FILED SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES Kirk A. Pasich (SBN 94242) pasichk@dicksteinshapiro.com Chanda R. Hinman (SBN 217412) MAR 22 2011 hinmanc@dicksteinshapiro.com Kathleen Y. Sullivan (SBN 267228) John A. Shake, Executive Officer/Clerk sullivank@dicksteinshapiro.com DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP 2049 Century Park East, Suite 700 John J. Willer Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 772-8300 Facsimile: (310) 772-8301 Attorneys for Plaintiffs SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAVIUS BASE, INC., a California corporation; Case No.: BC455623 THOMAS J. HANKS and MARGARITA WILSON HANKS, individually and as Trustees COMPLAINT FOR: of Certain Trusts; 1224-1228 5TH STREET LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; 5TH (1) Professional Negligence; STREET DEVELOPMENT CORP., a California (2) Breach of Fiduciary Duty; corporation; DOROTHY WILSON, an 14 individual; ALLEY PROPERTIES, LLC, a (3) Fraudulent Misrepresentation; (4) Negligent Misrepresentation; Delaware limited liability company; EDWARD 15 (5) Conversion; KESSLER, as Trustee of Certain Trusts; ELECTRIC CITY PRODUCTIONS, LLC, a (6) Fraudulent Concealment; California corporation; ELIZABETH A. HANKS, (7) Constructive Fraud; an individual; HARDLY THERE, LLC, a New (8) Breach of Oral Agreement; 17 York limited liability company; LILY A. (9) Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good REEVES, individually and as Trustee of Certain 18 Faith and Fair Dealing; and Trusts; MARCALON, INC., a California (10) Unjust Enrichment. corporation; PALMSEY LTD., a Cypriot corporation; THE PLAYTONE COMPANY, INC., a California corporation; PLAY-TONE-POST, a California general partnership; TINA J. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL KAHN, as Trustee of Certain Trusts; and RW 21 AND SONS, INC., a California corporation. Plaintiffs, 22 DATE PAID: 23 JERRY B. GOLDMAN, an individual; J.B. GOLDMAN INSURANCE AGENCY, INC., a 03/22/11 08:06:00 AH CCH46598000q California corporation, also known as JERRY B. GOLDMAN INSURANCE SERVICE(S); and DOES 1 through 20, Defendants. 27 28

Plaintiffs Clavius Base, Inc.; Thomas J. Hanks and Margarita Wilson Hanks, individually and as Trustees of Certain Trusts; 1224-1228 5th Street LLC; 5th Street Development Corp.; Dorothy Wilson; Alley Properties, LLC; Edward Kessler, as Trustee of Certain Trusts; Electric City Productions, LLC; Elizabeth A. Hanks; Hardly There, LLC; Lily A. Reeves, individually and as Trustee of Certain Trusts; Marcalon, Inc.; Palmsey Ltd.; The Playtone Company, Inc.; Play-Tone-Post; Tina J. Kahn, as Trustee of Certain Trusts; and RW and Sons, Inc. (collectively, "Plaintiffs") complain of defendants Jerry Goldman, J.B. Goldman Insurance Agency, Inc., also known as Jerry B. Goldman Insurance Service(s), and Does 1 through 20 (collectively, "Defendants") and allege as follows:

NATURE OF THIS ACTION

- 1. For over twenty years, Plaintiffs have relied upon Defendants, their insurance brokers, to advise Plaintiffs on, and to procure on Plaintiffs' behalf, myriad personal and business insurance policies. Each year, Defendants promised to procure, and represented that they had procured, such insurance.
- 2. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that in a breach of their duties and responsibilities to Plaintiffs, Defendants have breached their duties to Plaintiffs and acted wrongfully by, among other things, (i) falsely inflating and fraudulently overcharging Plaintiffs for, and misrepresenting the amounts of, the premiums on insurance policies that they procured for Plaintiffs, (ii) altering insurance documents and related records to conceal their fraudulent scheme, and (iii) taking other acts to engage in, and conceal, their embezzlement scheme through manipulation and deceit.
- 3. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that in acting wrongfully and in failing to perform their duties to Plaintiffs, Defendants have fraudulently overcharged Plaintiffs premiums (which premiums were actually paid by Plaintiffs), and embezzled and stolen from Plaintiffs for their own personal use and benefit hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Code of Civil

Procedure section 410.10. Some or all of the agreements that are the subject of this dispute were made

Ī

б

- 17. Plaintiff Hardly There, LLC, is a New York limited liability company with its principal place of business in Los Angeles County, California.

