SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

Cherilyn Sarkisian a.k.a. Cher, Isis Productions, Inc., Lindsay Scott, Roger Davies, and Does 1-50, Inclusive,

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

Jacquelyn Dowsett Ballinger, Suzanne M. Easter, and Kevin Wilson.

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles

SEP 18 2014

Sherri R. Cartor Executive Officer/Clerk By, Deputy
--

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. [AVISOI Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT WEST DISTRICT 1725 MAIN STREET, SANTA MONICA, CA 90401

CASE NUMBER: Número del Caso):				
varior out outpy.	SC	123	3	ĺ

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): PERRY C. WANDER, 9454 WILSHIRE BLVD, PH, BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212, (310)274-9985.

DATE: SEP 18 207	Sherri R. Carter, Clerk	Clerk, by (Secretario)	TA	PAVA LEVIS	, Deputy (Adjunto)
	summons, use Proof of Service of Sur esta citatión use el formulario Proof o NOTICE TO THE PERSON SER 1 as an individual defenda 2 as the person sued und	mmons (form POS-0 of Service of Summon ovED: You are serve ant.	ns, <i>(POS-0</i> d	<i>"</i>	
		orporation) efunct corporation) ssociation or partner	ship)	CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.70 (conser CCP 416.90 (authori	vatee)
	d other (specify): 4 by personal delivery on	(date):			Page 1 of 1

CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles

SEP 18 2014

Strent R. Car	len Executive O	fficer/Cleri
By \		Denuty

LAW OFFICES OF PERRY C. WANDER

Perry C. Wander, Esq. (SBN: 102523) 9454 Wilshire Blvd., Penthouse Suite

Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Telephone: 310-274-9985 Facsimile: 310-274-9987

pcwlaw@msn.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs' Jacquelyn D. Ballinger, Suzanne M. Easter, and Kevin Wilson

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGLES

6

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

JACQUELYN DOWSETT BALLINGER, SUZANNE M. EASTER,

PLAINTIFFS,

AND KEVIN WILSON.

VS.

CHERILYN SARKISIAN A.K.A. CHER, ISIS PRODUCTIONS, INC., LINDSAY SCOTT, ROGER DAVIES, AND DOES 1-50, INCLUSÍVE,

DEFENDANTS.

Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF:**

- 1. WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY
- 2. EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RETALIATION
- 3. EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BASED ON **RACE**
- 4. EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE
- 5. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 ET SEQ. 6. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

LISA HART COLE

5 2015

DEPTO

Date

8:30AM

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

24

23

25

26 27

28

Plaintiffs Jacquelyn Dowsett Ballinger ("Ballinger"), Suzanne M. Easter ("Easter"), and Kevin Wilson ("Wilson"), hereby allege, based upon information and belief, except as to allegations concerning Plaintiffs, or their counsel, which allegations are made upon Plaintiff's personal knowledge, against Defendants Cherilyn Sarkisian ("Cher") Isis Productions, Inc. ("Isis"), Lindsay Scott ("Scott"), Roger Davies ("Davies"), , and DOES 1-50 (collectively "Defendants"), as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This lawsuit is being filed against the actress and singer known as Cher an American singer and actress, who according to Wikipedia, is "recognized for having brought the sense of female autonomy and self-actualization into the entertainment industry". That was then, this is now.
- 2. Despite this claim of female empowerment, Cher was personally involved in the cover-up of a sexual assault against a female fan by one of her other male dancers while on Cher's Dressed to Kill Tour ("D2K Tour"). The assault occurred in a St. Louis hotel room where Cher and her tour employees were staying.
- 3. The cover-up surfaced when Plaintiffs, who were employed by Cher as dancers/choreographer, with over a decade of experience on previous Cher tours, were abruptly fired after reporting this criminal incident to tour management, despite previously signing employment contract extensions to remain on the second leg of the tour which runs through the end of the 2014 year. The purported reason given for the firing was "budget cuts".
- 4. The lawsuit also alleges that Cher made a racist comment when she stated, while reviewing tapes of auditions for dancers, that; "the tour had too much color" and prohibited her choreographer from casting any dark skinned blacks.
- 5. This was because Wilson, Cher's choreographer and Easter, a dancer, are dark skinned African Americans.

