METZGER LAW GROUP
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
RAPHAEL METZGER, ESQ., SBN 116020
KATHRYN A. DARNELL, ESQ., SBN 251364
401 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 800
LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4966
TELEPHONE: (562) 437-4499
TELECOPIER: (562) 436-1561
WEBSITE: www.toxictorts.com

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

APR 13 2010

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Council for Education and Research on Toxics ("CERT")

Deg Ramona See

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION AND ) RESEARCH ON TOXICS, a California ) corporation, acting as a private ) attorney general in the public ) interest;

Plaintiff,

vs.

**STARBUCKS** CORPORATION, a ) Washington corporation; STARBUCKS HOLDING COMPANY, а Washington corporation; ELEVEN, INC., а Texas BP AMERICA INC., a corporation; corporation; PRODUCTS NORTH AMERICA INC., Maryland corporation; BP WEST COAST PRODUCTS LLC, a Delaware corporation; GLORIA GOURMET CORP., COFFEES Illinois corporation; GLORIA JEAN'S GOURMET COFFEES FRANCHISING CORP., an Illinois corporation; INTERNATIONAL COFFEE & TEA, LLC, a Delaware corporation; IT'S A GRIND INC., California corporation; PEET'S COFFEE & TEA, Washington corporation; PRAISE INTERNATIONAL NORTH AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; SEATTLE COFFEE COMPANY, Georgia corporation; WINCHELL'S ) CASE NO. BC435759

COMPLAINT ASSERTING CAUSES OF ACTION FOR

- (1) VIOLATIONS OF PROP. 65 (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.6)
- (2) DECLARATORY RELIEF

[INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND PENALTIES SOUGHT]

IT/CASE: BC435759 LEA/DEFW:
CDEIFT #: CCH503057040
ATE PAID: 04/13/10 02:07:32
AYMENT: \$355.00 02:07:32
CHECK: 355.00
CASH:
CHANGE:
CASH

4.00 Т. Т. В.С.Т. Т. В.С.Т.	1				
437-4 TOX	2				
TELEPHONE (562) 437-4499 TOLL-FREE (877) TOX-TORT TELECOPIER (562) 436-1561 WWW.TOXICTORTS.COM	3				
ONE (F FREE OPIER VWW.1	4				
ELEPH TOLL- TELEC	5				
<b>F</b>	6				
	7				
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18				
	9				
0 %	10				
ATION ITE 8( 2-496(	11				
LAW OFFICES OF RAPHAEL METZGER OFESSIONAL LAW CORPORA IT OCEAN BOULEVARD, SUI BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802	12				
METZ WE CO W CO LEVAR DRNIA	13				
LAW OFFICES OF PHAEL METZG SSIONAL LAW CORI CEAN BOULEVARD CH, CALIFORNIA 9	14				
LAW PHA SSION SCEAN	15				
RAPHAEL METZGER  A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION  401 EAST OCEAN BOULEVARD, SUITE 800  LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4966	16				
A F 401 E LON	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
IC DN LUNG	22				
N TOX	23				
ATED I	24				
NACATANA NACATANA NACATANA	2,5				
PRACTICE CONCENTRATED IN TOXIC TORT & ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION OCCUPATIONAL & ENVIRONMENTAL LUNG DISEASE, CANCER, AND TOXIC INJURIES	2 = 2, 2 7				
CTICE T & E UPATIC	27				
PRA 108 000 DISE	28				

FRANCHISING, LLC, a California ) corporation; WINCHELL'S DONUT ) HOUSES OPERATING COMPANY, L.P., ) a corporation; YUM YUM DONUT ) SHOPS, INC., a California ) corporation; and DOES 1 through ) 100, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

//

	9	€.	Defend	lant,	Gloria	Jear	n's	Gou	rmet	Coffees	Franch	ising	Cor	p.,
is a	an	Il	linois	corp	oration	whi	.ch,	at	all	material	times	heret	.0,	was
doi	ng	bu	siness	thro	ughout	the	Sta	ıte -	of C	aliforni	ā.			

