RICHARD A. LEVINE, ESQ., State Bar No. 091671 SILVER, HADDEN, SILVER, WEXLER & LEVINE 1428 Second Street P.O. Box 2161 Santa Monica, CA 90407-2161 (310) 393-1486 Telephone (310) 395-5801 Fax Attorneys for Plaintiffs JOHN AKI and RIVERSIDE COUNTY DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE 10 RIC 1408586 11 JOHN AKI and RIVERSIDE COUNTY CASE NO.: DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, **ASSOCIATION** INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY 13 RELIEF Plaintiffs, 14 V. 15 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE; RIVERSIDE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, PAUL [Unlimited Civil Action] 16 ZELLERBACH, DISTRICT ATTORNEY; DOES 1 - 20, inclusive, Defendants. 18 19 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION 20 For a First Cause of Action by Plaintiff John Aki against Defendants County of 21 Riverside, Riverside District Attorney's Office, Paul Zellerbach, District Attorney; Does 1 - 20, 22 for violation of 42 United States Code 1983 allege as follows 23 At all times mentioned herein Plaintiff John Aki was a Deputy District Attorney 24 employed in the Riverside District Attorney's Office for the County of Riverside and was the 25 President and/or member of the Board of Directors of the Plaintiff Riverside County Deputy 26 District Attorneys Association. 27

At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff Riverside County Deputy District

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

3.

Attorneys Association was a recognized employee organization as defined in California Government Code Section 3501, formally recognized by the County to represent employees in the Riverside District Attorney's Office, including Deputy District Attorneys on all matters relating to employment conditions and employer-employee relations, including but not limited to wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment.

- 4. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant County of Riverside (hereinafter referred to as "County") was, and is, a public agency organized and existing under the laws and Constitution of the State of California and operated the Riverside District Attorney's Office with its principal place of business within the venue and jurisdiction in this Court. Defendants County and Riverside District Attorney's Office were "persons" within the meaning of 42 United States Code Section 1983 charged by its laws and ordinances with the general supervision of employees in the Riverside District Attorney's Office.
- 5. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant Paul Zellerbach was the District Attorney for the County of Riverside and charged with the administration and management of the Office of Riverside District Attorney and, in that capacity, approved and administered the policies and practices complained herein.
- 6. Plaintiffs are unaware of the true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of Defendants named herein as DOES 1 20, inclusive. Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend its Complaint to allege said Defendants' true names and capacities when the same are ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and thereon alleges that said fictitiously named Defendants are responsible in some manner for the injury to the Plaintiff alleged herein.
- 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are, and were at all times mentioned herein, the agents, employees of the remaining co-Defendants. Further, Plaintiffs alleges that Defendants were acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment.
- 8. Plaintiff John Aki commenced employment as a Deputy District Attorney with the Riverside District Attorney's Office in January 1998. During the course of his employment

.9

with the District Attorney's Office, Aki performed his prosecutorial duties with professionalism and skill and had been selected as Prosecutor of the Year on five (5) occasions, as well a National Capital Litigation trial lawyer of the year.

- 9. During the term of office of Zellerbach as District Attorney, significant labor relations controversies arose between Zellerbach and Aki as President and/or member of the Board of Directors of the Plaintiff Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys Association, including but not limited to litigation concerning Zellerbach's intention to terminate approximately 10 recently hired Deputy District Attorneys and replace with new employees selected by Zellerbach, controversy respecting Zellerbach's intended hiring as a Deputy District Attorney of a political supporter who was alleged involved in prosecutorial/unethical misconduct during his former employment in another District Attorney's office, and Association grievances filed against the Riverside District Attorney's Office regarding computer-camera surveillance capabilities within the workplace and invasion of privacy of nursing female Deputy District Attorneys.
- 10. In or about March 2013, Mike Hestrin, then Deputy District Attorney for the County of Riverside announced his candidacy against Zellerbach for the office of District Attorney for the County of Riverside.
- County of Riverside, and their agents and employees engaged in a pattern of retaliation, discrimination, restraint and/or interference with the exercise of Plaintiff John Aki's statutory and constitutional rights and privilege to engage in free speech, political activity and participation in activities as President and/or Board Director of the recognized employee organization, Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys Association, respecting the support of the candidacy of Mike Hestrin (then Deputy District Attorney for the Riverside District Attorney's Office) for the upcoming election for the office of District Attorney of the County of Riverside against the Defendant incumbent Paul Zellerbach, as well as in retaliation for the exercise of Aki's responsibilities as Association President respecting labor relations matters.

