17

16

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

্টু27 <u>ਦ</u>ੇ28

R. Rex Parris (SBN 96567) Alexander R. Wheeler (SBN 239541) Douglas Han (SBN 232858) Kitty Szeto (SBN 258136) R. REX PARRIS LAW FIRM 42220 10th Street West, Suite 109 Lancaster, California 93534 Telephone: (661) 949-2595 Facsimile: (661) 949-7524

A602401

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

JUL 28 2011

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk Mars

Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943) Maria F. Nickerson (SBN 274225) THE AIWAZIAN LAW FIRM 410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203 Glendale, California 91203 Telephone: (818) 265-1020 Facsimile: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

BC466315

ANTOINETTE LINDSAY, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA");

Plaintiff.

VS.

DOUGLAS EMMETT, INC., a Maryland corporation; DOUGLAS EMMETT MANAGEMENT, INC., a Delaware corporation; DOUGLAS EMMETT, LLC, an unknown business entity; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.

Defendants.

Case No.:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES & ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698, ET SEO.

(1) Violation of California Labor Code § 1194 (Unpaid Minimum and Overtime Wages)

(2) Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq. (California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)

Act of 2004)
(3) Violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200; et seq:

DEMAND FOR JURY TREAL

BC466315 LEA/DEF#;

COMES NOW, Plaintiff Antoinette Lindsay ("Plaintiff"), individually, and on behalf of members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The "amount in controversy" for each class representative, including claims for compensatory damages, penalties, interest, and pro rata share of attorneys' fees, is less than \$75,000.
- 2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court "original jurisdiction in all other causes" except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.
- 3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief,
 Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and transact business in the County of Los
 Angeles. Furthermore, according to the California Secretary of State's website,
 Defendants are headquartered 808 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 200, City of Santa
 Monica, State of California, 90401. Plaintiff resides in the County of Los Angeles and
 some of the acts and omissions alleged herein, relating to Plaintiff specifically, took

place in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff ANTOINETTE LINDSAY is an individual residing in the State of California.
- 6. Defendants DOUGLAS EMMETT, INC., DOUGLAS EMMETT MANAGEMENT, INC., and DOUGLAS EMMETT, LLC (hereinafter referred to as "DOUGLAS EMMETT"), at all times herein mentioned, were and are, upon information and belief, a Maryland corporation, a Delaware corporation, and an unknown business entity, respectively, and at all times hereinafter mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.
- 7. At all relevant times, DOUGLAS EMMETT was the "employer" of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes.
- 8. At all times herein relevant, DOUGLAS EMMETT and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and consent of each defendant designated herein.
- 9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff as alleged in this

Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

- 10. DOUGLAS EMMETT and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as Defendants.
- Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants including the unknown defendants identified as DOES, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 12. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.
 - 13. The proposed class is defined as follows:

 All current and former hourly paid or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants within the State of California at any time during the period from four years preceding the filing of this Complaint to final judgment.
 - 14. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.
- 15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:
 - a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be one thousand five hundred (1500) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

- b. <u>Typicality</u>: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom she has a well-defined community of interest.
- c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom she has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.
- d. <u>Superiority</u>: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all class members is impractical.
- e. <u>Public Policy Considerations</u>: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.
- 16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common

questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

- Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- Whether Defendants' had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, missed meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of meal periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal periods without compensation;
- e. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during rest periods without compensation;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- g. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to the class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- h. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members during their employment;
- i. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code; including, *inter alia*, section 226;

- j. Whether Defendants kept complete and accurate payroll records as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 1174(d);
- k. Whether Defendants' failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- 1. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- m. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;
- n. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- o. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 17. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees.
- 18. Defendants, jointly and severally, have employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee, from approximately August 2008 to approximately August 2010 in the State of California in the County of Los Angeles.
- 19. Defendants hired Plaintiff and classified her as an hourly-paid, nonexempt employee, and failed to compensate her for all hours worked, missed meal periods or rest breaks.
- 20. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class members; to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment; and to supervise their daily employment activities.
 - 21. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of

Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other class members.

