11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MICHAEL M. BARANOV - SBN 145137 BARANOV & WITTENBERG, LLP 2049 Century Park East, Suite 2250 Los Angeles, California 90067 Tel: (310) 229-3500

Attorneys for Plaintiff, DAVID ELLIOTT

JUL 16 2009

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk

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

DAVID ELLIOTT, an individual,

Plaintiff,

-VS-

BLATANT ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a California corporation, BARRY LEVINE, an individual, MATTHEW I. BERGER, an individual, JESSE BERGER, an individual, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.

BC417904

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff, DAVID ELLIOTT, alleges:

- Plaintiff DAVID ELLIOTT ("ELLIOTT") is, and at all times mentioned in this complaint was, a resident of the City of New York, State of New York.
- ELLIOTT is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that at all miss 2. herein mentioned defendant, BLATANT ENTERTAINMENT, INC. ("BLATANT corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, and doing business in the of Los Angeles, State of California. At all times herein mentioned, BLATANT was, and no engaged in the business of developing, producing and distributing comic books, graphic now video games and motion pictures as well as other ancillaries based on graphic novels. At Ya ¥arioüs

times, BLATANT was known as RADICAL PUBLISHING, INC. and BLATANT PICTURES, INC. BLATANT conducts business under the trade names RADICAL COMICS, RADICAL BOOKS, RADICAL KIDZ, RADICAL TOYS (RADCO), RADICAL INTERACTIVE and RADICAL PICTURES.

- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that defendants BARRY LEVINE and JESSE BERGER are individuals residing in and/or conducting business within County of Los Angeles, State of California and that defendant MATTHEW I. BERGER is an individual residing in the County of Santa Barbara who is conducting business within County of Los Angeles, State of California. All three of these defendants will be referred to herein as the "Individual Defendants." The Individual Defendants are officers, directors and shareholders of BLATANT.
- 4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sues them by those fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes that DOE defendants are California residents.
- 5. Unless otherwise alleged in this complaint, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on the basis of that information and belief alleges, that at all times mentioned in this complaint, each of the defendants was an agent and/or employee of their codefendants, and in doing the things alleged in this complaint, was acting within the course and scope of that agency and employment.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of the individual and corporate defendants exercised such control and dominion over the other corporate codefendants so as to make them its mere alter egos and instrumentalities and, as a result, each of the corporate codefendants' corporate shields should be disregarded.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

7. ELLIOTT is a co-founder, shareholder and former Co-Publisher and Editor-in-Chief of Radical Publishing and Blatant Entertainment, Inc. (collectively referred to herein as "BLATANT"). Since August 2006, ELLIOTT has been instrumental in building the Radical brand from a fledgling start-up to a well-recognized multimedia company. He is the driving force behind many of BLATANT's projects, including, but not limited to, Hercules, Caliber,

9

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Freedom Formula, City of Dust, Legends, Ryder on the Storm, Hotwire, Lords of Misrule, Oblivion, Medieval, FVZA and Assassins, and also is the sole creator of his reimagining of Aladdin. ELLIOTT owns six hundred fifty thousand (650,000) shares of BLATANT's stock, representing ten percent (10%) of BLATANT's outstanding shares.