 18. Plaintiff Lily A. Reeves, an individual, is a resident of Los Angeles County, California, and is acting herein in both her individual capacity and in her capacity as Trustee of Certain Trusts.
- 19. Plaintiff Marcalon, Inc., is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Los Angeles County, California.
- 20. Plaintiff Palmsey Ltd., is a Cypriot corporation, with its principal place of business in Cyprus, Greece.
- 21. Plaintiff The Playtone Company is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Los Angeles County, California.
- 22. Plaintiff Play-Tone-Post is a California general partnership with its principal place of business in Los Angeles County, California.
- 23. Plaintiff Tina J. Kahn is a resident of Los Angeles County, California, and is acting herein in her capacity as Trustee of Certain Trusts.
- 24. Plaintiff RW and Sons, Inc., is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Los Angeles County, California.
- 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendant Jerry Goldman, an individual, is a resident of Thousand Oaks, California and that he is an officer, director, and/or agent of Defendant J.B. Goldman Insurance Agency, Inc.
- 26. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendant J.B.

 Goldman Insurance Agency, Inc. is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Newbury Park, California. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendant J.B. Goldman Insurance Agency, Inc. is authorized to transact, and is transacting, business in the County of Los Angeles and the State of California.
- 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that at all times relevant hereto, each of the Defendants was, and is, in some manner responsible to Plaintiffs under the obligations stated herein, that each Defendant was and is an aider and abettor, joint tortfeasor, alter ego, agent, broker, employee, affiliate, and/or representative of other Defendants, in whole or in part,

and that each Defendant, in doing the things alleged herein, acted and continues to act within the scope of that agency, representation, and/or employment and with the knowledge and consent of said Defendants.

- 28. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants, and each of them, conspired together and willfully formed a deliberate design and purpose to, and/or entered into a scheme to, commit the acts and/or omissions herein alleged, and in pursuance thereof, did and/or caused to be done such acts and/or omissions, and that all of said acts and/or omissions were participated in and were done by all of these Defendants, or any one or more of them, as steps in furtherance of said conspiracy and for the unlawful purposes set forth herein.
- 29. Plaintiffs are presently unaware of the true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as Does I through 20, inclusive, and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to allege these Defendants' true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is an aider and abettor, joint tortfeasor, alter ego, agent, broker, employee, affiliate, and/or representative of the named Defendants, and is legally responsible for the unlawful conduct herein alleged.

FACTS RELEVANT TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 30. For more than twenty years, Defendants professed to Plaintiffs a specialty in procuring insurance policies for individuals and businesses—extending from homeowners' insurance to directors' and officers' insurance to umbrella policies—and, during this time, Defendants held themselves out as insurance brokers who were willing and able to procure such policies for Plaintiffs.
- 31. Or about February 7, 2011, Plaintiffs retained a new insurance broker, Shel Bachrach ("Bachrach"). After a review and analysis of various policies, coverage, and premiums charged by Defendants, Bachrach notified Plaintiffs' business managers that he was concerned that the insurance premiums from policies in the last year to two years appeared extraordinarily high for the coverage provided.
- 32. It also became clear in the days that followed that Defendants engaged in other breaches of conduct, including failing to advise Plaintiffs that they did not have the authority to directly procure

Defendants did not have the authority to seek appointments with insurance carriers, thereby precluding them from the ability to directly procure coverage, and may illegally have issued certificates of insurance without appointments.

- 33. When Defendants provided copies of some of the relevant insurance policies to Plaintiffs and/or their agents, on some of the policies the amount of the premium (and in some cases, the identity of the insurance broker that actually procured the coverage) was redacted. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants charged Plaintiffs more than the quoted premiums for coverage procured, the total amount of which has not yet been determined.
- 34. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants bound unnecessarily duplicative insurance coverage for various periods, the scope of which has not yet been determined.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Professional Negligence)

- 35. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 above.
- 36. For over two decades, Defendants acted as Plaintiffs' insurance brokers. Throughout the course of their dealings with Plaintiffs, Defendants held themselves out as skilled insurance brokers, having superior knowledge regarding their ability to procure myriad types of personal and business insurance policies for Plaintiffs. Defendants intended that Plaintiffs rely, and Plaintiffs did rely, on Defendants' alleged expertise and advice in connection with Plaintiffs' insurance matters.
- 37. Defendants, in the course of their involvement in the design, negotiation, and purchase of Plaintiffs' insurance coverage, agreed to advise Plaintiffs as to the coverage Plaintiffs were purchasing with Defendants' assistance and to procure insurance that would provide coverage to Plaintiffs for myriad events. In doing so, Defendants were required to use the skill and care that a reasonably careful insurance broker would have used in similar circumstances.

Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants failed to

38.

1

22.

- 43. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants violated their relationship of trust and confidence with Plaintiffs, breached their fiduciary duties, and failed to act as reasonable and careful agents and brokers by, among other things:

 a. Misrepresenting their ability to procure coverage for Plaintiffs by, for example, failing to advise Plaintiffs that they did not have the authority to seek
 - to directly procure coverage;

 b. Illegally issuing certificates of insurance without appointments;
 - c. Charging Plaintiffs premiums for insurance never procured and/or charging

 Plaintiffs more than the quoted premium for coverage procured;

appointments with insurance carriers, thereby precluding them from the ability

- d. Binding unnecessarily duplicative insurance coverage; and
- f. Covering up their predatory embezzlement scheme through manipulation and deceit.
- 44. Moreover, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the Defendants used their positions as agents and brokers of Plaintiffs to obtain a secret profit and/or commission by collecting unnecessary and/or inflated premiums.
- 45. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of Defendants' breaches of their fiduciary duties, Plaintiffs have suffered damages, including overcharged premiums, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses. The amount of these damages has not been precisely determined and the damages are continuing to accrue. Defendants will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the precise amount of these damages is ascertained.
- 46. Defendants' breaches of their duties as alleged above were undertaken with the intent of depriving Plaintiffs of their property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and were despicable, malicious, oppressive, and/or fraudulent conduct that subjected Plaintiffs to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

1,5-1

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Fraudulent Misrepresentation)

- 47. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 above.
- 48. In connection with the procurement of insurance policies for Plaintiffs, Defendants fraudulently misrepresented to Plaintiffs that they had the authority to procure such insurance, made specific and false representations as to the amount of the premiums charged by the insurance carriers, and represented to Plaintiffs that Defendants had procured the right amount of coverage for each Plaintiff at each level.
- 49. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the representations alleged above were in fact false. At the time such representations were made by Defendants, Plaintiffs were ignorant of the falsity of Defendants' representations and believed them to be true. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that at the time Defendants made these representations, Defendants knew that these representations were false and made such representations with the intent to deceive and defraud Plaintiffs and to induce Plaintiffs to act in reliance upon these representations.
- 50. Plaintiffs justifiably relied on Defendants' representations with respect to the procurement of Plaintiffs' insurance policies. In reliance on these representations, Plaintiffs were induced to and allowed Defendants to broker policies on their behalf, purchase the insurance policies, and pay the premiums quoted by Defendants. Had Plaintiffs known that Defendants were not authorized to procure Plaintiffs' insurance or issue insurance certificates and that Defendants were overcharging premiums, failing to procure insurance promised, double binding insurance coverage for the same Plaintiff at the same level, and/or covering up their scheme, Plaintiffs would not have taken these actions.
- 51. Plaintiffs' reliance on Defendants' representations was justified because of Defendants' alleged superior knowledge and expertise in purchasing insurance, Defendants' holding themselves out as skilled insurance brokers, and Defendants' long-term and special relationship with Plaintiffs.
- 52. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fraudulent misrepresentations, Plaintiffs have suffered damages, including overcharged premiums, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses. The

amount of these damages has not been precisely determined and the damages are continuing to accrue.

Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the precise amount of these damages is ascertained.

53. Defendants' acts alleged above included fraudulent misrepresentations with the intent of depriving Plaintiffs of their property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and were despicable, malicious, oppressive, and/or fraudulent conduct that subjected Plaintiffs to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Negligent Misrepresentation)

- 54. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 above.
- 55. In connection with the procurement of insurance policies for Plaintiffs, Defendants negligently represented to Plaintiffs that they had the authority to procure such insurance, made specific and false representations as to the amount of the premiums charged by the insurance carriers, and represented that they had procured the right amount of coverage for each Plaintiff at each level.
- 56. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis alleges, that the representations alleged above were in fact false. At the time such representations were made by Defendants, Plaintiffs were ignorant of the falsity of Defendants' representations and believed them to be true. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that at the time Defendants made these representations, Defendants knew, or should have known, that these representations were false, and that Plaintiffs would rely upon them. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants intended for Plaintiffs to rely on these representations.
- 57. Plaintiffs justifiably relied on Defendants' representations with respect to the procurement of Plaintiffs' insurance policies. In reliance on these representations, Defendants were induced to, and did, purchase the insurance policies and paid the premiums charged by Defendants. Had Plaintiffs known that Defendants were not authorized to procure Plaintiffs' insurance or issue insurance certificates and that Defendants were overcharging premiums, failing to procure insurance

as promised, double binding insurance coverage for the same Plaintiff at the same level, and/or covering up their scheme, Plaintiffs would not have taken these actions.