- 22. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 23. Defendants continue to employ hourly paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.
- 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times herein relevant, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees, advisors, and consultants highly knowledgeable about California wage laws, employment and personnel practices.
- 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times herein relevant, without any justification, Defendants must have ignored the employment and personnel policy changes proposed by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees, advisors, and consultants highly knowledgeable about California wage laws, employment and personnel practices.
- 26. Plaintiff and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.
- 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly paid or non-exempt employees. This scheme involved, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all hours worked, missed meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law.
- 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were
 entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not
 receiving wages for overtime compensation.
 - 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that

Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members the required rest and meal periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

- 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were
 entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at
 Plaintiff's and the other class member's regular rate of pay when a meal period was
 missed, and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of
 pay at Plaintiff's and the other class member's regular rate of pay when a meal period
 was missed.
- 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were
 entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's
 regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not receive all rest
 periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class
 members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.
- 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.
- 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
 Defendants knew or should have known that the class members were entitled to receive
 all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and
 minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not, in fact, receive
 all such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge.
- 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that

 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were

entitled to receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff and the other class members did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, within any time permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

- Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.
- 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were
 entitled to reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses and cost.
- 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and the other class members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff and the other class members that they were properly denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.
- 39. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay all overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other class members. Plaintiff and the other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week.

- 40. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 41. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.
- 42. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay the class members all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.
- 43. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members all wages within any time permissible under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204.
- 44. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 45. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members.
- 46. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs.
- 47. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and the other class members pursuant to California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.
- 48. California Labor Code section 218 states that noting in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this article."
- 49. At all times herein set forth, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by Defendants.

- 50. At all times herein set forth, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.
- 51. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action under PAGA may be brought by an "aggrieved employee," who is any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.
- 52. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violation was committed against her during their time of employment and she is, therefore, an aggrieved employee. Plaintiff and the other employees are "aggrieved employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.
- 53. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee, including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements have been met:
 - a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by certified mail (hereinafter "Employee's Notice") to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.
 - b. The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter "LWDA Notice") to the employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged violation within thirty (30) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice.

Upon receipt of the LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within thirty-three (33) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

- 54. On July 26, 2011, Plaintiff provided written notice by U.S. Certified Mail to the LWDA and to Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.
- Plaintiff will have satisfied the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies, for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Against ALL DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 100)

- 56. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 55, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
- 57. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provided that the minimum wage for employees fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.
- 58. California Labor Code section 1194 and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order further provided that it was

unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

- 59. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members employed by Defendants, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at a rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.
- 60. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.
- 61. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members were not paid for all hours worked.
- 62. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members were not paid at least minimum wage compensation for all hours worked.
- During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members were not paid overtime compensation for the all hours they worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week.
- During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.
- During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1198.

///

///

///

- 66. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.
- 67. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.
- 68. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover their unpaid minimum wages and overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.
- 69. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100) for the initial failure to timely pay each employee minimum wages, and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each subsequent failure to pay each employee minimum wages.
- 70. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.
- Pursuant to civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code section 2699(a), (f) and (g), the State of California, Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties plus costs and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

26 27 28

///

///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq. (Against All DEFENDANTS. and DOES 1 through 100)

- 72. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 71, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
- 73. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.
- 74. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.
- 75. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are "aggrieved employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

Failure to Pay Overtime

	76.	Defendants' failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaint	iff and
he o	ther agg	grieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes	
unlav	vful or	unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 510 and	1198.
///			

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

77. Defendants' failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

78. Defendants' failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

79. Defendants' failure to pay legally required minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

80. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to the aggrieved employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

81. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 204.

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

82. Defendants' failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code

section 226(a).

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

83. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California Labor Code section 1174(d) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 1174(d).