- ELLIOTT is informed and believes that he was the only employee of BLATANT 8. with extensive comic book and graphic novel experience. It was his reputation and experience with creators, retailers and distributors in the comic book industry that has enabled BLATANT to become the company that it is today. ELLIOTT's background, reputation and expertise gave BLATANT the credibility to attract its current investor pool and to raise funds to operate.
- Despite ELLIOTT's vital contributions, BLATANT has never lived up to its legal 9. obligations to ELLIOTT. Indeed, his employment as Editor-in-Chief was terminated by BLATANT as of May 1, 2009, after giving him two weeks notice on April 14th.
- ELLIOTT was assured by BLATANT, through its officers, defendants BARRY 10. LEVINE, MATTHEW I. BERGER and JESSE BERGER, that he would be provided with a fair employment severance package and that his ownership of BLATANT shares was secure. These representations were false. Instead, BLATANT initially refused to pay ELLIOTT's last two weeks of salary, and only paid it after being notified what "two weeks notice" meant. Thereafter, BLATANT communicated to him a "severance package" which required ELLIOTT to surrender 325,000 shares of BLATANT's shares for \$26,000. When this offer was rejected, BLATANT disputed that ELLIOTT was ever issued any shares.
- In addition, during his employment, BLATANT failed to pay ELLIOTT his full 11. salary. Despite being promised in writing by BLATANT, through its officer defendant JESSE BERGER, that starting on June 1, 2008 he would be paid \$106,000 per year, BLATANT instead paid ELLIOTT \$90,000 per year through May 1, 2009, for a difference of \$14,666.
- Furthermore, BLATANT failed to accord ELLIOTT appropriate credit on several 12. projects created and /or developed by him, including but not limited to Hercules and Aladdin.
- ELLIOTT is the creator of Aladdin and is the sole copyright owner of that project. 13. He is also a considerable contributor to Hercules and holds an interest in that project's copyright.

In fact it was his contributions that first secured a \$60,000 three month option from Rogue Pictures, where he signed the contracts as a Co-Producer on the project, which then led to the sale to Universal Pictures and Spyglass Entertainment for Peter Berg to potentially direct as a \$125,000,000 motion picture.

- 14. In addition, ELLIOTT, though his creative contributions, owns a portion of the copyrights in the following BLATANT projects: Caliber, City of Dust, Legends, Oblivion, Freedom Formula, Medieval, FVZA, Assassins, as well as the co-creation of Ryder on the Storm. He has not been fully compensated for his contributions nor afforded proper credit or even given permission to defendants for their use.
- 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes that based thereon alleges that BLATANT is exploiting Hercules, Aladdin, Caliber, City of Dust, Legends, Oblivion, Freedom Formula, Medieval, FVZA, Assassins and Ryder on the Storm (hereinafter collectively referred to as "the ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS") without regard to ELLIOTT's contributions and in violation of ELLIOTT's rights, even going so far as to assume credit and execution of his ideas. ELLIOTT has not been compensated for Hotwire, Cholly & Flytrap and the Lords of Misrule, three projects that he discovered and thereafter acquired for BLATANT.
- 16. Furthermore, BLATANT and its officers, consisting of Individual Defendants, have engaged in a pattern of abuse of minority shareholders' and investors' rights. Its management team consists almost entirely of persons related to each other. All of them are receiving grossly overinflated salaries, given their complete lack of entertainment, publishing and graphic novel experience. Defendant JESSE BERGER, without any applicable prior experience, was awarded a salary nearly twice ELLIOTT's. Defendant BARRY LEVINE's salary is two and three-quarter times that amount. BLATANT management has hired additional relatives who are equally lacking in skills. BLATANT management also failed to disclose several felony drug distribution convictions of its Senior Vice President, CEO and Treasurer, defendant JESSE BERGER. Defendant JESSE BERGER was represented in the criminal proceedings by his father, defendant MATTHEW BERGER, who acts as General Counsel for BLATANT, in what was and continues to be a clear conflict of interest. His trial was ongoing at this time and he

served his sentence at the weekends. He then hired his godson, Barrett Weislow, as his executive assistant. Based on information and belief, plaintiff alleges that Barrett was on parole/probation for a similar drug conviction when he was hired.

17. BLATANT's management failed to have any of its employees sign work-for-hire agreements and/or assignments of copyrights, thereby clouding title to all of BLATANT's projects, and making it impossible for BLATANT to provide proper chain of title documents and guarantees to investors, production companies, studios, and insurers, to the detriment of its shareholders.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR BREACH OF IMPLIED CONTRACT

(Against Defendant BLATANT and DOES 1-10)