- During the course of the political campaign for the election of District Attorney, Plaintiff Aki endorsed, and actively engaged off-duty in political activity in support of the candidacy of Mike Hestrin for District Attorney, and participated in the creation and/or issuance of public statement, press releases and campaign materials in support of the Hestrin campaign which was critical of the performance of Zellerbach in his duties as District Attorney, as well as addressed relevant law enforcement issues in the community and presenting Hestrin's vision for an improved District Attorney's Office under new leadership.
- transferred from the downtown Riverside office of the District Attorney (Western Division) where he had been assigned throughout his 17 year career to the Indio office (Eastern Division) contrary to well-established past practice in the District Attorneys' Office. The involuntary reassignment was motivated by District Attorney Zellerbach in order to facilitate monitoring of Plaintiff's off-duty campaign activities in support of Mike Hestrin, interfere with such campaign activities, and for the purpose of deliberately imposing hardship and burden on Plaintiff by a commute of approximately 4 hours roundtrip from Plaintiff's then recently relocated residence in Murrieta.
- Paul Zellerbach and his agents and employees had secretly conducted an administrative investigation regarding Plaintiff Aki as to the propriety of his legitimate utilization of a annual leave day- off to conduct Association/political activity on the scheduling of a criminal trial assigned to Plaintiff. In addition, Defendants and their agents and employees, without legal justification, conducted administrative investigations of Aki in an effort to discover misconduct and impose disciplinary action.
- 25. On or about January 9, 2014, Plaintiff Aki discovered District Attorney Paul Zellerbach and his agents and employees caused the removal of Plaintiff from his on-call responsibilities on Officer Involved Shooting investigations of which he had been assigned for approximately 10 years and thereby deprived Plaintiff corresponding compensation of which Plaintiff was otherwise entitled.

- 16. Commencing in or about July, 2014 and subsequent to Paul Zellerbach reelection loss to Mike Hestrin for the office of District Attorney, Aki was reassigned to the Gang Unit of the District Attorney's Office which was a less desirable and prestigious assignment.
- The Defendants, and each of them, have committed the herein illegal acts and conduct under color of statute, ordinances, regulations, customs and/or usages of the State of California, County of Riverside, and have deprived Plaintiff Aki of his rights, privileges and immunities secured to him as a result of Defendants illegally retaliating against Plaintiff Aki in the exercise of his First Amendment constitutional right of free speech and political activity and was denied equal protection in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.
- 18. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff Aki has suffered actual damages, including but not limited to loss of salary, benefits, diminution of retirement benefits, increased transportation expenses, and compensatory damages for violation of constitutional and statutory rights including, but not limited to, humiliation, indignity, loss of professional and personal reputation, physical and emotional injuries in an amount according to proof and in excess of \$25,000.00.
- 19. Defendant Zellerbach has willfully, wantonly and intentionally acted to oppress and injure the Plaintiff Aki as the result of Plaintiff's legitimate exercise of his constitutional right of free speech, participation in an election campaign, and participation in activities of the recognized employee organization justifying an award of punitive damages against Defendant Zellerbach in a sum according to proof.
- 20. Unless and until equitable relief is issued by this Court, including a mandatory injunction restoring Plaintiff Aki to his assignment in the downtown Riverside office of the District Attorney (Western Division), and on-call responsibilities on Officer Involved Shooting investigations, and enjoining the Defendants from enforcing their unconstitutional policies and practices against Plaintiff Aki, Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable injury and loss as a result of Defendants violating Plaintiff's constitutional rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Title 42 United States Code Section 1983.

