

1 LAW OFFICE OF CHAD D. MORGAN  
2 **Chad D. Morgan, Esq. SBN 291282**

3 P.O. Box 1989 PMB 342  
4 40729 Village Drive #8  
5 Big Bear Lake, CA 92315  
6 Tel: (951) 667-1927  
7 Fax: (866) 495-9985  
8 chad@chadmorgan.com

9 Attorney for Plaintiffs,  
10 Big Star Enterprises, Inc. & Guido Campellone

11  
12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
13 FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

14 Big Star Enterprises, Inc. and  
15 Guido Campellone,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 vs.

18 Jason Oh,  
19 Myungshin Rachel Oh,  
20 Northwood II Community Association,  
21 Dan Choe, and  
22 DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,  
23 Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2023-01369166-CU-CR-NJC

Assigned for all purposes: Judge Donald F. Gaffney

Complaint for Damages

Chad Morgan Esq

Philip E Black Esq

1 Plaintiff alleges as follows:

2 PARTIES

3 1. Plaintiff **Big Star Enterprises, Inc.** (Big Star) is a corporation organized under the laws  
4 of Colorado and having its principal place of business in Newport Beach, California. Big Star has  
5 leased residential real property located at 55 Bombay, Irvine, CA 92620 (the Bombay Property).

6 2. Plaintiff **Guido Campellone** is an individual who resides at the Bombay Property with his  
7 family. Guido Campellone is Big Star's President and its sole shareholder.

8 3. Defendants **Jason Oh** and **Myungshin Rachel Oh** (together, the Ohs) are individuals and  
9 residents of Fairfax, Virginia. The Ohs own the Bombay Property in Irvine, California.  
10

11 4. Defendant **Northwood II Community Association** (Northwood or the Association) is a  
12 nonprofit public benefit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California.  
13 Northwood is the home owners association for the community where the Bombay Property is  
14 located.

15 5. Defendant **Dan Choe** is an individual and resident of the City of Irvine, County of  
16 Orange. He is the Chairperson of Northwood's Board of Directors. At all times relevant to this  
17 complaint, Choe was acting both as an individual and as Northwood's agent.

18 6. The true names of Defendant DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff,  
19 who therefore brings this action against DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, by such fictitious names  
20 and will seek leave of this Complaint to show their true names, identities, and capacities when  
21 they have been ascertained. These DOE Defendants include (but are not limited to) individual  
22 Northwood members, Northwood officers and board members, and other Northwood employees  
23 or agents.  
24

25 7. Together, Northwood and Choe plus any other Northwood members, officers, directors,  
26 or agents who might be named as DOE Defendants are referred to as the Northwood Defendants.  
27  
28

1 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2 8. The Orange County Superior Court is the proper venue because this action arises from  
3 and concerns the lease of real property located in Orange County.

4 9. The Orange County Superior Court is the proper venue because the conduct Plaintiffs  
5 complain of has occurred in the County of Orange and several defendants reside in the County of  
6 Orange.

7 10. Northwood is the home owners association for a community located wholly within  
8 Orange County.

9 11. The Ohs own real property in Orange County California and have leased that property to  
10 Big Star. They have sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California to subject them this  
11 Court’s jurisdiction.

12 12. The relief sought is within the jurisdiction of this Court.

13 **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**  
14

15 13. On August 9, 2015, Big Star entered into a written lease agreement with the Ohs to lease  
16 the Bombay Property. The lease was for the benefit of Big Star’s owner, Guido Campellone and  
17 his family (the Campellones).

18 14. On June 11, 2021, Big Star and the Ohs entered into an “Extension of Lease” through  
19 June 30, 2022. On June 8, 2022, they entered into another “Extension of Lease” through June  
20 30, 2023. Prior to June 30, 2023, the Ohs promised—by words and conduct—to extend the lease  
21 for another term.

22 15. For reasons described below, the Ohs breached their promise—the parties’ agreement—  
23 to continue leasing the Bombay Property to Big Star even though they do not intend on selling or  
24 occupying the property. Rather than continuing to rent the Bombay Property to Big Star—as  
25 previously promised—the Ohs are evicting Big Star and the Campellones so they can rent the  
26 property to someone else.