- 58. Plaintiffs' reliance on Defendants' representations was justified because of Defendants' alleged superior knowledge and expertise in purchasing insurance, Defendants' holding themselves out as skilled insurance brokers, and Defendants' long-term and special relationship with Plaintiffs.
- 59. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent misrepresentations, Plaintiffs have suffered damages, including overcharged premiums, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses. The amount of these damages has not been precisely determined and the damages are continuing to accrue. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the precise amount of these damages is ascertained.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Conversion)

- 60. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 above.
- 61. As set forth above, Plaintiffs were induced to and allowed Defendants to procure insurance policies on their behalf and collect the premiums purportedly in payment of such policies. Had Plaintiffs known that Defendants were not authorized to procure Plaintiffs' insurance or issue insurance certificates and that Defendants were overcharging premiums, failing to procure insurance promised, double binding insurance coverage for the same Plaintiff at the same level, and/or covering up their scheme, Plaintiffs would not have taken these actions.
- 62. Plaintiffs reasonably and justifiably relied on Defendants to execute their duties as brokers for Plaintiffs and the representations Defendants made to Plaintiffs, and therefore purchased certain policies and paid the premiums quoted by Defendants. Defendants have converted a substantial portion of the premiums paid for their own use and benefit and to the detriment of Plaintiffs. Defendants have failed and refused to repay the improperly charged premiums.
- 63. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conversion, Plaintiffs have suffered damages, including overcharged premiums, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses. The amount of these

28

damages has not been precisely determined and the damages are continuing to accrue. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the precise amount of these damages is ascertained.

Defendants' acts of conversion were done with the intent of depriving Plaintiffs of their property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and were despicable, malicious, oppressive, and/or fraudulent conduct that subjected Plaintiffs to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages in an

(Against All Defendants for Fraudulent Concealment)

- Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants suppressed
 - Defendants did not have the authority to procure insurance on behalf of
 - Defendants charged Plaintiffs more than the quoted premiums for coverage
 - Defendants surreptitiously bound unnecessarily duplicative insurance coverage;
 - Defendants covered up their predatory embezzlement scheme through
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the suppression or concealment of information herein alleged was undertaken with the intent to induce Plaintiffs to act in
- At the time of Defendants' concealment or suppression, Plaintiffs were ignorant of the information concealed or suppressed by Defendants. If Plaintiffs had been aware of the existence of the facts not disclosed by Defendants, Plaintiffs would not have paid the premiums quoted by

Defendants or allowed Defendants to continue to broker policies on their behalf and purchase the policies recommended by Defendants.

- 69. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fraudulent concealment, Plaintiffs have suffered damages, including overcharged premiums, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses. The amount of these damages has not been precisely determined and the damages are continuing to accrue. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the precise amount of these damages is ascertained.
- 70. Defendants' acts alleged above included deceit and/or fraudulent concealment of material facts known to Defendants with the intent of depriving Plaintiffs of their property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and were despicable, malicious, oppressive, and/or fraudulent conduct that subjected Plaintiffs to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Constructive Fraud)

- 71. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 above.
- 72. As stated above, Defendants owed Plaintiffs fiduciary duties. Specifically, Defendants agreed to act as Plaintiffs' agents and brokers for purposes of procuring certain personal and business insurance policies for Plaintiffs. As such, a confidential relationship existed at all relevant times herein between Plaintiffs and Defendants. In that regard, Plaintiffs placed confidence in the fidelity and integrity of Defendants in entrusting Defendants with the responsibility to procure the appropriate insurance policies for Plaintiffs and to charge Plaintiffs the appropriate premiums for such coverage.
- 73. Despite having voluntarily accepted the trust and confidence reposed in them with regard to Plaintiffs' insurance policies and funds, and in violation of this relationship of trust and confidence, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants abused the trust and confidence of Plaintiffs by, among other things:
 - a. Misrepresenting their ability to procure coverage for Plaintiffs by, for example, failing to advise Plaintiffs that they did not have the authority to seek

appointments with insurance carriers, thereby precluding them from the ability

1

disregard of Plaintiffs' rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Breach of Oral Agreement)