- 6. This pattern of racism and discrimination continued to permeate the tour when Wilson was prohibited by Cher and tour management from casting any dark skinned African Americans who auditioned, even if they danced better than their white counterparts.
- 7. One month after the report of the assault, all three whistleblowers were fired, whilst the dancer whom they accused of sexual assault remained gainfully employed. After Plaintiffs retained counsel and notified tour management of their employment discrimination claims the dancer was put on "probation".
- 8. Plaintiffs' allege that their termination was unrelated to any purported budget cuts and that the reasoning provided was pretextual. The media recently reported that Cher's D2K Tour is on track to become one of the most successful treks of 2014. Billboard reports that the diva's tour grossed a reported \$54.9 million through the end of its first leg on July 11 and sold out all 49 shows. Due to the tour's huge success, the tour was extended for a second leg of shows through the end of the year and should make Cher the highest grossing tour of 2014.
- 9. In addition, for the second leg of the tour, Cher brought in Bob Mackie to remake all of her costumes, incurring at least \$100,000 per outfit in additional expense for EACH costume. Cher goes through over a dozen costume changes during her show. All of these actions are incongruous with Defendants' use of "budget cuts" as the reasoning behind Plaintiffs' terminated employments.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

Defendants have conducted and continue to conduct business in the State of California. Also, Defendants have purposefully availed themselves of the privilege of conducting business activities within the State of California by employing workers within the State. Defendants generally have maintained systematic and continuous business contacts with California. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon

alleges that at all times here and mentioned the individual defendants named herein are residents of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

11. Venue is proper in this district, as the cause of action arose within this judicial district and the contract was entered into within this judicial district and the principal defendant herein resides within this judicial district.

PARTIES

- 12. Plaintiffs Easter and Wilson are residents of the County of Los Angeles, California and Plaintiff Ms. Ballinger is a resident of the State of Hawaii.
- 13. Isis Production, Inc. is a California corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business at 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California, 90212.
- 14. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Cher, Scott, and Davies ("Individual Defendants") are, at all times herein mentioned, employed by defendant Isis and, in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course and scope of their employment.
- 15. Plaintiffs are informed and thereon allege on information and belief that there exists, at all times herein mentioned, a unity of interest between Defendant Cher and the Corporate Defendant Isis, such that any individuality and separateness between Cher and Isis have ceased, and Isis is the alter ego of Cher, who remains its sole director and officer.
- agent, representative, partner, and/or alter-ego of its co-defendants, or otherwise acting on behalf of each and every remaining defendant and, in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course and scope of their authorities as an agent, representative, partner, and/or alter ego of its co-defendants, with the full knowledge, permission, and consent of each and every remaining defendant, each co-defendant having ratified the acts of the other co-defendants.

17. At all relevant times herein, DOES 1-50 inclusive, were fictitious names for individuals, partnerships, joint ventures, corporations, limited liability corporations or other forms of legal entities, the identities of which are unknown at the present but who are liable to the Plaintiffs for committing the acts and/or omissions mentioned herein. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to allege the true names of DOES 1 through 50 when Plaintiffs learn those names.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 18. This action arises out of Defendants' unlawful and unfair employment practices at the Cher "Dressed to Kill" ("D2K") tour, where Plaintiffs have been employed as dancers, and in Wilson's case, a dancer and choreographer. Plaintiffs are pursuing claims of wrongful termination in violation of the provisions of California *Labor Code* Section 1102.5, which imposes liability where any person acting on the employer's behalf retaliates against an employee who engages in protected whistleblowing activity.
- 19. Plaintiffs were hired by Cher's production company, Defendant Isis. Plaintiff Ballinger was hired in 2009, Plaintiff Easter was hired in 1999, and Plaintiff Wilson was hired in 2002.
- 20. On or about June 3, 2014, after Cher's D2K Louisville show, another dancer on the show invited a female fan he met on tour named 'Jenn' to come stay in his room in St. Louis. 'Jenn' later complained to Ms. Ballinger, who was staying in the adjacent connecting room, that this co-dancer pressured Jenn to have sex with him. When she refused, the dancer became angry. 'Jenn' asked for Ms. Ballinger not to leave Jenn alone and for help, to which Ms. Ballinger obliged.
- 21. On June 8, 2014 the incident was relayed to Ms. Easter, who found it so disturbing that she went to Cher's tour director, Doriana Sanchez, and Cher's vocal assistant, Dennis Thomas. Ms. Easter relayed that she was deeply troubled by the incident and was subsequently taken to tour management, where she communicated what she knew of the incident.

