

FILED

1 **Judy Anne Mikovits**
2 **140 Acacia Ave. #5**
3 **Carlsbad, CA 92008**
4 **(805) 797-6967**
5 **jamikovits@me.com**

6 Attorney for Self: In Pro Per

2014 NOV 17 PM 4:42
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

BY: AA

7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

9 **CV 14-08909-SVW(PLA)**
Case No.

10 **JUDY ANNE MIKOVITS**

11 Plaintiff,

To be supplied by Clerk of USDC

12 vs.

13 **CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT**
14 **PURSUANT TO 42 USC Sec 1983**

15 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

16 **ADAM GARCIA, JAMIE MCGUIRE,**
17 **RICHARD GAMMICK, GEOFF DEAN,**
18 **THREE UNIDENTIFIED VENTURA**
19 **COUNTY DEPUTY SHERRIFFS,**
20 **F. HARVEY WHITEMORE, ANNETTE**
21 **F. WHITEMORE, CARLI WEST**
22 **KINNE, WHITEMORE-PETERSON**
23 **INSTITUTE, a Nevada corporation,**
24 **UNEVX INC., a Nevada corporation,**
25 **MICHAEL HILLERBY, KENNETH**
26 **HUNTER, GREG PARI and VINCENT**
27 **LOMBARDI.**

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Judy Anne Mikovits ("Plaintiff"), who presently resides in Carlsbad, California, representing herself pro se, and complaining against the Defendants Adam Garcia, Jamie McGuire, Richard Gammick, Geoff Dean, three unidentified Ventura County Deputy Sherriffs, F. Harvey Whittemore, Annette F. Whittemore, Whittemore-Peterson Institute, a Nevada corporation, UNEVX Inc., a Nevada corporation, Carli West Kinne, Michael Hillerby, Kenneth Hunter, Greg Pari and Vincent Lombardi, alleges as follows.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This action is brought pursuant to 42 USC Sec. 1983, and jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 USC Secs. 1331 and 1343. Plaintiff further invokes the pendant jurisdiction of this Court to hear and decide claims arising under state law.

2. The amount in controversy exceeds \$50,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

3. Venue is placed in this district because it is where the events complained of occurred.

4. Plaintiff demands a jury trial for all claims for which a jury trial is allowed.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Judy Mikovits, Ph.D. ("MIKOVITS" or "PLAINTIFF") was at all times material herein a citizen of the United States and a resident of Oxnard, California.

6. Defendant Adam Garcia ("CHIEF GARCIA") was at all times material herein a duly appointed and acting officer and Chief of Police of the Police Services Department of the University of Nevada at Reno ("UNR").

7. Defendant Jaime McGuire ("DETECTIVE MCGUIRE") was at all times herein a duly appointed and acting officer and Detective of the Police Services Department of UNR.

8. Defendant Richard Gammick ("D.A. GAMMICK") was at all times material herein the District Attorney of Washoe County, Nevada, in which UNR is located.

9. Defendant Geoff Dean ("SHERIFF DEAN") was at all times material herein the Sheriff of Ventura County, California.

10. The unidentified 3 Ventura County Deputy Sheriffs ("VENTURA DEPUTIES") were at all times material herein, duly appointed and acting as deputies of the Sheriff's Department of Ventura County, California.

11. Defendant F. Harvey Whittemore ("MR. WHITTEMORE") was at all times material herein the President of the UNR Foundation, a controlling equity owner of Defendant UNEVX (see below), a registered lobbyist and attorney admitted to practice in the State of Nevada, and the spouse of Defendant MRS. WHITTEMORE. MR. WHITTEMORE, widely described during that period as the most powerful lobbyist in Nevada, after the events related in

1 this Complaint, was subsequently convicted, and presently resides at the federal correctional
2 institution at Lompoc, California.

3 12. Defendant Annette F. Whittemore ("MRS. WHITTEMORE") was at all times material
4 herein the President of Defendant WPI (see below) and, together with her husband MR.
5 WHITTEMORE, a controlling equity owner of UNEVX.

6 13. Defendant Carli West KINNE ("KINNE") was at all times material herein a Vice
7 President of WP Biotechnologies, Inc., Legal Counsel for Defendant WPI, a registered attorney
8 admitted to practice in the State of Nevada, and MRS. WHITTEMORE'S niece. MR.
9 WHITTEMORE, MRS. WHITTEMORE and KINNE are sometimes referred to here as the
10 "WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS."