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

- 84. Defendants' failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs in accordance with California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.
- 85. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants and each of them, business expenses, unpaid wages, and/or untimely wages according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, as well as all statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, including but not limited to:
 - a. Penalties under California Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
 - b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11070 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

- c. Penalties under California Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation; and
- d. Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.
- 86. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five percent (25%) to the aggrieved employees.
- 87. Further, Plaintiff is entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5 and 2699 and any other applicable statute.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq. (Against All DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 100)

- 88. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 87, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
- 89. Defendants' conduct, as alleged in this Complaint, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff and the other class members, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the other class members seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

- 90. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.
- 91. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq. may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other class members violate California Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 204. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

Failure to Pay Overtime

92. Defendants' failure to pay overtime in violation of the Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failing to Provide Meal Periods

93. Defendants' failure to provide legally required meal periods in violation of the Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a), as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

94. Defendants' failure to provide legally required rest periods in violation of

the Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

95. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages in violation of the Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

96. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages upon termination in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

97. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages during employment in violation of California Labor Code section 204, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Provide Compliant Wage Statements

98. Defendants' failure to provide compliant wage statements in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

99. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records in violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d), as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code

section 17200, et seq.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

- 100. Defendants' failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and costs in violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.
- 101. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.
- 102. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured and continue to be injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including, but not necessarily limited to, the loss of money and/or property.
- 103. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages and other monies wrongfully withheld and retained by Defendants pursuant to California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.
- 104. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences from four years preceding the date of the filing of this Complaint; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, requests a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the general

public similarly situated, and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

- 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
- 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
- 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
- 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel, immediately upon its appointment, the names and most current contact information (address and telephone numbers) of all class members.

As to the First Cause of Action

- 5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum and overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- 6. For general unpaid wages, unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;
- 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid minimum wages and overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
- 8. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for Plaintiff and the other class members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;
 - 9. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2;
- 10. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);
- 11. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f) and (g) plus costs and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections

510 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198; and

12. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Second Cause of Action

- 13. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f) and (g) plus costs and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a). 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802; and
- 14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Third Cause of Action

- California Business and Professions Code section 17200, et seq. by failing to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay for all missed meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay all minimum wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and other class members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 204, failing to provide Plaintiff and other class members with complete and accurate wage statements, failing to keep complete and accurate payroll records, and failing to reimburse Plaintiff and other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs.
- 16. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
- 17. For restitution of unpaid wages and other monies wrongfully withheld and retained by Defendants to Plaintiff and the other class members and prejudgment interest from the day such amount were due and payable;

- 18. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully withheld acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;
- 19. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein that Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; and
- 20. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

DATED: July 26, 2011

THE AIWAZIAN LAW FIRM

Edwin Aiwazian

Attorneys for Plaintiff

	ORIGINAL	CM-010				
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943) THE AIWAZIAN LAW FIRM 410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203 Glendale, CA 91203		FOR COURT USE ONLY				
TELEPHONE NO.: (818) 265-1020 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Antoinette Lie	FILED COURT OF CALIFORNIA					
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street	Angeles	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
mailing adoress: city and zip code: Los Angeles 90012 BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk Courtho	use	JUL 28 2011				
CASE NAME: Lindsay vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et		John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk BY Mary Flores				
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER: BC 46 6 3 1 5				
✓ Unlimited Limited		Be 40 har a				
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	JUDGE:				
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000 \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defend (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT:				
particular and the second seco	w must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).				
Check one box below for the case type that Auto Tort	Dest describes this case: Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation				
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)				
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)				
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)				
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)				
Asbestos (04) Product liability (24)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)				
Medical malpractice (45)	Real Property Eminent domain/Inverse	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)				
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case				
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)				
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment				
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)				
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint				
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)				
Intellectual property (19)	L Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)				
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review Asset forfeiture (05)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition				
Cther non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)				
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)				
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)					
	ex under rule 3.400 of the California R	ules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the				
a. Large number of separately repres	ented parties d Large numbe	er of witnesses				
b Extensive motion practice raising dissues that will be time-consuming		with related actions pending in one or more courts ties, states, or countries, or in a federal court				
c. Substantial amount of documentary		ostjudgment judicial supervision				
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.[✓ monetary b. ✓ nonmonetary;	declaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive				
4. Number of causes of action (specify): three	ee (3)					
 5. This case is not a class action suit. 6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.) 						
Date: July 26, 2011						
Edwin Aiwazian						
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) (SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR APTORNEY FOR PARTY)						
NOTICE Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) 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 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.						
Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only. Page 1 of 2						
Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.30, 3.220, 3.400–3.403, 3.740; Cal. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10 www.courtinto.ca.gov				