- 22. The individuals present in the room at the time were Bill Buntain, tour accountant and coordinator, Nancy Shefts, tour manager, Hannah Hollings, road manager, and Doriana Sanchez, tour director. At their insistence, Plaintiff Wilson was asked to join Ms. Easter in another meeting with Cher's manager, Lindsay Scott, to report this complaint again. Present in Scott's office were Lindsay Scott, Bill Buntain, and Doriana Sanchez.
- 23. Ms. Easter and Mr. Wilson told Lindsay Scott about the alleged sexual assault and sexual harassment perpetrated by the dancer toward the young woman in his hotel room. Ms. Easter and Mr. Wilson were instructed not to tell anyone what had transpired, not to alert Dowsett of this conversation, and were informed that management would "take care of the situation."
- 24. The tour went on a break from June 12 to June 18, 2014, during which Plaintiffs were assured that the situation would be dealt with. When the tour resumed on June 19, 2014, the perpetrating co-dancer was still employed and the incident remained unmentioned. Ms. Easter returned to Doriana Sanchez to inquire as to why the Dancer was still on the tour and no action had been taken. Ms. Easter was assured once again that "management would deal with the situation."
- 25. Earlier this year, Cher auditioned new dancers for the tour with Mr. Wilson, who choreographed the show. A minority female dancer particularly impressed Mr. Wilson and Doriana Sanchez. When presented to Cher, Cher commented, "We have too much color onstage" and requested a white, blonde dancer. Mr. Wilson was instructed not to cast anymore dark skinned black dancers on the tour. A blonde haired, blue-eyed female was subsequently hired. Despite Mr. Wilson taking vast offense to this incredibly discriminatory comment, in fear of losing his job, Mr. Wilson did not respond to this outrageous, insensitive racist remark.

26. On July 20, 2014, Plaintiffs Wilson, Easter, and Ballinger were terminated from the tour, whilst the alleged sexual assailant remained gainfully employed.

- 27. Upon termination of Plaintiffs' employment, they filed complaints to pursue remedies under the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing ("DFEH") and requested right-to-sue letters pursuant to *Government Code* Section 12965(b). The DFEH issued right-to-sue notices to Plaintiff Ballinger, Easter and Wilson on August 4, August 5, and September 14, 2014, respectively.
- 28. Plaintiff Easter was presumptively discriminated against based on age, as she is over forty years old. According to the "McDonnell-Douglas Test" any plaintiff claiming age discrimination over the age of 40 raises a presumption of discrimination. Plaintiff Wilson and Easter both were discriminated against based on race, as they are both African American. In fact, Plaintiffs Wilson and Easter were the only two dark skinned African-Americans in the show's cast. All Plaintiffs were discriminated against based on retaliation, as they exposed their co-workers sexual assault to Defendants and were subsequently terminated.
- 29. Defendants allege that Plaintiffs' terminations arise solely from efforts to "down-size" the D2K performance as a result of budget cuts. This assertion directly conflicts with recent news reports that each of the forty-nine shows on the hugely successful D2K tour sold out. Cher's current CD "Dressed to Kill" debuted at number three on the Billboard Pop Charts and includes the number one dance hit "Woman's World." Moreover, the D2K tour has received some of the best reviews of Cher's career and has grossed a reported \$54.9 million through only the end of its first leg on July 11. Because of the show's vast success, a second leg of the tour has been extended through the end of the year.
- 30. Defendants' budget cut claims are further undercut by the tour's voluntary replacement of two dancers, which incurred additional costs in auditions

and rehearsals. These costs include payment of studio rental space, personnel, out-of-town dancer accommodations, and wardrobe re-sizing.