11 14. Defendant UNEVX Inc., a Nevada corporation, formerly known as VIPdx Inc.
12 ("UNEVX"), was at all times material herein a for-profit enterprise associated with the
13 WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS.

14 15. Defendant The Whittemore-Peterson Institute, a Nevada corporation ("WPI"), at all
15 times material herein was housed at, shared employees with, and subject to an Affiliation
16 Agreement with, UNR.

17 16. Defendant Kenneth Hunter, Sc.D. ("HUNTER") was at all times material herein is a
18 Professor of Immunology at UNR School of Medicine, and was the Chairman of the Scientific
19 Advisory Board of WPI.

20 17. Defendant Greg Pari, Ph.D. ("PARI") was at all times material herein is a Professor of
21 Immunology at UNR, Chairman of that Department, and a member of the Scientific Advisory
22 Board of WPI.

23 18. Vincent Lombardi, Ph.D. ("LOMBARDI") was at all times material herein an
24 employee of WPI and Director of Operations for UNEVX.

25 19. Michael Hillerby ("HILLERBY") was at all times material herein an independent
26 contractor engaged by WPI, and a former corporate officer of WPI.

20. At all times relevant to the allegations of this Complaint, and in all of their actions alleged herein, (a) Defendants CHIEF GARCIA, DETECTIVE McGUIRE, SHERIFF DEAN and the three VENTURA DEPUTIES were acting under color of law and pursuant to their respective authority as police officers and directly responsible supervisors in their respective police departments; (b) Defendant "D.A. GAMMICK" was acting under color of law and pursuant to his authority as District Attorney of Washoe County, Nevada; and (c) Defendants MR. WHITTEMORE, MRS. WHITTEMORE, KINNE, UNEVX, WPI, HUNTER, PARI, LOMBARDI and HILLERBY were acting in active conspiracy with Defendants CHIEF GARCIA, DETECTIVE McGUIRE and D.A. GAMMICK to cause the false imprisonment and other illegal actions claimed herein.

21. PLAINTIFF sues each and all Defendants in both their individual and official capacities.

22. The core of this Complaint is violation of PLAINTIFF'S federal Constitutional rights under color of law by virtue of false imprisonment, deliberate prevention of due process and defamation, all based on facially-meritless criminal and civil charges and a facially-defective alleged warrant, which were fabricated to detain, defame and thwart PLAINTIFF as a whistleblower, in a substantial case of Federal research grant fraud.

23. PLAINTIFF, a research scientist with a 25+ year professional career in immunology and virology, was from November, 2007 until September, 2011 the Principal Investigator (party primarily responsible to the federal grant agency) for an R-01 Grant from the US National Institutes of Health, entitled "Pathophysiology of ME/CFS," which had a five-year duration ending September, 2013 (the "NIH Grant"). The NIH Grant generally was directed towards detection and explanation of a series of possible virus phenomena related to Chronic Fatigue Syndrome ("CFS"), on which PLAINTIFF had published extensively in medical journals.

24. During that period, PLAINTIFF was employed as research director for WPI, and supervised multiple graduate and post-doctoral students in their related research including Defendant LOMBARDI. Her supervisor as an employee was MRS. WHITTEMORE.

1 25. During that same period, PLAINTIFF held an adjunct faculty appointment in the
2 Department of Immunology of UNR. Her supervisors as a faculty member were Defendants
3 HUNTER and PARI.

4 26. During June of 2011, PLAINTIFF determined that research conducted under her
5 direction at WPI, pursuant to the NIH Grant, indicated that a promising specific test procedure
6 developed by that lab, for possible detection of a hypothesized CFS retrovirus, had been
7 compromised, because the relevant cell samples were contaminated, and so the procedure and
8 conclusions were not scientifically reliable. This same conclusion was verified by other
9 independent immunologists consulting on the NIH Grant (but not affiliated with UNR).

10 27. Defendant LOMBARDI, a 2007 Ph.D. graduate, was responsible for the procedures
11 leading to the contamination. LOMBARDI's employment was supported part-time by the NIH
12 Grant, and part-time by UNEVX, a private company set up at the direction and under the control
13 of the WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS, to exploit that research and create a commercial diagnostic
14 test for profit. PLAINTIFF's investigation of the contamination primarily consisted of review of
15 employee work journals created under the NIH Grant ("NIH Grant Journals"), and confidential
16 patient data records indicating which cell samples related to which diagnoses ("NIH Grant
17 Personal Health Data").