- 79. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 above.
- 80. For over twenty years, Defendants have acted as Plaintiffs' insurance brokers for both business and professional insurance coverage. In that regard, Defendants agreed to provide Plaintiffs advice and to purchase certain insurance policies on their behalf. In exchange, Plaintiffs paid certain premiums and purchased insurance at Defendants' direction and recommendation (the "Agreement").
- 81. Plaintiffs performed all of their obligations under the Agreement with Defendants or have been excused from performance by reason of the acts and conduct of Defendants or by operation of the law.
- 82. In acting and failing to act as alleged above, Defendants breached their Agreement with Plaintiffs.
- 83. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breach of contract, Plaintiffs have suffered damages, including overcharged premiums, costs, and expenses. The amount of these damages has not been precisely determined and the damages are continuing to accrue. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the precise amount of these damages is ascertained.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)

- 84. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 and 80 through 83 above.
- 85. The Agreement contained an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing requiring that: (1) Defendants would not do anything to jeopardize Plaintiffs' insurance coverage or Plaintiffs' ability to realize the benefits of coverage that Defendants promised to procure on their behalf; (2) Defendants would deal fairly and in good faith with Plaintiffs; and (3) Defendants would promptly and fairly carry out their obligations under the Agreement, as alleged above.

- 86. Defendants breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing by, in addition to the wrongful acts described above, engaging in actions purposefully aimed at frustrating and interfering with Plaintiffs' insurance coverage and/or Plaintiffs' ability to realize the benefits of coverage that Defendants promised to procure on their behalf.
- 87. The acts alleged above constitute violations of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.
- As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of Defendants' breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, Plaintiffs have suffered damages, including overcharged premiums, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses. The amount of these damages has not been precisely determined and the damages are continuing to accrue. Defendants will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the precise amount of these damages is ascertained.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Unjust Enrichment)

- 89. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference herein each allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 above.
- 90. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants improperly charged Plaintiffs premiums for insurance never procured and/or charged Plaintiffs more than the actual premiums charged by the insurance carriers for substantial portions of the coverage procured. Moreover, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the Defendants used their positions as agents and brokers of Plaintiffs to obtain a secret profit and/or commission by collecting unnecessary and/or overstated premiums.
- 91. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Defendants have been unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiffs and have unjustly retained the benefits of their wrongful conduct.
- 92. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fraud and deceit, Plaintiffs have suffered damages, including overcharged premiums, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses. Plaintiffs are entitled to a constructive trust and restitution of the amounts wrongfully taken and retained by Defendants at Plaintiffs' expense.

COMPLAINT

PRAYER

COMPLAINT

ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

•	.			ONTIBL	Choops of her	1011	· . · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	2	1.	Such other, fur	rther, and/or d	ifferent relief as may	be just and pr	oper.	
- 1988 <u>- 1988</u>	3							
	4	Dated: Marc	h 21, 2011	Γ	DICKSTEIN SHAPIF	RO LLP		• •
	5				V:Oo to	> `()		
	6				Jala ta By: Kirk A. Pasich			
	7			A	Kirk A. Pasich Attorneys for Plaintif	n fs		
	8	·						
	9		to a garage are selected as	A		,		
	10							
	11		•					
	12 13			•				
	14				•	•		٠.
	15		•					
	16							
	17							
H _a t 2 :	18			Land Section 184				
180 名) 人。 177 (*)	19					•		
	20							
	21		-					
	22							
17/22/68	23							
	24			·				
	25 26			•	•			
	27	. <u>5</u>						
	28							
	20	t 1						
•				4	19			
Λ.		'-	• •		COMPLAINT	1	•	·· ·

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs Clavius Base, Inc.; Thomas J. Hanks, Margarita Wilson Hanks, individually and as Trustees of Certain Trusts; 1224-1228 5th Street LLC; 5th Street Development Corp.; Dorothy Wilson; Alley Properties, LLC; Edward Kessler, as Trustee of Certain Trusts; Electric City Productions, LLC; Elizabeth A. Hanks; Hardly There, LLC; Lily A. Reeves, individually and as Trustee of Certain Trusts; Marcalon, Inc.; Palmsey Ltd.; The Playtone Company, Inc.; Play-Tone-Post; Tina J. Kahn, as Trustee of Certain Trusts; and RW and Sons, Inc. (collectively, "Plaintiffs") hereby demand a trial by jury in this action.

