I-X, are named herein under fictitious names, as their true names and capacities are unknown to Plaintiff. CEH is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of

said DOES is responsible, in some actionable manner, for the events and happenings hereinafter referred to, either through said Marvin Engineering 's conduct, or through the conduct of its agents, servants or employees, or in some other manner, causing the harms alleged by Plaintiff in this complaint. When said true names and capacities of DOES are ascertained, CEH will seek leave to amend this complaint to set forth the same.

#### III

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, section 10.
- 6. CEH has performed any and all conditions precedent to the filing of a legal action pursuant to Proposition 65 by mailing a Notice of Violation, dated July 28, 2006, to the Attorney General of the State of California, the Los Angeles County District Attorney, and Marvin Engineering. A true and correct copy of this Notice is attached herein as Exhibit A. More than 60 days have passed since CEH mailed its Notice and no public enforcement entity has filed a complaint in this case.
- 7. This Court is the proper venue for the action because the causes of action have arisen in Los Angeles County. Furthermore, this Court is the proper venue under Code of Civil Procedure section 395 and Health and Safety Code section 25249.7.

#### IV

#### STATUTORY BACKGROUND

### A. PROPOSITION 65

8. The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 is an initiative statute passed as "Proposition 65" by an overwhelming majority vote of the people in November of 1986.

9. The warning requirement of Proposition 65 is contained in Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, which provides:

No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual, except as provided in Section 25249.10.

- 10. Implementing regulations for Proposition 65 provide that warnings are required for environmental exposures. Environmental exposures are those which may foreseeably occur as a result of contact with an environmental medium, including ambient air, "through inhalation, ingestion, skin contact or otherwise." 22 CCR section 12601 (d).
- 11. Warnings for environmental exposures must be "provided in a conspicuous manner and under such conditions as to make it likely to be read, seen, or heard and understood by an ordinary individual in the course of normal daily activity." 22 CCR section 12601 (d) (2). The warnings must also be "reasonably associated with the location and source of the exposure." <u>Id</u>.
- 12. Proposition 65 establishes a procedure by which the state is to develop a list of chemicals "known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity." Marvin Engineering had a duty to provide clear and reasonable warning to those persons exposed to PCE at significant risk levels 12-months after the chemical was published on the state list. PCE was listed as a carcinogen by the State of California on April 1, 1988.
- 13. Proposition 65 may be enforced by any person in the public interest who provides notice sixty days before filing suit to both the violator and designated law enforcement officials. The failure of law enforcement officials to file a timely complaint enables a citizen suit to be filed pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7 (c).

14. Proposition 65 provides for injunctive relief and a civil fine of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a) (b). Each individual exposure without warning is a separate violation.

V

# **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

- 15. Marvin Engineering conducts manufacturing operations that uses of PCE at its Inglewood facility. During the course of operations, PCE is emitted into the air and surrounding community as a fugitive emission.
- 16. PCE has been identified as a hazardous air pollutant pursuant to section 112 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. section 7412(b)) and has been designated as a toxic air contaminant pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 39657. Sufficient exposure to PCE can cause also significant adverse health effects, including central nervous system depression, headache, slurred speech, drowsiness, dizziness, nausea, loss of coordination and equilibrium, irritation to eyes, nose and throat, and cancer.
- 17. Marvin Engineering reported 4,330 pounds of PCE emissions for the 2004-2005 period to the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Other than dry cleaning facilities, Marvin Engineering is one of the few companies remaining within the District that uses PCE and is one of the higher emitters of PCE in the South Coast Air Basin.
- 18. Despite the availability and feasibility of safer solvents, Marvin Engineering has failed to eliminate PCE by substituting a less toxic solvent. Marvin Engineering has also failed to install emission control technology at its facility that would obviate the need to provide a warning to the surrounding community.

- 19. Marvin Engineering 's facility is located close to residents and workers from other businesses. The company is situated across the street from apartments about 30 meters away. Furthermore, a community center which contains a pre-school, is located 30 meters away. Nearby residents, Marvin Engineering 's workers and workers from other businesses have been and continue to be exposed to Marvin Engineering 's PCE emissions.
- 20. The Proposition 65 standard to require a warning in California is 10 excess cancer risks per one-million persons. Air dispersion modeling using the most sophisticated Environmental Protection Agency model ISCST3, demonstrates that numerous residents and workers have been exposed to levels of PCE above the Proposition 65 warning threshold.
- 21. Marvin Engineering has not provided clear and reasonable warnings to those residents and workers in the surrounding community who are exposed to PCE from its facility as required by Proposition 65.
- 22. Marvin Engineering has knowingly and intentionally exposed residents, including children, situated nearby, as well as workers in the surrounding neighborhood to PCE without providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning. Marvin Engineering has at all times relevant hereto been aware that its operations use a large amount of PCE, that the chemical escapes into the air as a fugitive emission, that safer solvents are feasible and available, and that improved emission control technology exists. Marvin Engineering has always been aware that a residential community, a community center with a pre-school program and other workers are situated close by. Marvin Engineering has operated its facility with knowledge that exposures to these chemicals have occurred.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Violation of section 25249.6 of the Health and Safety Code, Failure to Provide Clear and Reasonable Warning under Proposition 65)