- 21. On February 20, 2014, Plaintiff Aki filed a Claim for Damage with the County of Riverside which was rejected by the County on March 10, 2014.
- 22. Plaintiff Aki is entitled to attorneys fees against Defendants in accordance with 42 U.S.C. Section 1988.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

- 23. For a Second Cause of Action by Plaintiff Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys Association against Defendants County of Riverside, Riverside District Attorney's Office Paul Zellerbach, District Attorney and Does 1 20, for violation of 42 United States Code 1983 reallege paragraphs 22 and further allege as follows:
- Attorneys Association, as a recognized employee organization for employees in the Riverside District Attorney's Office, including Deputy District Attorneys, were vested with Constitutional rights, including First Amendment right to engage in freedom of association, free speech, political activity and participation in activities of their employee organization, and the right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, without retaliation, discrimination, restraint and/or interference by the County of Riverside, District Attorney Paul Zellerbach or their agents or employees.
- 25. In or about May 2013, the Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys
 Association endorsed Mike Hestrin (then Deputy District Attorney for the Riverside District
 Attorney's Office) for the upcoming election for the office of District Attorney of the County of
 Riverside against incumbent Paul Zellerbach.
- 26. During the course of the political campaign for the election of District Attorney, the Association issued and/or endorsed Hestrin campaign materials critical of the performance of Zellerbach in his duties as District Attorney, as well as addressed relevant law enforcement issues in the community and presenting Hestrin's vision for an improved District Attorney's Office under new leadership.
 - 27. As the direct and proximate result of the Plaintiff Association and its members

First Amendment right to engage in free speech, political activity and participation in activities of their employee organization, including the endorsement and support of Mike Hestrin for the District Attorney, Plaintiff Association and its members were subjected to retaliation, intimidation, coercion, discrimination, including but not limited to punitive transfers, unlawful public disclosure of confidential personnel information, false and stigmatizing disclosure of confidential personnel information, for the exercise of their First Amendment constitutional right of free speech and political activity and denied equal protection in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

- 28. In undertaking the aforesaid actions, Defendants sought to chill the Association's constitutional rights to freedom of association and freedom of speech by engaging in retaliation, intimidation, coercion, discrimination for the exercise of such rights.
- 29. Plaintiff Association seeks general, special, and punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them in excess of \$25,000.00 and according to proof, excepting that punitive damages are sought against Defendant Zellerbach alone.
- 30. Unless and until equitable relief is issued by this Court, including enjoining the Defendants from enforcing their unconstitutional policies and practices against Plaintiff
 Association and its members, Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable injury and loss as a result of Defendants violating Plaintiff's constitutional rights under the First and Fourteenth
 Amendment of the United States Constitution and Title 42 United States Code Section 1983.
- 31. On February 20, 2014, Plaintiff Association filed a Claim for Damage with the County of Riverside which was rejected by the County on March 10, 2014.
- 32. Plaintiff Association is entitled to attorneys fees against Defendants in accordance with 42 U.S.C. Section 1988.

1 /

33. For a Third Cause of Action by Plaintiffs John Aki and Riverside County
Deputy District Attorneys Association against Defendants County of Riverside, Riverside
District Attorney's Office, and Does 1-20 for violation of 42 United States Code 1983- Monell
Claim (Free Speech, Freedom of Association, Political Activity, Equal Protection), Plaintiffs
reallege paragraphs 32 and further allege as follows:

- 34. In perpetrating the above-described acts and omissions, County of Riverside and the Riverside Sheriff's Department and Does 1-20, inclusive, were, at all relevant times herein public entities of the State of California. Defendants' above-described acts and omissions constitute cognizable state action under color of state law.
- 35. In perpetrating the above-described acts and failures to act, the Defendants, and each of them, engaged in a pattern, practice, policy, tradition and/or custom of restraining Plaintiffs' free speech, political activity and freedom of association by harassing, retaliating and interfering with such rights in violation of the First Amendment and by depriving Plaintiffs equal protection in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution as well as corresponding California Constitutional protections. Because rights under the federal and state Constitutions are federally protected, Defendants violated Plaintiffs' rights under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.
- 36. At all relevant times herein, there existed within the County of Riverside and/or the Riverside District Attorney's Office a pattern, policy, practice, tradition, custom, and usage of harassment and retaliation against employees who engaged in free speech, political activity of right of association against the interests of Defendant Paul Zellerbach, which resulted in a deliberate indifference to Plaintiffs' exercise of Constitutional rights.
- 37. At all relevant times herein, the conduct by Defendant Paul Zellerbach and agents and employees of the County of Riverside was also pursuant to official policy and/or practice of the County, and/or policymaking authority by the County, and/or authorized or ratified by the County and/or committed with deliberate indifference to Plaintiffs' exercise of Constitutional rights.

38. The acts set forth herein also constituted a policy, practice, or custom of ordering, ignoring, encouraging, causing, tolerating, sanctioning, and/or acquiescing in the violation by County personnel of the Constitutional rights of employees.

- 39. The acts and failures to act as alleged herein also result from a custom, practice, or policy of inadequate training and a deliberate indifference to the rights of employees engaging in free speech and political activity, and the injuries suffered by Plaintiffs as alleged herein were caused by such inadequate training.
- 40. As the direct and legal result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer reasonable, foreseeable and ascertainable damages, including but not limited to loss of earnings, and other employment benefits, physical and emotional injuries, anxiety, embarrassment, humiliation in amount in excess of \$25,000.00 and according to proof.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 41. For a Fourth Cause of Action by Plaintiffs John Aki and the Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys Association against Defendants County of Riverside, Riverside District Attorney's Office, Paul Zellerbach, District Attorney and Does 1 20, for violation of California Constitution, Article 1, Section 1, Plaintiffs reallege paragraphs 1-16, 21, 25-28, 31 and further allege as follows:
- 42. At all times mentioned herein, California Constitution Article I, Section 1 provided in pertinent part as follows:

"All people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and obtaining safety, happiness and privacy."

43. Defendants, and each of them, in violation of Article I, Section 1 of the California Constitution, have engaged in retaliation, intimidation, coercion, discrimination for

- 44. Plaintiffs seeks general, special, and punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them.
- Unless and until equitable relief is issued by this Court, including enjoining the Defendants from enforcing their unconstitutional policies and practices against Plaintiffs, they will continue to suffer irreparable injury and loss.
- 46. On February 20, 2014, Plaintiffs filed Claims for Damage with the County of Riverside which were rejected by the County on March 10, 2014.
- 47. Plaintiffs are entitled to attorneys fees against Defendants in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure 1021.5

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 48. For a Fifth Cause of Action by Plaintiffs John Aki and the Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys Association against Defendants County of Riverside, Riverside District Attorney's Office, Paul Zellerbach, District Attorney and Does 1 20, for violation of California Constitution, Article I, Section 2, Plaintiffs reallege paragraphs 1-16, 21, 25-28, 31 and further allege as follows:
- 49. At all times mentioned herein, California Constitution, Article 1, Section 2(a) provided in pertinent portion that: "Every person may freely speak, write and publish his or her sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of this right."
- 50. Defendants, and each of them, in violation of Article I, Section 2(a) of the California Constitution, have engaged in retaliation, intimidation, coercion, discrimination for the exercise of such rights.
- 51. Plaintiffs seeks general, special, and punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them.
- 52. Unless and until equitable relief is issued by this Court, including enjoining the Defendants from enforcing their unconstitutional policies and practices against Plaintiffs, they will continue to suffer irreparable injury and loss.

11 12

13 14

15

16

1718

19

20

21.