18 28. In conducting that review, during July, 2011, she discovered that LOMBARDI had
19 put substantially all his time into UNEVX, and none into the NIH Grant project; and further that
20 he was using materials, data and text results that were paid for by the NIH Grant, instead for the
21 UNEVX for-profit project, against the terms of the NIH Grant and its funding and privacy
22 regulations for which she was principally responsible.

23 29. In August, 2011, PLAINTIFF submitted an independent study, showing that the
24 contaminated WPI study was in error, which article was accepted for publication in the
25 September 22, 2011 issue of *Science*, a major trade journal in medical research. That article had
26 the practical effect of invalidating the commercial diagnostic test that UNEVX and LOMBARDI
27 had recently begun to market. On or about September 2, 2011, PLAINTIFF informed the
28 WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS that she was terminating LOMBARDI from the NIH Grant staff,

1 as he had been drawing approximately 50% pay from the NIH Grant for about 2 years, but the
2 NIH Grant Journals demonstrated that he had performed substantially no work for it, and instead
3 placed all of his effort into the WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS' commercial project UNEVX
4 (known at the time as VIPdx).

5 30. On or about September 29, 2011, MRS. WHITTEMORE informed PLAINTIFF that
6 she was terminated, immediately locked the laboratory complex so that PLAINTIFF could not
7 retrieve any possessions or materials, and announced that all WPI employees were directed to
8 stay away from the facility for a week. On information and belief, MRS. WHITTEMORE
9 actively consulted with the other WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS and defendants HUNTER,
10 PARI, LOMBARDI and HILLERBY in the firing and abrupt closure. PLAINTIFF returned
11 home to California.

12 31. On November 18, 2011, DETECTIVE McGUIRE appeared at Plaintiff's residence,
13 misidentified herself as a patient of PLAINTIFF, speaking through the front door, with her
14 supervisor CHIEF GARCIA and three unidentified VENTURA DEPUTIES concealed, and then
15 when PLAINTIFF indicated that she did not recognize her, forced entry into PLAINTIFF's front
16 door, and handcuffed her, arrested her and detained her. DETECTIVE McGUIRE and the one
17 female VENTURA DEPUTIES immediately took PLAINTIFF to the sheriff's station at Ventura
18 County Courthouse.

19 32. CHIEF GARCIA and the two remaining male VENTURA DEPUTIES remained to
20 search PLAINTIFF'S residence, harassed PLAINTIFF's 73-year old spouse, and confiscated
21 various personal and professional items including computers and written records.

22 33. PLAINTIFF asked the VENTURA DEPUTIES for a warrant, at her residence at the
23 time of arrest, and was shown an otherwise-blank yellow piece of paper, with her name and
24 residential address, and a rubber stamp judge's approval imprint from the Ventura Superior Court,
25 listing no cause, listing no search scope or items sought, and indicating no arrest authority.
26
27
28

COUNT I

34. On information and belief, the defective alleged warrant was obtained and issued based on misrepresentations made by the WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS, LOMBARDI and HILLERBY and the active collusion of D.A. GAMMICK in conspiracy with MR. WHITTEMORE. As observed later in her eventual bail hearing, and by the dismissal of the criminal allegations, there never was any colorable flight risk, and there never were any colorable criminal charges warranting arrest.

35. Defendants WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS, WPI, LOMBARDI and HILLERBY committed fraud by claiming that PLAINTIFF had removed copies of certain NIH Grant Journals and NIH Grant Personal Health Data from the WPI lab (the "Key Materials"), without a basis for that claim. On information and belief, they knew that no such materials could have been removed by PLAINTIFF.

36. On information and belief, Defendants LOMBARDI, HILLERBY and UNEVX deliberately despoiled evidence of the location of the Key Materials while all regular employees of WPI were locked out of the facility.

37. Defendants WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS also created fraudulent contracts, with a forged signature allegedly from PLAINTIFF, to use as evidence that the WPI Key Materials were subject to some proprietary confidentiality interests.