10 Dated: March 21, 2011

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

Diekoren arranko bet

Kirk A. Pasich

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

COMPLAINT

DOCSLA-69304v8

TT/22/E

	number, and eddress):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Kirk A. Pasich, SBN 94242 Chand.	Hinman, SBN 217412	
Dickstein Shapiro LLP		
2049 Century Park East, Suite 700		FILED
Los Angeles, CA 90067	÷	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
TELEPHONE NO.: 310-772-8300	fax no.: 310-772-8301	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1		MAD 0 0 0044
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs Clavius Base,		MAR 2 2 2011
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS	s Angeles	(-) A 20
STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street		John A. Charle, Executive Officer/Clerk
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street		BY Deputy
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90012	2	Shaunya Wesley
BRANCH NAME: Central	•	
CASE NAME: Clavius Base, Inc., et al. v.	lerry B. Goldman, et al.	
CAGE TAME: Clarico Bacaj maj et ali 11		
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Camalay Casa Danisantian	CASE BMER: 4 5 5 6 2 3
	Complex Case Designation	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
☑ Unlimited ☐ Limited	☐ Counter ☐ Joinder	
(Amount (Amount	Filed with first appearance by defeat	Junet JUDGE:
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defend	Jani Dept:
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3,402)	
	below must be completed (see instructio	ns on page 2).
1. Check one box below for the case type that		
Auto Tort		Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3,400–3,403)
Auto (22)	Breach of continuous transaction (col	
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)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the
U Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)
Business tort/unfair business practice (07	') U Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment
Civil rights (08)	<u>Unlawful Detainer</u>	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Miscellaneous Civil Petition
Olher non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	U Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	
The state of the s		les of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
factors requiring exceptional judicial mana		les of Court. If the case is complex, thatk the
a. Large number of separately repre		r of witnesses
b. Extensive motion practice raising		with related actions pending in one or more courts
issues that will be time-consumin		ties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
		ostjudgment judicial supervision
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply):		laratory or injunctive relief c. 🔀 punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): Ter	า	
5. This case \square is \boxtimes is not a class a	action suit.	
6. If there are any known related cases, file a		may use form CM-015.)
Date: March 21, 2011		
Chanda R. Hinman	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	111
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	, ' - (5	SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
1. 2. 2. 30. 100. 100. 100. 100. 100. 100. 100.	NOTICE	
District month file this server the server the server		as (event appl) deims appear
		ng (except small claims cases or cases filed les of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
in sanctions.	Wellare and Histitutions Code), (Cal. Ku	les of Court, fale 3.220.) Pallote to the thay fesult
File this cover sheet in addition to any cover.	ver sheet required by local court rule	
		u must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
other parties to the action or proceeding.	TITE TO STATE TO THE TOTAL OF STATE TO	
	e 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sh	eet will be used for statistical nurnoses only

ASE	MH	MRE	R
~1	110	1100	1,

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

This	form is required purs	uant to LASC Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los A	ngeles Superior Court.			
	• •	aring and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:				
		is action? \square YES LIMITED CASE? \square YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 10 [trict and courthouse location (4 steps - If you checked "Limited Case", ski				
•	•	g the Civil Case Cover Sheet Form, find the main civil case cover sheet t	1			
	_	the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected	1			
		r Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature				
		the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action it location, see Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0.	you have checked.			
01 61		e Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below				
	Class Actions must be file May be filed in Central (O Location where cause of a Location where bodily inju Location where performance.	d in the County Courthouse, Central District. 6. Location of property or permather county, or no Bodily injury/Property Damage). 7. Location where petitioner res	anently garaged vehicle, iddes. ides. respondent functions wholly, of the parties reside, and office.			
	Α	В	С			
ti.	Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Case Cover Sheet Type of Action				
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2, 4.			
Ā	Uninsured Motorist (46)	A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death - Uninsured Motorist	1., 2 , 4.			
> t'	Asbestos (04)	A6070 Asbestos Property Damage	2.			
Tor	713003103 (04)	A7221 Asbestos- Pérsonal Injury/Wrongful Death	2.			
rrioh eath	Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2, 3. ,4., 8.			
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Deấth Tort	Medical Malpractice (45)	A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons .	1., 2., 4.			
		A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 2., 4.			
ge/W	Other	A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wronoful Death (e.g.,	1., 2., 4.			
r E	Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 2., 4.			
Othe		A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress	1.,2, 3.			
	(20)	A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.			
Tort	Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 2., 3.			
eath	Civil Rights (08)	A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.			
Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Defamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.			
	Fraud (16)	A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1. (2) 3.			
age/W		•				
Dam	,	E - Transport				
	GIV 109 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION	LASC, rule 2.0 Page 1 of 4			