27 16. The Ohs refusal to continue renting to Big Star is the result of an orchestrated campaign  
28 of harassment and discrimination by Northwood and its members, officers, and directors—the



1 Northwood Defendants—who seek to expel the Campellones from the community on the basis of  
2 their race.

3 17. One such example is a “Friendly Reminder” that Northwood sent to the Ohs on March  
4 22, 2023 alleging that the Campellones’ “pet” was in violation of Northwood’s leash rule. This  
5 prompted a response from Jason Oh to Guido Campellone: “I did not know that you have a pet.  
6 [¶] Per our lease agreement, we agreed not to have a pet. Any way [sic], please follow the  
7 community rules.” First, Campellone does not have a pet. He has a service animal that is  
8 protected by the Americans with Disabilities Act and state law. Second, Campellone’s service  
9 dog was not off leash, as alleged. Northwood fabricated this allegation with the intent to drive a  
10 wedge between the Ohs and Campellones. Third, many Northwood members allow their  
11 untrained pets to run off leash. Northwood ignores those violations and has arbitrarily attempted  
12 to enforce its rules against the Campellones on the basis of the Campellones’ race in order to  
13 drive them from the community.

14 18. Other examples of Northwood’s harassment and intimidation include:

- 15  
16 a. Northwood’s towing of Campellone’s vehicle, which was parked in front of his  
17 home. Northwood wrongfully alleged that the car was parked illegally and  
18 wrongfully asserted its right to tow the vehicle. Rather than towing Campellone’s  
19 vehicle for a lawful purpose, Northwood towed Campellone’s vehicle as a means  
20 to harass and discriminate against the him and his family. To the extent  
21 Northwood might have had the right to tow Campellone’s vehicle, it lost its right  
22 to enforce whatever rule he violated (if he violated a rule) because it did not  
23 enforce that rule against other residents who regularly park their cars in front of  
24 their homes. If Northwood acted within its rules, it arbitrarily applied that rule to  
25 Campellone on the basis of his race to harass and discriminate against him while  
26 ignoring the same rule as it might be applied to residents who share Choe’s race—  
27 the race favored by Northwood, its members, and its board.

1 b. Northwood’s demand to inspect the interior of the Campellone’s home—made  
2 without authority or justification—was a mechanism by which Northwood  
3 attempted to intimidate and discriminate against the Campellone family. While  
4 the Ohs generally have a right to inspect their property, their assertion of that  
5 right in response to Northwood’s demands was an act that aided and abetted  
6 Northwood’s harassment and discrimination because the Ohs asserted that right  
7 at Northwood’s behest rather than for any independent reason related to their  
8 oversight of the property.

9 19. Other instances of harassment and/or discrimination are described in the causes of action  
10 below.

11 20. The Ohs eventually admitted that Northwood’s interference was the basis for their  
12 decision to terminate the lease. On April 30, 2023, Jason Oh wrote to Guido Campellone:

13 Guido,

14 Hope you are doing well.

15 Upon much reflection, I have decided not to renew the lease this time.

16 After going through a lot of things with HOA and the Property Management past  
17 one year [sic], I think it is best for both of us.

18 So, I have asked my realtor to prepare a lease termination notice letter and I am  
19 emailing it to you in the attachment.

20 Please review it.

21 Thank you,

22 Jason

23 21. The “a lot of things with HOA and the Property Management” that Oh referred to is  
24 Northwood’s systematic harassment of Guido Campellone and his family. Jason Oh’s reference  
25 to “the Property Management”—even though he capitalized the words as if it was a proper  
26 noun—is a reference to how difficult Northwood had made it to manage the property rather than  
27 a reference to any sort of dispute between the Campellones’ and Oh’s property manager because  
28 the Ohs did not appoint a property manager until June 14, 2023, nearly two months later.

1 22. All of the conduct described in each cause of action below, as attributed to each of the  
2 Defendants, was done with sufficient malice and oppression as to warrant punitive damage for  
3 each cause of action. That malice and oppression is the Defendants' discriminatory intent to deny  
4 Plaintiffs' access to housing on the basis of race and/or disability.

5 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

6 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: Violation of the California Fair Employment and**  
7 **Housing Act (FEHA) by all Plaintiffs and against all Defendants**

8 23. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 22, above, as if fully  
9 set forth herein.