- 18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-17, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 19. Plaintiff was employed with defendants under an implied contract. The terms of the contract relied on by plaintiff included but were not limited to plaintiff receiving a salary of \$106,000 per year and defendants following their written personnel policies, which provided that employees would be treated fairly and in accordance with the laws of the State of California, and not discriminated against and harassed due to age;
 - Defendants breached their contract with plaintiff by:
 - (a) Failing to pay plaintiff his agreed upon salary;
 - (b) Refusing to give plaintiff the opportunity to succeed at his job;
 - (c) Failing to treat plaintiff in accordance with defendant's stated policies;
- (d) Treating plaintiff differently based solely due to his disability and medical condition, and age, over forty;
- (e) Terminating plaintiff in breach of the promises made to him to provide his with a severance package; and
 - (f) Terminating plaintiff without following defendants' policies and practices.
- 21. Defendants have refused and continue to refuse to allow plaintiff the benefits of his employment contract and to perform under this contract in the agreed on manner.

22. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of defendants' breach, plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial losses in earnings, bonuses, and job benefits, and expenses incurred in the search for comparable employment in an amount which will be proven at trial, as well as in his earning capacity.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR BREACH OF THE COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING

(Against Defendants BLATANT and DOES 1-10)

- 23. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-22, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 24. As a result of the employment relationship which existed between plaintiff and defendants, the expressed and implied promises made in connection with that relationship, and the acts, conduct, and communications resulting in these implied promises, defendants promised and were required by law to act in good faith toward and deal fairly with plaintiff which requires, among other things, that:
- (a) Each party in the relationship must act with good faith toward the other concerning all matters related to the employment;
- (b) Each party in the relationship must act with fairness toward the other concerning all matters related to the employment;
- (c) Neither party would take any action to unfairly prevent the other from obtaining the benefits of the employment relationship;
 - (d) Defendants would similarly treat employees who are similarly situated;
- (e) Defendants would comply with their own representations, rules, policies,
 and procedures in dealing with plaintiff;
- (f) Defendants would not treat plaintiff differently or retaliate against plaintiff due to age, over forty;
- (g) Defendants would give plaintiff's interests as much consideration as they gave their own interests.

- 25. Defendants' termination of plaintiff was wrongful, in bad faith, and unfair, and therefore a violation of defendants' legal duties. Plaintiff further alleges that defendants breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing when they:
- (a) Repeatedly refused to abide by their own policies when dealing with plaintiff;
- (b) Repeatedly denied the existence of the contract and the agreements made with plaintiff, including that to provide plaintiff with a severance package;
- (c) Unfairly prevented plaintiff from obtaining the benefits of his employment relationship;
 - (d) Terminated plaintiff's employment because of his age, over forty;
- (e) Terminated plaintiff's employment for false reasons and in a manner that was inconsistent with defendants' stated policies and practices and with the laws of the State of California; and
- 26. Defendants' breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing was a substantial factor in causing damage and injury to plaintiff. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' unlawful conduct alleged in this complaint, plaintiff has lost substantial employment benefits with defendants, including loss of reputation, lost wages, and other employee fringe benefits in an amount which will be proven at trial, as well as future wages and employment benefits.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

(Against Defendants BLATANT and DOES 1-10)

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-26, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 28. Plaintiff further alleges that defendants' termination of Plaintiff was in violation of the public policy of the State of California which prohibits employers from discriminating against employees due to age, over 40.

の世ノイシュルです

- 29. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of defendant employer's wrongful termination of plaintiff in violation of the public policy of the State of California, plaintiff has lost and will continue to lose income and benefits, and has suffered and continues to suffer humiliation, embarrassment, mental and emotional distress, and discomfort all to plaintiff's damage in an amount which will be proven at trial.
- 30. Because the acts taken toward plaintiff were carried out by managerial employees acting in a deliberate, cold, callous, malicious, oppressive, and intentional manner in order to injure and damage plaintiff, plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against defendant employer in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of defendants.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

(Against All Defendants)