- 10. Defendant, International Coffee & Tea, LLC, is a Delaware corporation which, at all material times hereto, was doing business throughout the State of California.
- 11. Defendant, It's a Grind Inc., is a California corporation which, at all material times hereto, was doing business throughout the State of California.
- 12. Defendant, Peet's Coffee & Tea, Inc., is a Washington corporation which, at all material times hereto, was doing business throughout the State of California.
- 13. Defendant, Praise International North America, Inc., is a Delaware corporation which, at all material times hereto, was doing business throughout the State of California.
- 14. Defendant, Seattle Coffee Company, is a Georgia corporation which, at all material times hereto, was doing business throughout the State of California.
- 15. Defendant, Winchell's Franchising, LLC, is a California corporation which, at all material times hereto, was doing business throughout the State of Calfornia.
- 16. Defendant, Winchell's Donut Houses Operating Company, L.P., is a corporation which, at all material times hereto, was doing business throughout the State of California.
- 17. Defendant, Yum Yum Donut Shops, Inc., is a California corporation which, at all material times hereto, was doing business throughout the State of California.

LAW OFFICES OF

18. The true names and capacities of Defendants Does 1 through
100 are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said defendants by
such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to state
the true names and capacities of said fictitious defendants when they
have been ascertained.

19. Plaintiff is informed and believes and alleges, that at all material times, Defendants were acting in an individual, corporate, partnership, associate, conspiratorial or other capacity or as the agent, employee, co-conspirator, or alter ego of their co-defendants, and in doing the acts herein alleged, were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such partner, associate, agent, employee, co-conspirator, or alter ego, and with the permission, consent, knowledge, authorization, ratification and direction of their co-defendants.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 20. This Court has jurisdiction over this case pursuant to Cal. Const. Art. VI, § 10, and pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act ("Proposition 65").
- 21. CERT has satisfied all the jurisdictional conditions precedent to maintaining this action by mailing notices of the violations to the persons entitled to receive them, as required by Health and Safety Code § 25249.7, along with Certificates of Merit and the Summary of Proposition 65, all in accordance with the provisions of 27 C.C.R. § 25903.
- 22. All said notices of violation were mailed at least 70 days prior the date on which this action was filed (60 days for the notice

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

ď 27

28

required by Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d), plus 10 days for mailing the notice to out-of-state defendants as required by Code of Civil Procedure § 1013).

- More than 70 days have passed since copies of the notices were mailed to all the above-referenced governmental authorities, and neither the Attorney General, any district attorney, nor any city attorney has filed a complaint against defendants for the violations alleged in the notices.
- The County of Los Angeles is a proper venue for this action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395 and Health and Safety Code 25249.7, and because the causes of action and many of violations arose in the County of Los Angeles.

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION 65

- In November 1986, California voters overwhelmingly approved an initiative to address growing concerns about exposure to toxic chemicals. That initiative is now officially known as the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act, but is commonly referred to by its original name, "Proposition 65."
- Proposition 65 requires the Governor to publish a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm. Agents that cause cancer are called carcinogens; those that cause birth defects or other reproductive harm are called reproductive toxicants. The list, which must by law be updated at least once a year, contained more than 550 chemicals as of May 15, 1998.
  - Any company with ten or more employees that operates within

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

OFFICES OF

the State or sells products in California must comply with the requirements of Proposition 65. Under Proposition 65, businesses are prohibited from knowingly discharging listed chemicals into sources of drinking water, and are required to provide a clear and reasonable warning before knowingly and intentionally exposing persons to a listed chemical.

- 28. Proposition 65 authorizes the Attorney General, district attorneys, and county and local prosecutors, as well as private citizens, to bring suit against violators to enjoin future violations and to obtain civil penalties for past violations.
- 29. Proposition 65's warning requirement serves as an incentive for business to substitute less toxic chemicals for listed chemicals and to warn the public where substitution is unfeasible.

#### GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 30. For many years, Defendants have engaged in the coffee business in California, selling ready-to-drink coffee to millions of customers throughout the State of California.
- 31. Since June 2002 and continuing to the present, Defendants have exposed and continue to expose numerous consumers purchasing ready-to-drink coffee at all of their businesses located within the State of California, including within the cities of Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, and San Jose, to high levels of acrylamide, a toxic and carcinogenic chemical contained in Defendants' ready-to-drink coffee which is ingested by customers consuming said coffee.
- 32. Exposures to acrylamide unavoidably occurred via ingestion whenever a consumer purchased and thereafter consumed Defendants'

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

OFFICES OF

coffee acrylamide-containing ready-to-drink from June continuing to the present.