10 24. Under section 12955 of the Government Code it is unlawful

- 11 a. “[f]or the owner of any housing accommodation to discriminate against or harass  
12 any person because of the race, color, ... [or] disability ... of that person.” (Gov.  
13 Code § 12955(a).)
- 14 b. “[f]or any person ... to discriminate against any person on the basis of ... color,  
15 race, ... [or] disability ....” (Gov. Code § 12955(c).)
- 16 c. “[f]or any person to aid, abet, incite, compel, or coerce the doing of any of the acts  
17 or practices declared unlawful in this section, or to attempt to do so.” (Gov. Code  
18 § 12955(g).)

19  
20 25. Individuals among Northwood’s membership (DOE Defendants) discriminated against  
21 Campellone on the basis of his race and color. They also discriminated against him on the basis of  
22 his disability.

23 26. Individuals on Northwood’s Board—Dan Choe and DOE Defendants—also  
24 discriminated against Guido Campellone both on their own behalf and on behalf of other  
25 Northwood members and Northwood itself. By discriminating against Guido Campellone on  
26 behalf of Northwood and other Northwood members, Choe and other board members aided and  
27 abetted that discrimination.  
28

1 27. Northwood is liable for discrimination by Choe and other Northwood board members  
2 because those individuals were acting on Northwood's behalf and carrying out its official position  
3 because, *inter alia*, those the individuals were Northwood's policy makers and established that  
4 course of conduct as Northwood's official position. Furthermore, Northwood was or should  
5 have been aware of discrimination its members and board members directed to Campellone and  
6 did nothing to prevent that discrimination.

7 28. The discrimination by the Northwood Defendants was intended to (1) drive the  
8 Campellone family from their home or (2) induce the Ohs to cease renting the Bombay Property  
9 to the Campellones if they would not leave on their own.

10 29. Part of the discrimination by the Northwood Defendants has been harassment that has  
11 created a hostile environment that was so severe that it has interfered with Campellone's  
12 enjoyment of the Bombay Property. The Northwood Defendants have engaged in stalking on  
13 Northwood's behalf by stopping in front of the Campellones' home and trying to peer inside;  
14 aggressively staring at the Campellones (in a way that is not done to other residents) as they move  
15 throughout the community in an effort to intimidate them and make them feel unwelcome;  
16 making false accusations that the Campellone's have violated Association rules in an intimidating  
17 manner and threatening to have them evicted from their home; threatening to make reports to  
18 law enforcement based on false accusations of Association rule violations; blocking their driveway  
19 while they were attempting to enter or exit the property in manner that forced the Campellones  
20 to choose between receiving Defendants' discrimination or altering their arrival or departure  
21 plans; spreading rumors and making false statements to others in the community with the intent  
22 of increasing community animosity against the Campellones in furtherance of Defendants' effort  
23 to force them from the community; the use of RFID date to monitor the Campellones ingress into  
24 and egress from the community for the purpose of harassing and intimidating them; demands to  
25 inspect the interior of the Campellone's home and other forms of harassment.

26 30. While the discrimination described above did not induce the Campellones to voluntarily  
27 move, it did induce the Ohs' to breach their promise to renew Big Star's lease and is otherwise  
28

1 the reason why the Ohs' instigated eviction proceedings against Big Star and the Campellones.  
2 This is both an independent of act of discrimination by the Ohs against the Campellones and also  
3 an act by the Ohs to aid and abet discrimination by the Northwood Defendants.

4 31. The effect of this course of conduct was to make the Bombay Property—the  
5 Campellones' residence for nearly 10 years—unavailable to them. Rather than evicting the  
6 Campellones for a lawful purpose, the Ohs are evicting them so that they can rent the property to  
7 someone who shares their race and who does not have a disability that requires the use of a  
8 service animal.

9 32. Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer harm as a result of Defendants' conduct. In  
10 addition to general damages and emotional distress, they have been forced to incur attorneys fees  
11 to defend against Defendants' unlawful eviction. If that eviction is successful, they will be forced  
12 to incur moving costs and other expenses associated with their move from the Bombay Property.  
13 The pattern of willful and purposeful conduct—harassment—is in conscious disregard of  
14 Plaintiffs' rights and is without just cause or excuse. It is a basis for punitive damages.