23

22

24

26

28

- 53. On February 20, 2014, Plaintiffs filed Claims for Damage with the County of Riverside which were rejected by the County on March 10, 2014.
- 54. Plaintiffs are entitled to attorneys fees against Defendants in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure 1021.5

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 55. For a Sixth Cause of Action by Plaintiffs John Aki and the Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys Association against Defendants County of Riverside, Riverside District Attorney's Office, Paul Zellerbach, District Attorney and Does 1 20, for violation of California Constitution, Article I, Section 3, Plaintiffs reallege paragraphs 16, 21, 25-28, 31 and further allege as follows:
- 56. At all times mentioned herein, California Constitution, Article 1, Section 3 provided in pertinent portion that: "The people have the right to instruct their representatives, petition for redress of grievances, and assemble freely to consult for the common good."
- 57. Defendants, and each of them, in violation of Article I, Section 3 of the California Constitution, have engaged in retaliation, intimidation, coercion, discrimination for the exercise of such rights.
- 58. Plaintiffs seeks general, special, and punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them.
- 59. Unless and until equitable relief is issued by this Court, including enjoining the Defendants from enforcing their unconstitutional policies and practices against Plaintiffs, they will continue to suffer irreparable injury and loss.
- 60. On February 20, 2014, Plaintiffs filed Claims for Damage with the County of Riverside which were rejected by the County on March 10, 2014.
- 61. Plaintiffs are entitled to attorneys fees against Defendants in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure 1021.5

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 62. For a Seventh Cause of Action by Plaintiffs John Aki and the Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys Association against Defendants County of Riverside, Riverside District Attorney's Office, Paul Zellerbach, District Attorney and Does 1 20, for violation of Government Code Section 3502 and 3506, Plaintiffs reallege paragraphs 16, 21, 25-28, 31 and further allege as follows:
- 63. At all times mentioned herein, Government Code Section 3502 provided in pertinent portion that "public employees shall have the right to form, join, and participate in the activities of employee organizations of their own choosing for the purpose of representation on all matters of employer-employee relations."
- 64. At all times mentioned herein, Government Code Section 3506 provided that "Public agencies and employee organizations shall not interfere with, intimidate, restrain, coerce or discriminate against public employees because of their exercise of their rights under Section 3502".
- 65. Defendants, and each of them, in violation of Government Code Sections 3502 and 3506, have engaged in retaliation, intimidation, coercion, discrimination for the exercise of such rights.
- 66. Plaintiffs seeks general, special, and punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them.
- 67. Unless and until equitable relief is issued by this Court, including enjoining the Defendants from enforcing their unlawful policies and practices against Plaintiffs, they will continue to suffer irreparable injury and loss.
- 68. On February 20, 2014, Plaintiffs filed Claims for Damage with the County of Riverside which were rejected by the County on March 10, 2014.
- 69. Plaintiffs are entitled to attorneys fees against Defendants in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure 1021.5

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 70. For a Eighth Cause of Action by Plaintiffs John Aki and the Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys Association against Defendants County of Riverside, Riverside District Attorney's Office, Paul Zellerbach, District Attorney and Does 1 20, for violation of Government Code Section 3506.5, Plaintiffs reallege paragraphs 1-16, 21, 25-28, 31 and further allege as follows:
- 71. At all times mentioned herein, Government Code Section 3506.5 provided in pertinent portion:

"A public agency shall not do any of the following:

- (a) Impose or threaten to impose reprisals on employees, to discriminate or threaten to discriminate against employees, or otherwise to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees because of their exercise of rights guaranteed by this chapter."
- 72. Defendants, and each of them, in violation of Government Code Sections 3506.5, have engaged in retaliation, intimidation, coercion, discrimination for the exercise of such rights.
- 73. Plaintiffs seeks general, special, and punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them.
- 74. Unless and until equitable relief is issued by this Court, including enjoining the Defendants from enforcing their unlawful policies and practices against Plaintiffs, they will continue to suffer irreparable injury and loss.
- 75. On February 20, 2014, Plaintiffs filed Claims for Damage with the County of Riverside which were rejected by the County on March 10, 2014.
- 76. Plaintiffs are entitled to attorneys fees against Defendants in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure 1021.5.