- 31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-30, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 32. Defendants, as officers, directors and shareholders of BLATANT, a California corporation in which plaintiff owns a ten percent (10%) ownership interest, owe the plaintiff a fiduciary duty of loyalty and a fiduciary duty of care imposed by California Corporations Code Section 16404(a)-(3).
- BLATANT by terminating plaintiff in order to attempt to obtain his shares at a discount, and engaging in a pattern of abuse of minority shareholders' and investors' rights, which includes but is not limited to hiring relatives and friends of each other, not qualified for jobs for which they were hired, paying each other and their relatives grossly overinflated salaries, failing to disclose felony convictions of officers and senior managers, spending corporate funds on personal ventures, spending funs on unnecessary events, and failing to protect corporate assets and copyrights, and have any of its employees sign work-for-hire agreements and/or assignments of copyrights, thereby clouding title to all of BLATANT's entertainment projects, and making it

impossible for BLATANT to provide proper chain of title documents and guarantees to investors, production companies, studios, and insurers, to the detriment of its shareholders.

- 34. As a proximate result of defendants' conduct described above, plaintiff suffered damages in an amount to be ascertained at trial, but in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this court.
- 35. The aforementioned acts of defendants were willful, wanton, malicious and oppressive, were undertaken with the intent to defraud, and justify the award of exemplary and punitive damages against defendants and each of them.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR FRAUD AND DECEIT

(Against All Defendants)

- 36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-35, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 37. On and prior to March 2009, in Los Angeles, California, defendants, orally and in writing willfully, maliciously, falsely, and fraudulently represented to the plaintiff that if he were to terminate his employment with BLATANT, he would receive a substantial severance package and that his ownership of BLATANT shares would remain secure.
- 38. At the time these representations were made by defendants to the plaintiff, plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants knew that the representations were false.
- 39. These misrepresentations were made pursuant to a design and scheme by defendants to force plaintiff from his employment with BLATANT and to acquire plaintiff's shares for a fraction of their value.
- 40. At the time these representations were made, plaintiff was ignorant of their falsity, but believed them to be true. If plaintiff knew of the falsity of defendants' representations, he would not have so acted and would not have terminated his employment with BLATANT in reliance on these representations.

- 41. As a proximate result of the willful, malicious, false, and fraudulent misrepresentations made by defendants to plaintiff, he has been damaged in an amount to be proved at trial.
- 42. The conduct of defendants described herein was oppressive, fraudulent and malicious, thereby entitling plaintiff to an award of punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of defendants.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

(Against All Defendants)

- 43. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-42, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 44. The ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS contain a large amount of material wholly original with plaintiff and is copyrightable subject matter under the laws of the United States and the State of California.
- 45. Plaintiff has notified defendants that defendants have infringed the copyright of plaintiff, and defendant has continued to infringe the copyright by exploiting the ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS without plaintiff's authority and permission.
- 46. By failing to afford plaintiff credit on the ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS, defendants have thereby been engaging in unfair trade practices and unfair competition against plaintiff to plaintiff's irreparable damage.
- 47. Plaintiff requests that defendants, their agents, and servants be enjoined during the pendency of this action and permanently from infringing the copyright of plaintiff in any manner, and from publishing, selling, marketing, or otherwise disposing of the ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS.
- 48. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of defendants' copyright infringement and unfair trade practices, plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial losses in earnings, bonuses, and harm to reputation in an amount which will be proven at trial.

49. The conduct of defendants described herein was oppressive, fraudulent and malicious, thereby entitling plaintiff to an award of punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of defendants.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

(Against All Defendants)

- 50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-49, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 51. ELLIOTT is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that unless restrained and enjoined, defendants, and each of them, will continue to violate ELLIOTT's interest in the ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS, fail to compensate ELLIOTT for Hotwire, Cholly & Flytrap and the Lords of Misrule, misappropriate the ideas and trade secrets presented by ELLIOTT to defendants in confidence and will continue to exploit such ideas and trade secrets and ENTETAINMENT PROJECTS without any compensation and credit to ELLIOTT.
- 52. ELLIOTT has no adequate or speedy remedy at law to enforce his rights and, unless restrained, defendants will cause ELLIOTT to suffer irreparably damage, injury and harm.
- 53. ELLIOTT requests that defendants be restrained and enjoined from using and exploiting the ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS, Hotwire, Cholly & Flytrap and the Lords of Misrule any of the ideas and trade secrets of ELLIOTT, including but not limited to producing, distributing, syndicating, broadcasting, and otherwise exploiting the ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS, Hotwire, Cholly & Flytrap and the Lords of Misrule and any of their ancillary rights, in any and all media and markets.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR RESCISSION

(Against Defendants BLATANT and DOES 1-10)

54: Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-53, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.