- 31. The lawsuit is based in part on California's Whistleblower Statute, Labor Code Section 1102.5, which imposes liability on any entity or person who retaliates against an employee who engaged in protected whistleblowing activity. The statute protects employees from retaliation for making internal complaints about suspected violations of federal or state law. The law also extends whistleblower protections to employees who report behavior that they reasonably believe to be illegal to a supervisor, or other employee with authority to "investigate, discover or correct."
- 32. Once it has been demonstrated that whistleblowing activity was a contributing factor in the termination of the employee, the employer has the burden of proof to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that the alleged action would have occurred for legitimate, independent reasons.
- 33. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants in this action will not be able to meet that burden of proof, as Defendants cannot demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that the firings of her long tenured dancers occurred because of "budget cuts".

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION BY ALL PLAINTIFFS AGAINST ALL

<u>DEFENDANTS AND DOES 1-50, INCLUSIVE</u> (Violation of California Labor Code § 1102.5 (Whistle-Blower Statute)

- 34. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 35. During the entire period of Plaintiffs' employment, and including Plaintiffs' last month of employment, Plaintiffs made numerous and repeated complaints to employees, managers, supervisors and managing agents of Defendants, and each of them, of violation of State law and/or Federal law, regarding the sexual assault of a female fan by an employee of defendant Isis while on tour.

- 36. Defendants, and each of them, retaliated against Plaintiff for complaining about the foregoing violations of State and/or Federal law to Defendants, and each of them, and wrongfully terminated Plaintiffs on or about July 20, 2014, in violation of California *Labor Code* § 1102.5. When Plaintiffs were wrongfully terminated, Plaintiffs' complaints of violations of State and/or Federal law were a motivating factor and/or reason in Plaintiffs' termination.
- 37. By the acts herein alleged and in violation of California *Labor Code* § 1102.5, Defendants, and each of them, made, adopted, and enforced rules, regulations, and policies preventing Plaintiffs from disclosing information to government and law enforcement agencies, where Plaintiff had reasonable cause to believe that Defendants, were violating (1) unfair business practices laws, California *Business and Professions Code* § 17200 et seq.
- 38. By the aforesaid acts and conduct of Defendants, each Plaintiff has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages pursuant to California *Civil Code* § 3333 including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, attorney's fees, and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained, for which Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend when ascertained.
- 39. As a direct and legal result of the acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs were rendered disordered, both internally and externally, and suffered, among other things, numerous internal injuries, severe fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. The exact nature and extent of said injuries are not known to the Plaintiffs, who will pray leave of court to insert the same when they are ascertained. Plaintiffs do not at this time know the exact duration or permanence of said injuries, but are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that some of the said injuries are reasonably certain to be permanent in character.

- 40. The aforementioned acts of Defendants, and each of them, were willful, wanton, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable and were done in willful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Plaintiffs, and were done by managerial agents and employees of Defendants and DOES 1 through 100, and with the express knowledge, consent, and ratification of managerial agents and employees of Defendants and DOES 1 through 100, thereby justifying the awarding of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at the time of trial, but not less than ten million dollars (\$10,000,000).
- 41. As a result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged herein, Plaintiffs are entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of said suit as specifically provided in California *Code Of Civil Procedure* § 1021.5.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION BY ALL PLAINTIFFS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS AND DOES 1-50, INCLUSIVE (For Employment Discrimination Based On Retaliation Government Code § 12940)

- 42. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 43. At all times herein mentioned, the public policy of the State of California, as codified, expressed and mandated in California *Government Code* § 12940 was to prohibit employers from discriminating and retaliating against any individual. This public policy of the State of California is designed to protect all employees and to promote the welfare and well-being of the community at large. Accordingly, the actions of Defendants, and each of them, in discriminating, retaliating and terminating Plaintiff on the grounds of stated above, or for complaining about such discrimination and retaliation, was wrongful and in contravention and violation of the express public policy of the State of California, and the laws and regulations promulgated thereunder.