38. These misrepresentations were made in order to detain PLAINTIFF in a Ventura County jail, on false criminal charges and fraudulent assertions of flight risk, during the period of time when she otherwise would have acted to defend herself in Nevada, in a just-filed Nevada State Court action by WPI relating to the Key Materials, set for hearing on November 22, 2011, the fifth day of her incarceration. No information about the cause or intent of her detention was provided to Plaintiff at the time of her arrest.

39. Shortly after PLAINTIFF's arrest, MR. WHITTEMORE contacted Plaintiff's husband, David Nolde, and informed him that he was seeking the WPI Key Materials, and that Plaintiff might be released before Thanksgiving (November 24th) if they were found. This was the first indication offered to PLAINTIFF regarding the motive for the arrest.

1 official, regarding the basis for the extraordinary enforcement actions sought, for purposes of
2 retaliation rather than justice; or he willfully disregarded it on the basis of his relationship with
3 MR. WHITEMORE.

4 44. Defendant D.A. GAMMICK committed wrongful denial of due process against
5 PLAINTIFF, and actively cooperated in misuse of legal process against PLAINTIFF, with
6 resulting personal injury, loss of career economic value, and grave defamation.

7 COUNT III

8 45. On information and belief, the factual and legal misrepresentations made by the
9 WHITEMORE PRINCIPALS, LOMBARDI and HILLERBY with the active collusion of D.A.
10 GAMMICK relied on fraudulent forged documentation, which was facially apparent from a
11 cursory examination of the document. D. A. GAMMICK conspired with the WHITEMORE
12 PRINCIPALS, LOMBARDI and HILLERBY by failing to inquire or exercise good judgment, as a
13 law enforcement official, regarding the evidence of any colorable claim.

14 46. This same forged evidence was put into evidence again in 2013 -- in PLAINTIFF's
15 later Chapter 7 federal bankruptcy proceeding, which PLAINTIFF initiated on advice of counsel
16 after having been rendered unable to pursue a career by Defendants' actions described herein -- in
17 a proof of claim submitted for WPI by Defendant KINNE under penalty of perjury. That proof of
18 claim reasserted the forged contract, which had been given credibility by the original conspiracy.

19 47. The Defendants WHITEMORE PRINCIPALS, WPI, LOMBARDI, HILLERBY and
20 D.A. GAMMICK conspired to defraud PLAINTIFF, with resulting personal injury, loss of career
21 economic value, and grave defamation.

22 COUNT IV

23 48. The defective alleged warrant created in Ventura State Court, on which the foregoing
24 arrest was made, contained no indicia of cause, scope or harm; it was fatally vague and invalid.
25 It could not properly be used as a basis for immediate arrest and indefinite detention. On
26 information and belief, it was issued on the basis of knowingly fraudulent statements directly
27 made to the Ventura Superior Court by CHIEF GARCIA and DETECTIVE McGUIRE,
28 employed as police officers by UNR, in service of the WHITEMORE PRINCIPALS'

1 commercial interests. CHIEF GARCIA and DETECTIVE McGUIRE conspired with the
2 WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS by failing to inquire or exercise good judgment, as law
3 enforcement officials, regarding any colorable evidence justifying extraordinary and immediate
4 cross-border arrest sought without a colorable criminal charge; or they willfully disregarded that
5 or knowingly lied, on the basis of MR. WHITTEMORE's relationship with UNR.

6 49. Defendants CHIEF GARCIA and DETECTIVE McGUIRE committed false
7 imprisonment and wrongful denial of due process against PLAINTIFF, with resulting personal
8 injury, loss of career economic value, and grave defamation.

9 COUNT V

10 50. The defective alleged warrant created in Ventura State Court, on which the foregoing
11 arrest was made, contained no indicia of cause, scope or harm; it was fatally vague and invalid.
12 It could not properly be used as a basis for immediate arrest and indefinite detention. This would
13 be apparent on its face to any arresting officer asked to honor or support an arrest or a search from
14 another jurisdiction.

15 51. SHERIFF DEAN and the three unidentified VENTURA DEPUTIES under his direct
16 supervision were in a position to independently assess the circumstances and gravity of the UNR
17 Police Department's request for evidence justifying extraordinary and immediate cross-border
18 arrest without a colorable criminal charge. They were in a position to review the alleged warrant
19 as well. They failed to inquire or exercise good judgment, as law enforcement officials, regarding
20 any colorable basis for the extraordinary actions sought by CHIEF GARCIA and DETECTIVE
21 McGUIRE; or they willfully disregarded that lack of basis.