- 23. CEH refers to paragraphs 1-22, inclusive, and incorporates them herein by this reference.
- 24. Marvin Engineering operates a business, which employs ten or more persons.
- 25. By committing the acts alleged above, Marvin Engineering has, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individuals, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.
- 26. Said violations render Marvin Engineering liable for civil fines up to \$2,500 (two thousand, five hundred dollars) per day, for each such violation.
- 27. Marvin Engineering 's continued violation of the law will irreparably harm CEH and the public interest in whose behalf Plaintiff brings this action, for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (Declaratory Relief)

- 28. CEH refers to paragraphs 1-27, inclusive, and incorporates them herein by this reference.
- 29. There exists an actual controversy relating to the legal rights and duties of the parties, within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1060, between Plaintiff and Marvin Engineering concerning:
- a) whether Marvin Engineering has exposed individuals to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer without providing clear and reasonable warning; and

# VII

# **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, CEH prays for relief against Marvin Engineering as follows:

- 1. On the First Cause of Action, for civil penalties for each and every violation according to proof;
- 2. On the First Cause of Action, and pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7 (a), for such temporary restraining orders, preliminary and permanent injunctive orders, or other orders, prohibiting Marvin Engineering from exposing persons to PCE without providing clear and reasonable warnings;
- 3. On the Second Cause of Action, for a declaratory judgment pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1060 declaring:
- a. that Marvin Engineering has exposed individuals to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer without providing clear and reasonable warning; and
- 4. On all Causes of Action, for reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to section 1021.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure or the substantial benefit theory;
  - 5. For costs of suit herein; and

111 111 111

1 /// /// ///

6. For such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: October 20, 2006

Ву

Michael Freund

Attorney for Center for Environmental Health

#### MICHAEL FREUND

ATTORNEY AT LAW
1915 ADDISON STREET
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1101

TEL 510/540-1992

FAX 510/540-5543

EMAIL FREUND1@AOL.COM

July 28, 2006

Bill Lockyer, Attorney General Edward Weil, Deputy Attorney General 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612-1413

Steve Cooley, District Attorney Los Angeles District Attorney's Office 210 W. Temple Street Room 18-709 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Notice of Violation

Dear Prosecutors:

I represent Center for Environmental Health ("CEH"), a non-profit California corporation working to prevent and reduce toxic hazards to human health and the environment. This letter constitutes notification that Marvin Engineering Company, Inc. located at 260 W. Beach Ave., Inglewood, CA 90302 has violated the warning requirement of Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (commencing with section 25249.5 of the Health and Safety Code).

In particular, this company has exposed and continues to expose numerous individuals within the surrounding area to the following chemical subject to Proposition 65: perchloroethylene listed as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer on April 1, 1988. The time period of this violation commenced one year after the listed date above. The route of exposure has been primarily through inhalation of these chemicals; however additional exposures may arise through dermal contact with, or ingestion of, these chemicals. The general geographic location of the unlawful exposure to the residential community and occupational area lies within a radius of approximately .3 mile from the facility.

Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to certain listed chemicals. Marvin Engineering Company, Inc. is in violation of Proposition 65 because it failed to provide a warning to persons residing and working in the area surrounding the facility that they have been and continue to be exposed to perchloroethylene. (22 C.C.R. section 12601.) While in the course of doing business, the company is knowingly and intentionally exposing people to these chemicals, without first providing clear and reasonable warning. (Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.)

The Court of the C

Moreover, based on the exposure involved, we believe the method of warning should be "... a notice mailed or otherwise delivered to each occupant in the affected area. Such notice shall be provided at least once in any three-month period." (22 C.C.R. section 12601 (d) (1) (B)).

Proposition 65 requires that notice and intent to sue be given to a violator 60-days before the suit is filed. With this letter, CEH gives notice of the alleged violation to the noticed party and the appropriate governmental authorities. This notice covers all violations of Proposition 65 that are currently known to CEH from information now available to us. CEH is continuing its investigation that may reveal further violations. A summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and referenced as Appendix A, has been provided to the noticed party.