- At all times herein mentioned, the public policy of the State of California, as codified, expressed and mandated in California Labor Code § 1102.5, was to prohibit employers from discriminating against, retaliating against and terminating any individual on the grounds of their complaining of unlawful activity or refusing to commit an unlawful act, i.e. complaining of Unfair Business Practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq. and violations of California Government Code § 12650 et seq. This public policy of the State of California is designed to protect all employees and to promote the welfare and well being of the community at large. Accordingly, the actions of Defendants, and each of them, in discriminating, harassing and retaliating and constructively terminating Plaintiff on the grounds alleged and described herein were wrongful and in contravention and violation of the express public policy of the State of California, to wit, the policy set forth in California Labor Code § 1102.5, et seq., and the laws and regulations promulgated thereunder.
- 45. By the aforesaid acts and conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs have been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages pursuant to California *Civil Code* § 3333 including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, medical and related expenses for care and procedures both now and in the future, attorneys fees, and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained, for which Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend when ascertained.
- 46. As a direct and legal result of the acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs were rendered sick, sore, lame, disabled and disordered, both internally and externally, and suffered, among other things, numerous internal injuries, severe fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. The exact nature and extent of said injuries are not known to the Plaintiffs, who will pray leave of court to insert the same when they are ascertained.

47. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants, as aforesaid, Plaintiffs have been caused, and did suffer, and continue to suffer severe and permanent emotional and mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. The exact nature and extent of said injuries is presently unknown to plaintiff, who will pray leave of court to assert the same when they are ascertained.

- 48. The aforementioned acts of Defendants, and each of them, were willful, wanton, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable and were done in willful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Plaintiffs, and were done by managerial agents and employees of Defendants and DOES 1 through 50, and with the express knowledge, consent, and ratification of managerial agents and employees of Defendants and DOES 1 through 50, thereby justifying the awarding of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at the time of trial, but not less than ten million dollars (\$10,000,000).
- 49. As a result of the discriminatory acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged herein, Plaintiffs are entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of said suit as specifically provided in California *Code of Civil Procedure* § 1021.5.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION BY PLAINTIFFS WILSON AND EASTER AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS AND DOES 1-50, INCLUSIVE (For Employment Discrimination Based On Race California Government Code§ 12900 Et Seq.)

- 50. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 51. At all times relevant to this complaint, California Government Code § 12900 et seq. and its implementing regulations were in full force and effect. Under California Government Code § 12940(a), it is unlawful for an employer to terminate or otherwise discriminate against a person in compensation or in terms of

condition or privileges of employment on account of age, disability, national origin, race, religion or sex.

- 52. As set forth above, Plaintiffs Wilson and Easter are African-American persons and members of a protected class.
- 53. Plaintiff Suzanne Easter's race was a motivating factor in Defendants' decision to discriminate against and eventually terminate Easter. Such discrimination violates *Government Code* § 12940(a) and has resulted in damage to Plaintiff Easter.
- 54. Plaintiff Kevin Wilson's race was a motivating factor in Defendants' decision to discriminate against, harass and eventually terminate Wilson. Such discrimination violates *Government Code* § 12940(a) and has resulted in damage to Plaintiff Wilson.
- 55. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiffs Easter and Wilson have each suffered damages including, but not limited to, loss of income and benefits, and have suffered emotional distress and other damages.
- 56. In doing the things alleged herein, Defendants' conduct was despicable. Defendants acted toward Plaintiffs Wilson and Easter with malice, oppression, fraud, and with willful and conscious disregard to Plaintiffs' rights, entitling each Plaintiff to awards of punitive damages, in a sum according to proof at trial, but not less than ten million dollars (\$10,000,000).
- 57. As a result of the discriminatory acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged herein, Plaintiffs are entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of said suit as specifically provided in California *Code of Civil Procedure* § 1021.5.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION BY PLAINTIFF EASTER

AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS AND DOES 1-50, INCLUSIVE

(For Employment Discrimination Based On Age Govt. Code § Sec. 12940 (A))

- 58. Plaintiff Easter hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 59. Plaintiff Easter was at all times material hereto an employee governed by *Government Code* § 12940(A) ("FEHA"), among other things, prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of age.
- 60. Easter is a member of a class protected by FEHA, in that she is an African American woman over the age of 40.
- 61. Defendants have wrongfully and unlawfully discriminated against her because of her age in violation of the FEHA by engaging in the course of conduct set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint, as well as herein and below. Easter's age was a motivating factor in Defendants' acts with respect to Easter.
- 62. Defendants' actions toward Easter constitute unlawful discrimination against her in the terms, conditions and privileges of her employment based on age, in violation of Section 12940(a) of the FEHA.
- 63. As a proximate result of Defendants' discriminatory actions against her, in violation of the FEHA, Easter has been harmed in that she has suffered the loss of the wages, salary, benefits, seniority, and additional amounts of money she would have received if she had not been discriminated against by Defendants. As a result of such discrimination and consequent harm, Easter has suffered damages in an amount according to proof.
- 64. As a further proximate result of Defendants' discriminatory actions against Easter, as alleged above, in violation of the FEHA, Easter has been harmed in that Easter has suffered the intangible loss of such employment-related opportunities and Easter suffered harm to her reputation, employability and earning capacity.

- 65. As a result of such discrimination and consequent harm, Easter suffered damages in an amount according to proof.
- 66. As a further proximate result of Defendants' discriminatory actions against her in violation of the FEHA, Easter has been harmed in that she has suffered humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress, and has been injured in mind and body as follows: Easter has suffered and continues to suffer sleeplessness, crying spells, anxiety, and irritability. As a result of such discrimination and consequent harm, Easter has suffered damages in an amount according to proof.
- 67. As a result of the discriminatory acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged herein, Plaintiffs are entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of said suit as specifically provided in California *Code of Civil Procedure* § 1021.5.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION BY ALL PLAINTIFFS AGAINST

ALL DEFENDANTS AND DOES 1-50, INCLUSIVE

(For Violation Of California's Unfair Competition Law Business And Professions Code Section 17200)

- 68. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 69. Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq. defines unfair competition to include any "unfair," "unlawful" or "deceptive" business practice. California's Unfair Competition Law also provides for injunctive relief and restitution for violations.
- 70. Defendants have committed numerous unfair, unlawful, or deceptive business practices described herein and these practices have worked to the detriment of Plaintiffs and others.
- 71. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that

 Defendants continue to engage in the practices described herein and is continuing and