22 52. Defendants SHERIFF DEAN and the three VENTURA DEPUTIES committed false
23 imprisonment and wrongful denial of due process against PLAINTIFF, with resulting personal
24 injury, loss of career economic value, and grave defamation.


COUNT VI

53. PLAINTIFF was released from detention in Ventura County late on November 22nd, hours after the conclusion of the Nevada State Court Action hearing in Reno. Defendant CHIEF GARCIA, acting in conspiracy with the WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS, demanded immediately upon PLAINTIFF's release, via her new attorney, that she travel to Reno to appear in the Nevada State Court Action, under threat of re-arrest. During that proceeding in Nevada State Court, Defendants escorted PLAINTIFF to a located where members of the news media were stationed and, at the request of the press, required PLAINTIFF to submit to mugshot photographs later used in scientific trade journals and local press.

54. Defendants CHIEF GARCIA, acting in conspiracy with the WHITTEMORE PRINCIPALS, committed false imprisonment and wrongful defamation against PLAINTIFF, with resulting loss of career economic value, and grave injury to her reputation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment from the Defendants, and each of them, in both their individual and official capacities, and seeks (a) compensatory and punitive damages; (b) injunctive or mandamus relief to void the Adams Injunction so as to permit her to defend and vindicate herself, and as evidence of certain claims made herein; (c) attorney's fees, costs and interests and (d) such other relief as Plaintiff may be entitled.

Dated: November 17, 2014

By: 
Judy Anne Mikovits

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL COVER SHEET

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself ☒) <u>JUDY ANNE MIKOVITS</u>	DEFENDANTS (Check box if you are representing yourself ☐) <u>GARCIA, MCGUIRE, GAMMICK, DEAN, FHWWHITE</u> <u>AF WHITTEMORE, KINNE, WPI, LAFEVK, HILLERBY</u> <u>HUNTER, PAKI, LOMBARDI & 3 UNKNOWN</u>
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff <u>SAN DIEGO</u> (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant <u>WASHOE, NV</u> (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information. <u>JUDY ANNE MIKOVITS</u> <u>140 ACACIA AVE, APTS</u> <u>CARLSBAD CA, 92008</u> <u>805-759-6617</u>	Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information.
---	--

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.) ☐ 1. U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 2. U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 3. Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) ☒ 4. Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES -For Diversity Cases Only (Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant) <table style="width:100%;"> <tr> <td style="width:33%;">Citizen of This State</td> <td style="width:10%;">PTF ☒ 1</td> <td style="width:10%;">DEF ☐ 1</td> <td style="width:33%;">Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State</td> <td style="width:10%;">PTF ☐ 4</td> <td style="width:10%;">DEF ☐ 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen of Another State</td> <td>☐ 2</td> <td>☒ 2</td> <td>Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State</td> <td>☐ 5</td> <td>☐ 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country</td> <td>☐ 3</td> <td>☐ 3</td> <td>Foreign Nation</td> <td>☐ 6</td> <td>☐ 6</td> </tr> </table>	Citizen of This State	PTF ☒ 1	DEF ☐ 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State	PTF ☐ 4	DEF ☐ 4	Citizen of Another State	☐ 2	☒ 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	☐ 5	☐ 5	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6
Citizen of This State	PTF ☒ 1	DEF ☐ 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State	PTF ☐ 4	DEF ☐ 4														
Citizen of Another State	☐ 2	☒ 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	☐ 5	☐ 5														
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6														

IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)

☒ 1. Original Proceeding	☐ 2. Removed from State Court	☐ 3. Remanded from Appellate Court	☐ 4. Reinstated or Reopened	☐ 5. Transferred from Another District (Specify)	☐ 6. Multi-District Litigation
--	--	---	--	---	---

V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes ☐ No (Check "Yes" only if demanded in complaint.)