- 55. Plaintiff brought the Aladdin project to BLATANT based on defendants' representations that he would receive appropriate compensation and credit for it.
- 56. As alleged above, all of these representations, on which plaintiff reasonably relied, were false, thereby resulting in a fraud in the inducement of the contract between plaintiff and defendants pertaining to Aladdin, warranting rescission thereof and reversion of all rights in Aladdin to plaintiff.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

(Against Defendants BLATANT and DOES 1-10)

- 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-56, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 58. An actual controversy has arisen between plaintiff and defendants, wherein plaintiff contends that he is the owner of six hundred fifty thousand (650,000) shares of BLATANT stock, which stock represents ten percent (10%) of BLATANT's outstanding stock, and defendants deny this contention.
- 59. A declaration of the rights and obligations of the parties is necessary in order to determine plaintiff's ownership of the stock.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR MANDATORY INJUNCTION

(Against Defendants BLATANT and DOES 1-10)

- 60. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-59, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 61. Plaintiff is the owner of six hundred fifty thousand (650,000) shares of BLATANT stock, which shares represent ten percent (10%) of BLATANT's outstanding stock. Defendants refused to issue plaintiff a stock certificate representing his ownership of the shares.
- 62. A mandatory injunction is required to mandate defendants to issue plaintiff a share certificate for six hundred fifty thousand (650,000) shares of BLATANT stock.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR

ACCOUNTING AND APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER

(Against Defendants BLATANT and DOES 1-10)

- 63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-62, inclusive, of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 64. Plaintiff, as a shareholder of BLATANT, has demanded an accounting of its books and records, as well as a review of its financial records. None of the information demanded has been forthcoming and defendants remain in sole possession, custody and control of BLATANT's books and records. An order of the court mandating an accounting is required.
- 65. Unless a receiver is appointed by the court to take possession of, care for and to manage and operate BLATANT and its assets, such assets are in danger of being lost, removed or materially destroyed, since BLATANT's officers and directors are engaged in a pattern of conduct detrimental to the interest of BLATANT and its shareholders, as alleged above.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff demands judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

- For compensatory damages, including lost wages and benefits, profits, general damages, harm to reputation and emotional distress damages and according to proof at the time of trial but no less than \$1,000,000;
- For disgorgement of all of defendants' profits derived from THE
 ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS and associated with their misappropriation of
 ELLIOTT's proprietary and confidential information and trade secrets, and their
 failure to provide plaintiff with any compensation and/or credit;
- For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all requiring defendants and their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with or for them to be prohibited from using and exploiting any of the ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS, by producing, distributing, syndicating, broadcasting, and otherwise exploiting the

	ENTERTAINMENT PROJECTS and any of its ancillary rights, in any and all				
1	media and markets;				
2	4. For mandatory injunction requiring defendants to issue plaintiff a share certificate				
3	evidencing his owner of six hundred fifty thousand (650,000) shares of				
4 5	BLATANT stock;				
6	5. For an order rescinding the transfer of rights in Aladdin to defendants and a				
7	reversion of all such rights to plaintiff;				
8	6. For an accounting of BLATANT's books and records, from its inception to date;				
9	7. For an appointment of a receiver to take over management and control of				
10	BLATANT;				
11	8. For treble damages;				
12	9. For punitive damages;				
13	10. For attorneys' fees and costs;				
14	11. For prejudgment interest on all amounts claimed; and				
15	12. For any other and further relief that the court considers proper.				
16					
17	DATE: July 16, 2009 BARANOV & WITTENBERG, LLP				
18	By: 4:60				
19	Michael M. Baranov, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff, DAVID ELLIOTT				
20					
21	DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY				
2.2	Plaintiff demands that this case be tried by a jury.				
23					
24	DATE: July 16, 2009 BARANOV & WITTENBERG, LLP				
25	or hill				
26	Michael M. Baranov, Esq.				
2'	Attorneys for Plaintiff, DAVID ELLIOTT				
28					