- 33. Testing of Defendants' ready-to-drink coffee has shown that even a single, small (12-ounce) serving of ready-to-drink coffee approximately 10 times more acrylamide than the Significant Risk Level ("NSRL") for acrylamide established by Office of California's Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA").
- 34. Acrylamide is a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and has been listed since January 1, 1990 as a carcinogen on the list of carcinogenic chemicals published by the Governor of the State of California at 27 California Code of Regulations § 27001.
- 35. Because acrylamide is listed in Proposition 65 as carcinogen, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, Defendants were and are required to warn their customers that their ready-todrink coffee contains a chemical known by the State of California to cause cancer before exposing said customers to acrylamide contained in their ready-to-drink coffee.
- Since June 2002, Defendants have violated and continue to violate California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 by exposing millions of individuals within the State of California to acrylamide without first clear giving and reasonable warnings individuals that their ready-to-drink coffee contains a chemical known by the State of California to cause cancer.
- The violations of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 are numerous and have occurred continuously and uninterrupted since June 2002 (shortly after the date on which acrylamide was discovered

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

//

//

in high-temperature cooked, baked, and roasted foods) to the present at all of Defendants' businesses located within the State of California during this period where ready-to-drink coffee was purchased from Defendants' businesses. The timing of the violations is such that they occurred every moment that every individual within the State of California consumed Defendants' ready-to-drink coffee without first receiving the required Proposition 65 warnings from June 2002 and continuing to the present.

- 38. At all material times hereto, Defendants concealed from Californians and from Plaintiff that their ready-to-drink coffee contained a chemical known to the state to cause cancer.
- 39. At all material times hereto, Defendants fraudulently concealed from Plaintiff herein and from Californians exposed to their ready-to-drink coffee material facts concerning the toxic, neurotoxic, developmental, reproductive, and carcinogenic hazards of their ready-to-drink coffee.
- Defendants' concealment of said carcinogenic and other their toxic hazards of ready-to-drink coffee was Plaintiff did not know, that nor in the exercise of reasonable care could Plaintiff have known, that Defendants were knowingly and intentionally exposing Californians to carcinogens and reproductive toxins in violation of Proposition 65, until Plaintiff discovered such in December 2009.
- 41. By mailing Defendants notice of their violations of Proposition 65, the statute of limitations on Plaintiff's claims against Defendants is further equitably tolled.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act

Exposing People to Carcinogen without Warning

California Health and Safety Code § 25249.6

(By Plaintiff Against all Defendants)

- 42. Plaintiff refers to paragraphs 1 through 41, and, by this reference, incorporates said paragraphs hereat in full.
- 43. At all times material hereto, Defendants were doing business in the State of California.
- 44. In the course of doing business in the State of California, since at least June 2002 (shortly after the date on which acrylamide was discovered in high-temperature cooked, baked, and roasted foods) and continuing to the present, Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals to acrylamide in their ready-to-drink coffee, without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

For Declaratory Relief
(By Plaintiff Against all Defendants)

- 45. Plaintiff refers to paragraphs 1 through 44 and, by this reference, incorporates said paragraphs hereat as though set forth in full.
- 46. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendant.
  - 47. Plaintiffs contend the following:

OFFICES OF

(A). That Defendants are legally obligated to provide cancer hazard warnings on the containers of their ready-to-drink coffee that they sell to the consuming public in the State of California and that Defendants should be enjoined from failing to do so.

- (B). That Plaintiff's case, including the First Cause of Action, against Defendants for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act Exposing People to Carcinogen without Warning under California Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 (Proposition 65), serves important public interests which should be litigated and addressed expeditiously by the court.
- (C). That the primary jurisdiction doctrine does not apply to this case.
- (D). That this action is entitled to preferential trial setting.
- (E). That the court cannot and ought not defer this action to await potential or pending regulatory action by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.
- (F). That Defendants cannot establish that exposure to acrylamide from their ready-to-drink coffee products does not pose "no significant risk" in accordance with the "No Significant Risk Level" established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment pursuant to 27 C.C.R. § 25705.
- (G). That Defendants cannot establish that sound considerations of public health support any alternative risk level, pursuant to 27 C.C.R. § 25703.
- (H). That Plaintiffs' claims for violations of Proposition 65 are not preempted by the federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