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.				
Professional Negligence (25)	1 Aboli Legal Maiplactice			
Other (35)	A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2., 3.		
Wrongful Termination (36)	A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.		
Other Employment (15)	A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3.		
'Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not Unlawful Detainer or wrongful eviction) A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2., 5, 2., 5, 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.		
Collections (09)	A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6 2., 5.		
Insurance Coverage (18)	A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.		
Other Contract (37)	A6009 Contractual Fraud A6031 Tortious Interference A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.		
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.		
Wrongful Eviction (33)	A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2,6.		
Other Real Property (26)	A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure A6032 Quiet Title A6060 Other Real Property(not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.		
Unlawful Detainer- Commercial (31)	A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.		
Unlawful Detainer- Residential (32)	A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.		
Unlawful Detainer- Drugs (38)	A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2. ,6.		
Asset Forfeiture (05)	A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.		

CIV 109 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04 CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION

_LASC, rule 2.0 American LegalNet, Inc. www.FormsWorkflow.com

Page 2 of 4

	SHORT TITLE: CLAVIUS BA	ASE, INC., et al. v. JERRY B. GOLDMAN, et al CASE NUMBER	
(Cont'd.)	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Judicial Review (Cont'd.)	Writ of Mandate (02)	A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
Judici	Other Judicial Review (39)	A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8
nplex	Construction Defect (10)	A6007 Construction defect	1., 2., 3
Provisionally Complex	Claims Involving Mass Ton (40)	A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
slonall Litiga	Securities Litigation (28)	A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provis	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	A6141 Sister State Judgment A6160 Abstract of Judgment Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil ea อาเMiscellaneous Civil รร/ชอิคัยในอกร ำ Complaints	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2.,8
	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	A6030 Declaratory Relief Only A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) A6000 Other Civil Comptaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance(21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8.	
∠ F		A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.

CIV 109 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION

LASC, rule 2.0

American LegalNet, Inc. www.Forms.Workflow.com

Page 3 of 4

SHORT	ritle: CLAVIUS BASE, 17	√C., et al. v	. JERRY B. GOLD	MAN, et al	CASE NUMBER				
					sidence or place of business, son for filing in the court locati				
	REASON: CHECK THE NU WHICH APPLIES		ADDRESS: 8383 Wilshir	re Blvd, Suite 500					
	☐ 1. ☑ 2. ☐ 3. ☐ 4. ☐ 5. ☐ 6. ☐ 7. ☐ 8. ☐ 9. ☐ 10.								
CiTY:		STATE:	ZIP CODE:			 			
Beve	rly Hills	СА	90211						
true an Centra	d correct and that the abo	ve-entitled m	patter is properly filed	d for assignmer	ows of the State of California that to the Los Angeles Proc., § 392 et seq., and LAS	courthouse in the			
· Dated:	March 21, 2011	_	V see ya.		ISIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PART DA R. HINMAN Bys For Plaintiffs CLAVIUS E				
	PLEASE HAVE THE F		G ITEMS COMPL Y COMMENCE Y		READY TO BE FILED IN OF OURT CASE:	DER TO			
1.	Original Complaint or	Petition.							
2.	If filing a Complaint, a	completed	Summons form fo	or issuance by	y the Clerk.				
, 3 .	Civil Case Cover She	et form CM	-010.		•				
4.	4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form LACIV 109 (Rev. 01/07), LASC Approv								
5.	5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.								
6.	Signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, JC form FL-935, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age, or if required by Court.								
7.	 Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this ac must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case. 								
			•						
			:						
CIV 109	(Rev. 01/07)	CIV	IL CASE COVI	ER SHEET	ADDENDUM	LASC, rule 2.0			

CIV 109 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04 CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION American

American LegalNet, Inc. www.FormsWorkflow.com

Page 4 of 4