		FOREGINAL CM-010			
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Ba		Los Angeles Superior Court			
MICHAEL M. BARANOV, SBN1451	.37				
BARANOV & WITTENBERG, LLP					
2049 CENTURY PARK EAST		JUL 16 2009			
SUITE 2250		302 10 2000			
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067 TELEPHONE NO.: 310.229.3500	FAX NO.:	latin & Oladea E			
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): PLAINTIFF, DAVI		John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk			
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LO		By SHAUNYA-WESLEY Deputy			
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. HILL STRE	ET	OF INCIDENT PROPERTY			
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. HILL STRE	ET				
CITY AND ZIP CODE: LOS ANGELES, CA	90012				
BRANCH NAME: CENTRAL					
CASE NAME: ELLIOTT V. BLATAN	FT .	DO44#464			
ON W. CARE COVER OFFEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER: BC417904			
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Counter Joinder				
X Unlimited Limited (Amount		nt JUDGE:			
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defenda (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)				
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)		DEPT:			
	elow must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).			
1. Check one box below for the case type that		Description of the Control of the Co			
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	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			
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case			
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)			
X Business tort/unfair business practice (0	7) Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment			
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)			
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint			
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)			
Intellectual property (19)	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)				
2. This case is _X_ is not comfactors requiring exceptional judicial man	iplex under rule 3.400 of the California Rul	les of Court. If the case is complex, mark the			
a. Large number of separately repr	esented parties d. Large number	of witnesses			
b. Extensive motion practice raising		with related actions pending in one or more courts			
issues that will be time-consumi	· ······	ies, states, or countries, or in a federal court			
c. Substantial amount of document		estjudgment judicial supervision			
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply):		declaratory or injunctive relief c. X punitive			
- ·					
4. Number of causes of action (specify): E		×			
	ass action sult.				
	and serve a notice of related case. (Year)	way use form CM-U15.)			
Date: JULY 16, 2009	27				
MECHAEL M. BARANOV, SBN1451	31 72 G CC	GNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)			
The section is a section in the sect	NOTICE				
Raintiff must file this cover sheet with the	first paper filed in the action or proceeding	g (except small claims cases or cases filed			
ាំ ្រី ហ៊ាder the Probate Code, Family Code, or	Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rule	s of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result			
in sanctions.	☐ Sanctions.				
#Île this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule. Fighth 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					
Figure parties to the action or proceeding.					
I hiess this is a collections case under ma	le 3.740 or a complex case, this cover she	eet will be used for statistical purposes only.			

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

	(02::::::::::		Superior Court.		
	This form is required p	ursuant to LASC Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles	Superior Court		
JUR Item Step the i	NYTRIAL? X YES CLA II. Select the correct of p 1: After first complete of margin below, and, p 2: Check one Super p 3: In Column C, circ any exception to the co	district and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", sking the Civil Case Cover Sheet Form, find the main civil case cover sheet he to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected. For Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature let the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action yourt location, see Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0. Table Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (See Column C below the county Courthouse Central District. 6. Location of property or perman	of this case. ou have checked. v) nently garaged vehicle.		
 Class Actions must be filed in the County Countriouse, Central District. May be filed in Central (Other county, or no Bodily Injury/Property Damage). Location where cause of action arose. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred. Location where performance required or defendant resides. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred. Location where one or more of the parties reside. Location where one or more of the parties reside. Location where one or more of the parties reside. Location where defendant/respondent functions who defendant resides. Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration. 					
	Α	B	C Applicable Reasons -		
	Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of Action (Check only one)	See Step 3 Above		
ם	Auto (22)	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.		
Auto	Uninsured Motorist (46)	A7110 Personal injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.		
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	A6070 Asbestos Property Damage A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.		
	Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.		
	Medical Malpractice (45)	A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 2., 4. 1., 2., 4.		
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	Personal Injury Property Damage A7230 Intentional Bodlly Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)			
ersonal Injury/Property Je/Wrongful Death Tort	Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 2., 3.		
	Civil Rights (08)	A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.		
	Defamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.		
ersonal Injur je/Wrongful	Fraud (16)	A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.		
7 0					

Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort (Cont'd.) CASE NUMBER SHORT TITLE: ELLIOTT V. BLATANT C Applicable Reasons В A Civil Case Cover Type of Action - See Step 3 Above (Check only one) Sheet Category No. 1., 2., 3. Professional A6017 Legal Malpractice Negligence 1., 2., 3. A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) (25)2., 3. A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort Other (35) **Employment** Wrongful Termination 1., 2., 3. A6037 Wrongful Termination (36)1., 2., 3. Other Employment Complaint Case A6024 Other Employment 10. (15)A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not Unlawful Detainer or wrongful 2., 5. Breach of Contract/ Warranty A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) 2., 5. (06)Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) 1., 2., 5. A6019 (not insurance) 1., 2., 5. A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) 2., 5., 6. Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff A6002 Collections 2., 5. (09)A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case Insurance Coverage 1., 2., 5., 8. A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex) (18)1., 2., 3., 5. 図 A6009 Contractual Fraud Other Contract 1., 2., 3., 5. (37)A6031 Tortious Interference 1., 2., 3., 8. A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) **Eminent** A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels _ Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14) Property Wrongful Eviction 2., 6. A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case 2., 6. A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure Real Other Real Property 2.,6. A6032 Quiet Title (26)2., 6. A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) Unlawful Detainer -A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction) 2., 6. Commercial (31) Detainer Unlawful Detainer -2., 6. A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction) Residential (32) Unlawful Unlawful Detainer -2., 6. A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs Drugs (38) Review A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case 2., 6. Asset Forfeiture (05) Judicial 2., 5. A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration ₽etition re Arbitration (11)

	SHORT TITLE: ELLIOT	T V. BLATANT CASE NUMBER	CASE NUMBER		
- 1	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) Other Judicial Review (39) Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review A6150 Other Writ / Judicial Review A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	2., 8. 2. 2. 2., 8.		
Provisionally Complex Litigetion	Construction Defect (10) Claims Involving Mass	A6007 Construction defect	1., 2., 3.		
	Tort (40) Securities Litigation (28)	A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.		
Provisio Li	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 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., 9.		
Z Z	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.		
Miscellaneous 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-comp A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.		
S	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.		
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	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.		

					·	·	
SHORT TITLE: ELLIOTT V. BL	ATANT			CASE NUMB	ER		
				<u> </u>			
Item III. Statement of Location: E other circumstance indicated in It	inter the addre	ess of the accident on Page 1, as the	t, party's re e proper re	sidence o	or place of t iling in the (business, pe court locatio	erformance, or on you selected.
REASON: CHECK THE NUMBER UNDER C	OLUMN C WHICH	APPLIES IN THIS CASE	ADDRESS:				
1. 22. 3. 4. 5.	6. 🗀 7. 🗀 8.	9. 10.	7421 BE	EVERLY	BLVD.		
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:					
LOS ANGELES	CA	90036	}				
Item IV. Declaration of Assignme foregoing is true and correct and	ent: I declare u	nder penalty of pe	erjury unde	r the laws	of the Stat	te of Califor	nia that the
COUNTY SUPERIOR courtho				District of	f the Los A	ngeles Sup	erior Court
(Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq.,				nd (d)).			
Dated: JULY 16, 2009			/(2	A.			<u></u> .
			MTOUN		ATURE OF ATTO	RNEY/FILING PAR	₹TY}
•			MICHA	בייון עבי	ACMINON.	BOY.	

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

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet form CM-010.
- 4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form LACIV 109 (Rev 01/07), LASC Approved 03-04.
- 5. Payment in full of the filling 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.