15 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: Violation of the Federal Fair Housing Act (FHA) by**  
16 **all Plaintiffs against all Defendants**

17 33. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 22, above, as if fully  
18 set forth herein.

19 34. California's Fair Employment and Housing Act is generally modeled on the federal Fair  
20 Housing Act (FHA) (42 U.S.C. § 3601 *et seq.*), which is an additional basis for relief.

21 35. Under the FHA, the following acts are unlawful:

- 22 a. To “make unavailable or deny, a dwelling to any person because of race, color,  
23 religion, sex, familial status, or national origin.” (42 U.S.C. § 3604(a).)  
24 b. “To discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale  
25 or rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection  
26 therewith, because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, or national origin.”  
27 (42 U.S.C. § 3604(b).)  
28



1 c. "To represent to any person because of race, color, religion, sex, handicap,  
2 familial status, or national origin that any dwelling is not available for inspection,  
3 sale, or rental when such dwelling is in fact so available." (42 U.S.C. § 3604(d).)

4 d. To discriminate in the rental of a dwelling on the basis of the renter's disability or  
5 the disability of anyone residing in the dwelling. (42 U.S.C. § 3604(f).)

6 36. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 25 through 32, above, as if fully  
7 set forth herein.

8 **III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: Intentional Interference with Contractual Relations by**  
9 **all Plaintiffs against the Northwood Defendants.**

10 37. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 22, above, as if fully  
11 set forth herein.

12 38. There is a valid contract between Big Star and the Ohs. These parties knew and  
13 understood that the contract was intended for the benefit of the Campellone family.

14 39. The Northwood Defendants knew of the contract between the Campellone/Big Star and  
15 the Ohs.

16 40. The Northwood Defendants' intentional acts were intended to induce the Ohs to breach  
17 their agreement with the Campellones and remove them from property.

18 41. But for the Northwood Defendants' interference, the Ohs would have renewed Big Star's  
19 lease for another year and the Campellones would not have been evicted from their home.

20 42. Plaintiffs have incurred general and special damages as a result of the Northwood  
21 Defendants' interference in their relationship with the Ohs.

22 43. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 25 through 32, above, as if fully  
23 set forth herein.

24 **IV. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: Promissory Estoppel by all Plaintiffs against the Ohs**

25 44. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 22, above, as if fully  
26 set forth herein.  
27  
28

1 45. Jason Oh, on behalf of himself and Myungshin Rachel Oh, made a clear and unambiguous  
2 promise to Guido Campellone, individually and on Big Star's behalf, to extend the lease for  
3 another year.

4 46. Big Star and Campellone reasonably relied upon that promise and made future plans  
5 about the residence for the coming year based on that promise.

6 47. The Ohs breach of that promise has caused Big Star and Campellone harm. That harm  
7 includes the economic costs associated with leaving their residence of nearly 10 years plus the  
8 emotional toll the unlawful eviction and impending move have taken upon them.

9 48. Enforcement of the Ohs' promise is necessary to avoid the injustice Plaintiffs have  
10 suffered.

11  
12 **V. FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION: Civil Stalking (Civ. Code § 1708.7) by Campellone**  
13 **against the Northwood Defendants.**

14 49. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 22, above, as if fully  
15 set forth herein.

16 50. For the past several years, Defendant Dan Choe, along with presently unidentified DOE  
17 Defendants, acting on Northwood's behalf, has engaged in a course of conduct that is consistent  
18 with the definition of civil stalking set forth in Civil Code section 1708.7.

19 51. Choe's actions and the action of other Northwood directors and members was on  
20 Northwood's behalf.

21 52. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 29 through 31, above, as if fully  
22 set forth herein.

23 53. The Northwood Defendnats' knowing and willful conduct was intended to seriously  
24 alarm, annoy, torment, or terrorize Guido Campellone. This conduct was intended to drive the  
25 Campellones' from their home—an unlawful purpose.

26 54. Defendants' conduct was the type of conduct that would cause a reasonable person to  
27 suffer substantial emotional distress.  
28

1 55. Defendants' conduct actually caused Campellone to suffer substantial emotional distress.  
2 That substantial emotional distress has subjected Campellone to general and special damages.