The address of the noticing party Center for Environmental Health is 528 61<sup>st</sup> Street, Oakland, CA 94609. CEH can be contacted through my office at 1915 Addison Street, Berkeley, CA 94704. Telephone: (510) 540-1992.

If you have any questions, please contact my office at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Michael Freund

cc: Michael Green, Director CEH

# **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

# Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7 (d)

- I, Michael Freund hereby declare:
- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached Notice of Violation in which it is alleged that the party identified in the Notice has violated Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings to those persons exposed to perchloroethylene in and around its facility.
- 2. I am the attorney for the noticing party Center for Environmental Health ("CEH").
- 3. CEH is a non-profit California corporation whose primary mission is to prevent and reduce toxic hazards to human health and the environment.
- 4. The Notice of Violation alleges that the party identified emits perchloroethylene into the atmosphere such that nearby residences and workers are exposed to the chemical at levels that require a warning pursuant to Proposition 65. Perchloroethylene was listed as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer on April 1, 1988. Please refer to the Notice of Violation for additional details regarding the alleged violations.
- 5. I have consulted with a scientist with 22 years of regulatory and private-sector experience in air quality issues. The consultant has the appropriate experience and expertise regarding the exposure issues in this case. The consultant has reviewed facts, studies or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of this action. These facts, studies or other data overwhelmingly demonstrate that the party identified in the Notice exposes residents and workers in and around the facility to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

- 6. Based on my consultation with an experienced consultant in this field and especially the results of the exposure assessment, it is clear that there is sufficient evidence that human exposures exist from the emission of perchloroethylene from the noticed party's facility. Furthermore, as a result of the above, I have concluded that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and the information did not prove that the alleged violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 7. The copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the California Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7 (h) (2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: July 28, 2006

Michael Freund

Attorney for Center for Environmental

Health

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of Alameda. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is 1915 Addison Street, Berkeley, California 94704. On July 28, 2006 I served the within:

Notice of Violation and Certificate of Merit (Supporting documentation pursuant to 11 CCR section 3102 sent to Attorney General only)

on the parties in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States Post Office mail box in Berkeley, California and/or by hand delivery to said parties addressed as follows:

Attorney General's Office Attn: Prop 65 Coordinator 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612

Steve Cooley, District Attorney Los Angeles District Attorney's Office 210 West Temple Street Room 18-709 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Robert Crandell Marvin Engineering Company, Inc. 260 W. Beach Ave. Inglewood, CA 90302

I, Michael Freund, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 28, 2006 at Berkeley, California.

Michael Freund

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of Alameda. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is 1915 Addison Street, Berkeley, California 94704. On October 20, 2006 I served the within:

Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties (Center for Environmental Health v. Marvin Engineering Company, Inc.)

on the parties in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States Post Office mail box in Berkeley, California and/or by hand delivery to said parties addressed as follows:

State of California-Dept. of Justice Attorney General's Office Attn: Prop 65 Coordinator 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612

I, Michael Freund, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 20, 2006 at Berkeley, California.

Michael Freund

		CIYI-U I U			
for more	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY			
Michael Frand		<b>*************************************</b>			
1915 Addison S	·				
Berkeley, CA 9		Los anobles superior court			
TELEPHONE NO.: 510-540-1992	FAX NO.: 510-540-5543	TOR ANODOMS GOT DIE			
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Center for Env	ironmental Health	OCT 2 5 2006			
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF	LOS ANGELES	ψυ Z Δ Ζυψο			
STREET ADDRESS: 111 North H	ill Street	John A. Clark, Executive Officer/Clerk			
MAILING ADDRESS:					
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles	CA 90012	D. Gardia Deputy			
BRANCH NAME:	, 611 30012	D. Garoia			
CASE NAME: Center for Enviro	nmontol Health				
Marvin Engineering Co	mpany, inc.	CAOC NUMBER			
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASÉ NUMBER: BC360876			
<u></u> Unlimited Limited	Counter Joinder	0/3000/0			
(Amount (Amount	···	JUDGE:			
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defen	idant			
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 1811)				
Items 1–5 beld	ow must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).			
1. Check one box below for the case type that	best describes this case:				
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation			
	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 1800–1812)			
Auto (22) Uninsured motorist (46)		Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)			
• •	Collections (09)				
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Insurance coverage (18)	Construction defect (10)			
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Uther contract (37)	Mass tort (40)			
Asbestos (04)	Real Property	Securities litigation (28)			
Product liability (24)	Eminent domain/Inverse	X Environmental/Toxic tort (30)			
Medical malpractice (45)	condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the			
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Wrongful eviction (33)	above listed provisionally complex case			
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Other real property (26)	types (41)			
Business tort/unfair business practice (07		Enforcement of Judgment			
·		Enforcement of judgment (20)			
Civil rights (08)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint			
Defamation (13)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)			
Fraud (16)	Drugs (38)				
Intellectual property (19)	Judicial Review	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)			
Professional negligence (25)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition			
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)			
Employment	Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)			
Wrongful termination (36)					
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)				
		Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the			
factors requiring exceptional judicial mana	- <del></del>				
a. Large number of separately repre	esented parties d. Large numb	er of witnesses			
b. Extensive motion practice raising	difficult or novel e. Coordination	with related actions pending in one or more courts			
issues that will be time-consumin		nties, states, or countries, or in a federal court			
c. Substantial amount of documents	<u> </u>	postjudgment judicial supervision			
Type of remedies sought (check all that approximation)		Francisco Cabarrata			
· /		nunitive			
	ary; declaratory or injunctive relief c.	punitive			
4. Number of causes of action (specify):	ب. رو				
	ss action suit.				
6. If there are any known related cases, file a	and serve a notice of related case. (You	may use form CM-015.)			
Date: 10/20/06		<i>'MI ] ] [</i> ]			
Michael Freund	<b>)</b>	Men of			
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)			
	NOTICE				
Plaigtiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed					
under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 201.8.) Failure to file may result					
in sanctions.  • File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.					
If this case is complex under rule 1800 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.	204. Or the Camorria Maies of Court, yo	a made serve a copy of this cover street of all			
Unless this is a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only					