affirmatively re-hire Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege

28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

		CM-01		
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State & LAW OFFICES OF PERRY C. WANDE 9454 WILSHIRE BLVD. PH BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212	sar number, and address): R	ON CHARLED OF V ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles		
TELEPHONE NO.: 310-274-9985 ATTORNEY FOR (Nome): PLAINTIFFS	FAX NO.:	SEP 18 2014		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF L STREET ADDRESS: 1725 MAIN STREE		Sherri R. Carter Executive Officer/Clerk By, Deputy		
MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: SANTA MONICA, BRANCH NAME: WEST DISTRICT	CA 90401			
CASE NAME: BALLING V. CHER				
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER: 0 (102121		
Unlimited Limited		SC (23/3)		
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	WROS 1104 ***		
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defen	dant JUDGE: LISA HART COLE		
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)			
	low must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).		
1. Check one box below for the case type the				
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 types (41)		
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)			
Business tort/unfair business practice (07	,	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)	Stron potation (not opcomed azoro) (15)		
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)			
 This case is is is not comp factors requiring exceptional judicial manage 	lex under rule 3.400 of the California Rul	es of Court. If the case is complex, mark the		
a. Large number of separately repres	ented parties d. Large number	of witnesses		
b. Extensive motion practice raising of		vith related actions pending in one or more courts		
issues that will be time-consuming		es, states, or countries, or in a federal court		
c. Substantial amount of documentar		stjudgment judicial supervision		
Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.[✓ monetary b. ✓ nonmonetary; de	claratory or injunctive relief c. 🗾 punitive		
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 6				
	action suit.			
if there are any known related cases, file ar	nd serve a notice of related case (You ma	ay use form CM-015()		
Date: SEPTEMBER 17, 2014	1)	Λ Λ Λ		
PERRY C. WANDER		Mary		
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		NATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)		
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the fire	NOTICE V st paper filed in the action or proceeding	(except small claims cases or cases filed		
in sanctions.		of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result		
 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		Page 1 of 2		
orm Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.30, 3.220, 3.400–3.403, 3.740; Cal. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10 www.courtinfo.ca.gov		

SHORT TITLE: BALLING V. CHER	CASE NUMBER
	1

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

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.				
Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case: JURY TRIAL? ✓ YES CLASS ACTION? ✓ YES LIMITED CASE? ✓ YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 5 ✓ HOURS/ DAYS				
tem II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):				
Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A , the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.				
Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case.				
Step 3: In Column C , circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0.				
Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)				
 Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, 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 of property or permanently garaged vehicle. Location where petitioner resides. Location where petitioner resides. Location where need or more of the parties reside. Location of Labor Commissioner Office 				

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above
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)	☐ 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., 4. 1., 4.
Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	A7270 Intertional infliction of Emotional Distress	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

Auto

SHORT TITLE: BALLING V. CHER

CASE NUMBER

Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort Employment Contract Real Property Unlawful Detainer

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above
Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Defamation (13)	☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	□ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice ☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
Other (35)	□ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	☑ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	☐ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	 □ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) □ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach - Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) □ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) □ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) 	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	☐ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
Insurance Coverage (18)	☐ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Other Contract (37)	 □ A6009 Contractual Fraud □ A6031 Tortious Interference □ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) 	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
l	 □ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure □ A6032 Quiet Title □ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) 	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	□ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE: BALLING V. CHER

CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forfeiture (05)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
riew	Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review	Writ of Mandate (02)	□ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus □ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter	2., 8.
Judi	This of manages (ob)	☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
ion	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	□ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
Litiga	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
mplex	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	□ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
ily Co	Securities Litigation (28)	☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	☐ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Pro	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	☐ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
		□ A6141 Sister State Judgment	2., 9.
ent ent	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.
Enforcement of Judgment		- ,	2., 9.
info			2., 8.
m 0			2., 8.
		□ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8., 9.
nts	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints		☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.
Com	Other Complaints	A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.
Miso	(Not Specified Above) (42)	☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
- 0		☐ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case 2	2., 8.
. [☐ A6121 Civil Harassment	2., 3., 9.
suos		☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9.
lane etiti	Other Petitions	☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	` '	☐ A6190 Election Contest	l.
E 0	(43)	☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.
İ		A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	., 3., 4., 8.
		A6100 Other Civil Petition 2	., 9.
		A6100 Other Civil Petition 2	., 9.

SHORT TITLE: BALLING V. CH	IER	CASE NUMBER	
			cident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or othe the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.
REASON: Check the appropunder Column C for the type this case.	of action that you ha	e selected for	ADDRESS: ISIS PRODUCTIONS, INC. 9100 WILSHIRE BLVD. #1000 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212
□1. □2. ☑3. □4. □]5. □6. □7. □8. [□9. □10.	
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:	
BEVERLY HILLS	CA	90212	
and correct and that the at	bove-entitled matter	is properly file	rjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true d for assignment to the SANTA MONICA courthouse in the nia, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and	(d)].		
Dated: SEPTEMEBR 17, 20	014		(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

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, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 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.