48. On information and belief, Defendants contend the following:

- (A). That they are not legally obligated to provide cancer hazard warnings on the containers of ready-to-drink coffee that they sell to the consuming public in the State of California.
- (B). That Plaintiffs' First Cause of Action is not in the public interest and that Plaintiffs' case should be dismissed.
- (C). That the primary jurisdiction doctrine applies to this case.
- (D). That this action is not entitled to preferential trial setting.
- (E). That the court can and should defer this action pending regulatory action by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.
- (F). That exposure to acrylamide from their ready-to-drink coffee products does poses "no significant risk" in accordance with the "No Significant Risk Level" established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment under 27 C.C.R. § 25705.
- (G). That sound considerations of public health support an alternative risk level, pursuant to 27 C.C.R. § 25703.
- (H). That Plaintiffs' claims for violations of Proposition65 are preempted by the federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.
- 49. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination the respective rights and duties of the parties. Such a declaration is and appropriate at the present time to determine Plaintiff's right to bring this action expeditiously to trial and to allow for a judicial determination of the rights of the parties and the merits of Plaintiff's claims.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

II

AW OFFICES OF

### PRAYER FOR JUDGMENT AND RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

### Injunctive Relief

1. For a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, permanent injunction, and such other injunctive relief as may be had pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), enjoining Defendants from exposing persons to acrylamide in their ready-to-drink coffee sold in the State of California without first providing clear and reasonable warning that their ready-to-drink coffee contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

### Civil Penalties

2. For civil penalties, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), not to exceed \$2,500 per day for each and every violation by each and every Defendant of Proposition 65, in addition to all other penalties established by law.

### Other Equitable Relief

3. For such other equitable relief, including other *cy pres* relief, as may be necessary to effectuate justice and to remedy adverse health effects of Californians exposed to acrylamide in Defendants' ready-to-drink coffee.

11

### TOLL-FREE (877) TOX-TORT TELECOPIER (562) 436-1561 WWW.TOXICTORTS.COM 1 TELEPHONE (562) 437-4499 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION I EAST OCEAN BOULEVARD, SUITE 800 LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4966 11 12 LAW OFFICES OF 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 PRACTICE CONCENTRATED IN TOXIC TORT & ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION OCCUPATIONAL & ENVIRONMENTAL LUNG DISEASE, CANCER, AND TOXIC INJURIES

22

23

24 11, 1

25

27

28

### Declaratory Relief

For a declaration of the rights and obligations of the parties.

### Attorney's Fees

5. For Plaintiff's reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

### Costs

6. For Plaintiff's costs of suit.

### Other Relief

For such other relief as the Court deems proper and just. 7.

DATED: April 13, 2010 METZGER LAW GROWP

A Professional/ Law Corporation

ESQ. for Attorneys Plaintiff Council for Education and Research on Toxics ("CERT")

~ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		CM-010
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, Bar Raphael Metzger, Esq.	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Metzger Law Group		
401 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 8	00	
Long Beach, CA 90802  TELEPHONE NO.: (562) 437-4499  ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff	FAX NO.: (562) 436-1561	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LO STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Stre	s Angeles et	APR 1 3 2010
MAILING ADDRESS:		
city and zip code: Los Angeles, CA Branch name: Central District		John A. Clarke/Executive Officer/Clerk
CASE NAME: CERT vs. STARBUCK	S	AMBER LAFLEUR-CLAYTON
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:
X Unlimited Limited	Counter Joinder	BC485759
(Amount (Amount	Filed with first appearance by defenda	int JUDGE: DC \$0 0 (5 9
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT:
	elow must be completed (see instructions	s on page 2).
1. Check one box below for the case type tha	t best describes this case:	
Auto Tort	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 Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)
	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	X Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Other real preparty (26)	
Business tort/unfair business practice (07	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Enforcement of Judgment
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	
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
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	
This case is _X is not comfactors requiring exceptional judicial mana Large number of separately reprb Extensive motion practice raising	agement: esented parties d Large numbe	r of witnesses with related actions pending in one or more courts
issues that will be time-consumit	<del></del> -	ties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
c. Substantial amount of document	ary evidence f. Substantial p	ostjudgment judicial supervision
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a	a. monetary b. X nonmonetary;	declaratory or injunctive relief c. X punitive (civi) pmatter
	2 ass action suit.	1 M
6. If there are any known related cases, file	//	mayluse term CM-015.)
Date: April 13, 2010	and serve a notice of related case.	
Raphaël Metzger, Esg.	► <i>[F-80]</i>	
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		IGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	NOTICE	
under the Probate Code, Family Code, or in sanctions.	first paper filed in the action or proceedi Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rul	ng (except small claims cases or cases filed es of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
<ul> <li>File this cover sheet in addition to any co</li> <li>If this case is complex under rule 3.400 e</li> <li>other parties to the action or proceeding.</li> </ul>	ver sheet required by local court rule. It seq. of the California Rules of Court, yo	ou must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
• Unless this is a collections case under ru	le 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sh	neet will be used for statistical purposes only.

counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court. sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item item it are provided below. A cover check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must

to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740. requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed

plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the

### CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

Sister State Judgment Auto Subrogation domestic relations) -non) inampbut io noisseinoO Conuty) Sase Abstract of Judgment (Out of Other Promissory Note/Collections Enforcement of Judgment (20) Enforcement of Judgment case type listed above) (41) (arising from provisionally complex Other Breach of Contract/Warranty Warranty Insurance Coverage Claims Environmental/Toxic Tort (30) Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence) Securities Litigation (28) Confract/Warranty Breach—Seller Claims Involving Mass Tort (40) or wrongful eviction) Construction Defect (10) Contract (not unlawful detainer AntitrustTrade Regulation (03) Breach of Rental/Lease Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403) Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

Mechanics Lien harassment) Injunctive Relief Only (non-Declaratory Relief Only above) (42) Other Complaint (not specified (72) OOIA

Other Enforcement of Judgment

Petition/Certification of Entry of

Administrative Agency Award

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal.

(sexet biagnu ton)

Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Civil Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) Other Commercial Complaint

Partnership and Corporate Miscellaneous Civil Petition (uou-tortnon-complex)

Civil Harassment (64) (43) Other Petition (not specified Governance (21)

əsnqV Elder/Dependent Adult Workplace Violence

Petition for Relief from Late Petition for Name Change Election Contest

Other Civil Petition Claim

Megligent Breach of Contract/

Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09)

Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff

complex) (18) Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

Confractual Fraud Other Contract (37) Ofher Coverage

Confract

Eminent Domain/Inverse Real Property Other Contract Dispute

Mortgage Foreclosure Writ of Possession of Real Property Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26) Wrongful Eviction (33) Condemnation (14)

domain, landlord/tenant, or Other Real Property (not eminent Quiet Title

Unlawful Detainer foreciosure)

drugs, check this item; otherwise, Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal Residential (32) Commercial (31)

Judicial Review report as Commercial or Residential)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus Writ of Mandate (02) Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11) Asset Forfeiture (05)

Case Matter Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review of Health Officer Order Other Judicial Review (39) Review

Commissioner Appeals Notice of Appeal-Labor

> Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/VD Premises Liability (e.g., slip Other PVPDMD (23) Malpractice Other Professional Health Care Physicians & Surgeons Medical Malpractice-Medical Malpractice (45) toxic/environmental) (24) Product Liability (not asbestos or Wrongful Death Asbestos Personal Injury/ Asbestos Property Damage (40) sotsedsA Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury) (otuA to beeteni arbitration, check this item motorist claim subject to case involves an uninsured Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the Damage/Wrongful Death Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property **InoT otuA** the case is complex.

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

Employment

Fraud (16)

(61)

Ofher Employment (15)

Wrongful Termination (36)

Legal Malpractice

Intellectual Property (19)

yarassment) (08)

Practice (07)

Hon-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Ofher PI/PD/WD

Professional Megligence (25)

Detamation (e.g., slander, libel)

false arrest) (not civil

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

Business Tort/Unfair Business

Negligent Infliction of

Intentional Infliction of

Emotional Distress

Emotional Distress

(e.g., assault, vandalism)

Other Non-PIVPDMD Tort (35)

(not medical or legal)