CLASS ACTION under F.R.Cv.P. 23: ☐ Yes ☒ No **MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT:** \$ 750,000

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)

42 U.S.C. 1983

VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)

OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CONT.	IMMIGRATION	PRISONER PETITIONS	PROPERTY RIGHTS
☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/Etc. ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Org. ☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act ☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Admin. Procedures Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Vet.) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Vet. Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property TORTS PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Fed. Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury-Med Malpractice ☐ 365 Personal Injury-Product Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions TORTS PERSONAL PROPERTY ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability BANKRUPTCY ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS ☒ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/Accommodations ☐ 445 American with Disabilities-Employment ☐ 446 American with Disabilities-Other ☐ 448 Education	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus/Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinement FORFEITURE/PENALTY ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other LABOR ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Employee Ret. Inc. Security Act	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405 (g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405 (g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609

CV 14 - 08909

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Case Number:

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL COVER SHEET**

VIII. VENUE: Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

QUESTION A: Was this case removed from state court? ☐ Yes ☒ No If "no," skip to Question B. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.	STATE CASE WAS PENDING IN THE COUNTY OF: ☐ Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo ☐ Orange ☐ Riverside or San Bernardino	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS: Western Southern Eastern	
QUESTION B: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a PLAINTIFF in this action? ☐ Yes ☒ No If "no," skip to Question C. If "yes," answer Question B.1, at right.	B.1. Do 50% or more of the defendants who reside in the district reside in Orange Co.? <i>check one of the boxes to the right</i> →	YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Southern Division. ☐ Enter "Southern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there. ☐ NO. Continue to Question B.2.	
	B.2. Do 50% or more of the defendants who reside in the district reside in Riverside and/or San Bernardino Counties? (Consider the two counties together.) <i>check one of the boxes to the right</i> →	YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Eastern Division. ☐ Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there. NO. Your case will initially be assigned to the Western Division. ☐ Enter "Western" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.	
QUESTION C: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a DEFENDANT in this action? ☐ Yes ☒ No If "no," skip to Question D. If "yes," answer Question C.1, at right.	C.1. Do 50% or more of the plaintiffs who reside in the district reside in Orange Co.? <i>check one of the boxes to the right</i> →	YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Southern Division. ☐ Enter "Southern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there. ☐ NO. Continue to Question C.2.	
	C.2. Do 50% or more of the plaintiffs who reside in the district reside in Riverside and/or San Bernardino Counties? (Consider the two counties together.) <i>check one of the boxes to the right</i> →	YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Eastern Division. ☐ Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there. NO. Your case will initially be assigned to the Western Division. ☐ Enter "Western" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.	
QUESTION D: Location of plaintiffs and defendants?	A. Orange County	B. Riverside or San Bernardino County	C. Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo County
Indicate the location(s) in which 50% or more of <i>plaintiffs who reside in this district</i> reside. (Check up to two boxes, or leave blank if none of these choices apply.)	☐	☐	☐
Indicate the location(s) in which 50% or more of <i>defendants who reside in this district</i> reside. (Check up to two boxes, or leave blank if none of these choices apply.)	☐	☐	☒
D.1. Is there at least one answer in Column A? ☐ Yes ☐ No If "yes," your case will initially be assigned to the SOUTHERN DIVISION. Enter "Southern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there. If "no," go to question D2 to the right. →	D.2. Is there at least one answer in Column B? ☐ Yes ☐ No If "yes," your case will initially be assigned to the EASTERN DIVISION. Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below. If "no," your case will be assigned to the WESTERN DIVISION. Enter "Western" in response to Question E, below. ↓		
QUESTION E: Initial Division?	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD		
Enter the initial division determined by Question A, B, C, or D above: →	WESTERN DIVISION		
QUESTION F: Northern Counties?			
Do 50% or more of plaintiffs or defendants in this district reside in Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo counties? ☒ Yes ☐ No			

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL COVER SHEET**

IX(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed in this court?

☒ NO ☐ YES

If yes, list case number(s):

IX(b). RELATED CASES: Is this case related (as defined below) to any civil or criminal case(s) previously filed in this court?

☒ NO ☐ YES

If yes, list case number(s):

Civil cases are related when they (check all that apply):

- ☐ A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;
- ☐ B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or
- ☐ C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

Note: That cases may involve the same patent, trademark, or copyright is not, in itself, sufficient to deem cases related.

A civil forfeiture case and a criminal case are related when they (check all that apply):

- ☐ A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;
- ☐ B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or
- ☐ C. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

**X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY
(OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):**

DATE: 11/17/2014

Notice to Counsel/Parties: The submission of this Civil Cover Sheet is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. For more detailed instructions, see separate instruction sheet (CV-071A).

Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))