			OAGE WINDER	
SHORT TITLE: Center for	Privirenmental	Hoalth	CASE NUMBER	DA7/A07/
center for	FillAllOllinelical	Hearth	l	BC360876
				00000

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

	(CERTIF	ICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE TO GOOD THE GOOD TO THE GOOD THE GOOD THE GOOD TO THE GOOD TH	
This	form is required purs	uant to LASC Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Ar	ngeles Superior Court.
Item I.	Check the types of her	aring and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:	_ =
JURY	TRIAL? YES CLASS	ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 4 ict and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", ski	Hours/ Days. to Item III, Pg. 4):
Step	1: After first completing	the Civil Case Cover Sheet Form, find the main civil case cover sheet h	eading for your case in
the left	margin below, and, to	the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected	u. Lof this case
Step	2: Check one Superior	Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature	you have checked
Step For an	<ol><li>In Column C, circle y exception to the cour</li></ol>	the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action to location, see Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0.	
	Applicabl	e Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below	)
	4. Location where performer	d in the County Courthouse, Central District. ther county, or no Bodily Injury/Property Damage). ry, death or damage occurred. ry, death or defendant resides.  n requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration	des. espondent functions wholly. of the parties reside. ner Office.
		В	c
	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of Action (Check only one)	Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Auf	Uninsured Motorist (46)	A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
ļ		A6070 Asbestos Property Damage	2.
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2.
	Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
ΣĞ		A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons	1., 2., 4.
igt.	Medical Malpractice (45)	A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 2., 4.
ersona e/Wron	Other	A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)	1., 2., 4.
er Po mag	Personal Injury Property Damage	A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 2., 4.
Zth Dar	Wrongful Death (23)	A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress	1., 2., 3.
O	(20)	A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 2., 3.
. A.A. 	Civil Rights (08)	A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
ا آھے	Defamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
rsona roper	Fraud (16)	A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Non-Personal Injury/Property	Intellectual Property (19)	A6016 Intellectual Property	2., 3.
žΞ			

A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case

A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration

CIV 109 03-04 (Rev. 03/06) LASC Approved

Asset Forfeiture (05) Petition re Arbitration

(11)

2., 6.

2., 5.

CW 109 03-04 (Rev. 03/06)

SHORT TITLE:				CASE NUMBER	
Item III. Statement of Location other circumstance indicated i	: Enter the	address of the a	accident, party	's residence or place of business, performer reason for filing in the court location years.	ormance, or ou selected.
REASON: CHECK THE NUMBER UNDER COLUMN C WHICH APPLIES IN THIS CASE			ADDRESS:	251 West Beach Ave. Inglewood, CA 90302	
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:			
true and correct and that the abo	ve-entitled	matter is properly	filed for assignr	ne laws of the State of California that the forment to the Los Angeles courtho	use in the
Dated: 10/20/06	_		·	(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)	

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

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet form CM-010.
- 4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form LASC Approved CIV 109 03-04 (Rev. 03/06).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- Signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, JC form 982(a)(27), if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age, or if required by Court.
- 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.

5 CIV 109 03-04 (Rev. 03/06)