25

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

26

27

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

28

Association pray for judgment against Defendants, and each of them as follows: For general damages in excess of \$25,000.00 and according to proof, special and punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, excepting that punitive damages are For equitable relief, including a mandatory injunction restoring Plaintiff Aki to his assignment in the downtown Riverside office of the District Attorney (Western Division) and on-call responsibilities on Officer Involved Shooting investigations, and enjoining the 10 Defendants from enforcing their unconstitutional policies and practices against Plaintiffs. For declaratory adjudication decreeing the legal rights and obligations of the For attorneys fees pursuant to 42 United States Code 1988 and/or Code of Civil For such other and further relief as this Court may deem necessary and proper. SILVER, HADDEN, SILVER, WEXLER & LEVINE By: RICHARD A. LEVINE Attorneys for Plaintiff

Riverside DA Aki. Association lawsuit 8.1.14.wpd

		CM-010
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bail Richard A. Levine, Esq. (SBN: 91671)	r number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Silver, Hadden, Silver, Wexler & Levine	•	
P.O. Box 2161		
Santa Monica CA 90407-2161	ENVIO (210) 205 5901	
TELEPHONE NO.: (310) 393-1486 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): John Aki and Riversi	de County Deputy District Attor	nevs
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF R		
STREET ADDRESS: 4050 Main Street	, ordice	
MAILING ADDRESS: 4050 Main Street	•	
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Riverside CA 92501-	-3703	
BRANCH NAME: Riverside Court		
CASE NAME:		
John Aki, et al. v. County of Riversi	de, et al.	
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:
Unlimited Limited	Counter Joinder	RIC 1408586
(Amount (Amount		JUDGE:
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defendation (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
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:		
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)	Construction defect (10) 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)
Business tort/unfair business practice (07	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment
Civil rights (08)	<u>Unla</u> wful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19)	j Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Professional negligence (25)	Judiciai 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/ is notcomplex 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 e Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts issues that will be time-consuming to resolve in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court		
c Substantial amount of documenta		· · ·
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a	. monetary b. nonmonetary;	declaratory or injunctive relief c. ✓ punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 8	•	
5. This case ☐ is ☑ is not a cla	ss action suit.	•
6. If there are any known related cases, file a	and serve a notice of related case. (You	may use form CM-015.)
Date: September 4, 2014		a comment
Richard A. Levine, Esq.		
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	·	SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
	NOTICE	an James and annual interiment appear on appear filed
• 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. 		

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE 4050 Main Street - 2nd Floor Riverside, CA 92501 www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

NOTICE OF DEPARTMENT ASSIGNMENT AND CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE (CRC 3.722)

AKI VS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

CASE NO. RIC1408586

This case is assigned to the Honorable Judge John D. Molloy in Department 10 for all purposes.

The Case Management Conference is scheduled for 03/03/15 at 8:30 in Department 10.

The plaintiff/cross-complainant shall serve a copy of this notice on all defendants/cross-defendants who are named or added to the complaint and file proof of service.

Any disqualification pursuant to CCP section 170.6 shall be filed in accordance with that section.

Requests for accommodations can be made by submitting Judicial Council form MC-410 no fewer than five court days before the hearing. See California Rules of Court, rule 1.100.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that I am currently employed by the Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, and that I am not a party to this action or proceeding. In my capacity, I am familiar with the practices and procedures used in connection with the mailing of correspondence. Such correspondence is deposited in the outgoing mail of the Superior Court. Outgoing mail is delivered to and mailed by the United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, the same day in the ordinary course of business. I certify that I served a copy of the foregoing NOTICE on this date, by depositing said copy as stated above.

Court Executive Officer/Clerk