3 **VI. SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION: Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress by**  
4 **Campellone against all Defendants**

5 56. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 22, above, as if fully  
6 set forth herein.

7 57. The conduct described in the Fifth Cause of Action, above, is beyond all bounds of  
8 decency tolerated by society.

9 58. That conduct was directed at Plaintiffs and intended to cause them to suffer from severe  
10 emotional distress.

11 59. Plaintiffs have actually suffered severe emotional distress. That distress has included  
12 severe and depression, anxiety, and other physical ailments.

13 60. Defendants' conduct is the direct and proximate cause of Plaintiffs' harm. That harm has  
14 caused Campellone to suffer general and special damages.  
15

16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

17 Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for the following:

- 18 1. General and special damages against all Defendants;  
19 2. Punitive damages against all Defendants;  
20 3. An award of their costs of suit and reasonable attorneys' fees from all Defendants; and  
21 4. Such and further relief as the Court deems proper.  
22

23 DATE: December 18, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,  
LAW OFFICE OF CHAD D. MORGAN

24  
25  
26 By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
Chad D. Morgan Esq.  
27 Attorney for Plaintiffs  
28

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State, Recipient number and address)  
 Chad D. Morgan 951282 CR-NJC - ROA # 3 - DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court By A. Van Arkel, Deputy Clerk.

Law Office of Chad Morgan  
 P.O. Box 1989 PMB 342 / 40729 Village Dr. 38 Big Bear Lake CA 92315  
 TELEPHONE NO.: 951-667-1927 FAX NO. (Optional): 866-495-9985  
 E-MAIL ADDRESS: chad@chadmorgan.com  
 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Big Star Enterprises, Inc and Guido Campellone

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Orange North Justice Center  
 STREET ADDRESS: ~~700 Civic Center Drive West~~ 1275 North Berkeley Avenue  
 MAILING ADDRESS: Santa Ana 92701  
 CITY AND ZIP CODE: ~~Santa Ana 92701~~ Fullerton, CA 92832-1258  
 BRANCH NAME: ~~Central Justice Center~~

CASE NAME:  
 Big Star Enterprises v. Oh

**CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET**

**Unlimited** (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000)  **Limited** (Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)

**Counter**  **Joinder**

Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)

CASE NUMBER: 30-2023-01369166-CU-CR-NJC  
 Assigned for all purposes:  
 JUDGE: Judge Donald F. Gaffney  
 DEPT.:

Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2).

1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:

<p><b>Auto Tort</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Auto (22)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Uninsured motorist (46)</p> <p><b>Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Asbestos (04)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Product liability (24)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Medical malpractice (45)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other PI/PD/WD (23)</p> <p><b>Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Business tort/unfair business practice (07)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil rights (08)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Defamation (13)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Fraud (16)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property (19)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Professional negligence (25)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)</p> <p><b>Employment</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful termination (36)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other employment (15)</p>	<p><b>Contract</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Breach of contract/warranty (06)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Rule 3.740 collections (09)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other collections (09)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage (18)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other contract (37)</p> <p><b>Real Property</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful eviction (33)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other real property (26)</p> <p><b>Unlawful Detainer</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (31)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Residential (32)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Drugs (38)</p> <p><b>Judicial Review</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Asset forfeiture (05)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Petition re: arbitration award (11)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Writ of mandate (02)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other judicial review (39)</p>	<p><b>Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Construction defect (10)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mass tort (40)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Securities litigation (28)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/Toxic tort (30)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41)</p> <p><b>Enforcement of Judgment</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of judgment (20)</p> <p><b>Miscellaneous Civil Complaint</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RICO (27)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other complaint (not specified above) (42)</p> <p><b>Miscellaneous Civil Petition</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partnership and corporate governance (21)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other petition (not specified above) (43)</p>
--	---	---

2. This case  is  is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:

a.  Large number of separately represented parties d.  Large number of witnesses

b.  Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve e.  Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court

c.  Substantial amount of documentary evidence f.  Substantial postjudgment 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): 6

5. This case  is  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: Dec. 18, 2023

Chad D. Morgan (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY 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.