Other Professional Malpractice

# CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION

	(CERTIFICA	ATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCA	TION)				
	This form is required p	oursuant to LASC Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles	Superior Court.				
Item Ste the	RYTRIAL? X YES CL In II. Select the correct <b>p 1:</b> After first comple left margin below, and,	hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:  ASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 25  district and courthouse location (4 steps — If you checked "Limited Case", staining the Civil Case Cover Sheet Form, find the main civil case cover sheet to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected	eading for your case ir				
	• — •	rior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature					
	•	sie the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action y ourt location, see Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0.	ou have checked.				
1 01		cable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (See Column C below	w)				
0.1	<ol> <li>May be filed in Centra</li> <li>Location where cause</li> <li>Location where bodily</li> <li>Location where perfor</li> </ol>	injury, death or damage occurred.  mance required or defendant resides.  9. Location where one or more of the commission of Labor Commission of La	des. espondent functions wholly. If the parties reside. ner Office.				
Ste	<b>p 4:</b> Fill in the informa	tion requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.					
벋	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.					
	Asbestos (04)	Asbestos (04)  A6070 Asbestos Property Damage  A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death					
ry/rroperry Death Tort	Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.				
rersonal injury/rroperty ge/Wrongful Death Tort	Medical Malpractice (45)	1., 2., 4. , 1., 2., 4.					
rersonal Injuige/Wrongful	Other Personal Injury	A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)  A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g.,	1., 2., 4.				
Omer	Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 2., 4.				
		A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress  A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 3.				
perty n Tor	Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 2., 3.				
Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Civil Rights (08)	A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.				
	Detamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.				
onal Wron	Fraud (16)	A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.				
Non-Pers Damage/							

SHORT TITLE: CERT VB. STARBUCKS

Z., 5.	notition to CompelvConfirmVacate Arbitration	3118A	Petition re Arbitration (11)
.5 6.	Asset Forfeiture Case	8019A	(30) entieiture (05)
Z , 6.	Unlawful Detainer-Druga	S209A	Unlawful Detainer - Drugs (38)
2., 6.	Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	0S09A	- Unlawful Detainer - (SS) laitnebizeR
·9 '·2	Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	1209A	- Unlawful Detainer Commercial (31)
2., 6.	Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	0909A	
.9, .2	Stift failug	SE03A	(56)
2., 6.	Mortgage Foreclosure	8109A	Other Real Property
2., 6.	Wrongful Eviction Case	£S09A	Vongful Eviction (5£)
2.	Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	00£7A	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)
1, 2,, 3,, 8,	Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	7209A	
1., 2., 3., 5.	Tortious Interference	1E03A	(28)
1., 2., 3., 5.	Confractual Fraud	6009A	Ofher Contract
1, 2, 5, 8.	insurance Coverage (not complex)	3109A	Insurance Coverage (18)
2., 5.	Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	S109A	(60)
2., 5., 6.	Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff	2009A	Collections
1,, 2,, 5.	Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	8S09A	
1., 2., 5.	Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud)	e109A	(not insurance)
5., 5.	Confract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence)	8009A	Varianty (60)
2., 5.	Sreach of Rental/Lease Contract (not Unlawful Detainer or wrongful eviction)	¥009¥	Breach of Contract
.01	Labor Commissioner Appeals	6019A	(31)
1, 2, 3.	Other Employment Complaint Case	₽209A	Ofher Employment
1., 2., 3.	notinimation	7£09A	noibsnimaeT luìgnorW (36)
5., 3.	Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	3209A	Offher (35)
1, 2, 3.	Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	0309A	(55)
1,, 2,, 3,	Legal Malpractice	7109A	Professional Megligence
C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above	B Type of Action (Check only one)		Civil Case Cover

CASE NUMBER

Judicial Review Unlawful Detainer

Real Property

SHORT TITLE: CERT VS. STARBOCKS

CASE NUMBER

	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.
×	Construction Defect (10)	A6007 Construction defect	1., 2., 3.
Somple. In	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Securities Litigation (28)	A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provision	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	X 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  A6107 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. 2., 8. 2., 8., 9.
Civil	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	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 Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
us Su	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above)	A6121 Civil Harassment  A6123 Workplace Harassment  A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case  A6190 Election Contest  A6110 Petition for Change of Name  A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law  A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8. 2., 9.

Карћает Метгдеф				
(SIGNATURE) (SIGNATURE)				
(1/)	(Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and LASC Local Rule 2.0, subds.  Dated: April 13, 2010			
District of the Log Angeles Superior Court	courthouse in the Central			
properly filed for assignment to the Superior	foregoing is true and correct and that the above-entitled matter is p			
Item IV. Declaration of Assignment: I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the				
	CA Angeles CA 90057			
v boress. S100 W Beverly Blvd.				
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.				
	·			
CASE NUMBER	SHORT TITLE: CERT VS. STARBUCKS			

## PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filling a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet form CM-010.
- 4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form LACIV 109 (Rev 01/07), LASC Approved 03-04.
- 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 addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.