SHORT TITLE

Lindsay vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et al.

CASE NUMBER

BC 46631

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

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court. Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case: CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL ☐ HOURS/ ☑ DAYS Item II. indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps - If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4): Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected. Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case. Step 3: In Column C, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0. Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below) Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.
 Location where petitioner resides. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).

- Location where cause of action arose.

 Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.

 Location where performance required or defendant resides.
- Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
 Location where one or more of the parties reside.
 Location of Labor Commissioner Office

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

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.		B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	Auto (22)		A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Uninsured Motorist (46)		A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
T. Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	ļ	A6070 Asbestos Property Damage A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2.
	Product Liability (24)		A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	1	A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
	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., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

Lindsay vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et al.

CASE NUMBER

Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

Employment

Contract

Real Property

TI/82/25 Unlawful Detainer

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Business Tort (07)	□ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Defamation (13)	☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
	☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	
Other (35)		1., 2., 3.
	A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (45)	☑ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case	1), 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	10.
	A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)	2., 5.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06)	☐ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence)	2., 5.
(not insurance)	A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud)	1., 2., 5.
	A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	1., 2., 5.
	A ASSES Office Dieach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud of negligence)	,
Collections (09)	□ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff	2., 5., 6.
001100110110 (00)	☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5.
Insurance Coverage (18)	☐ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	☐ A6009 Contractual Fraud	1., 2., 3., 5.
Other Contract (37)	☐ A6031 Tortious Interference	1., 2., 3., 5.
	☐ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	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 Post Press + (00)	A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure	2., 6.
Other Real Property (26)	☐ A6032 Quiet Title	2., 6.
	☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	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- Post-Foreclosure (34)	□ A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.
<u> </u>		<u>. </u>

Lindsay vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et al.

CASE NUMBER

		В	С
	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of Action (Check only one)	Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forfeiture (05)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
Judicial Review	Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
		☐ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus	2., 8.
Ęċį	Writ of Mandate (02)	☐ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter	2.
Jud		☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review .	2., 8.
ion	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
Litigat	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
mplex I	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
CO II	Securitles Litigation (28)	☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provisionally Comptex Litigation	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	□ A6036 Toxic Tort/Envirohmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Prov	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	☐ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	□ A6141 Sister State Judgment	2., 9.
Ħ Ħ		☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.
Enforcement of Judgment		☐ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2., 9.
forc Jud		☐ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2., 8.
er of		☐ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2., 8.
		☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8., 9.
us nts	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
		☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.
ellar Som	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.
Miscellaneo Civil Complai		☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
- 5		☐ 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.
sons		☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.
scel vil P		☐ A6190 Election Contest	2.
エチンな老/4Miscellaneous Civil Petitions		☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.
		☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 4., 8.
		☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.
i nt	L	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

SHORT TITLE: Lindsay vs. Douglas Emmett, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER

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

REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.			ADDRESS: 808 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 200
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:	
Santa Monica	CA	90401	
	it the above-entitled matter	is properly fil	erjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true ed for assignment to the Stanley Mosk courthouse in the rnia, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Rule 2.0, subds. (b),	(c) and (d)].		
Dated: 7/26/2011			AMINITAN VIII

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PART

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

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