

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

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

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

SP PLUS CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive.

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

IKE CERALDE, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the general public,

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
4/21/2023 4:37 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By D. Jackson Aubry, Deputy Clerk

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.

¡AVISO! 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): Stanley Mosk Courthouse

111 North Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

23STCV09036

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's 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):

Roman Otkupman, Nidah Farishta: 5743 Corsa Ave, Suite 123, Westlake Village, CA 91362; (818)293-5623

DATE: 04/21/2023
(Fecha)

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court
Clerk, by _____, Deputy
(Secretario) D. Jackson Aubry (Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.
2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3. ☐ on behalf of (specify):

under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation)	☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)
☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)	☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)	☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
☐ other (specify):	
4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

Roman Otkupman, CSBN 249423

Roman@OLFLA.com

Nidah Farishta, CSBN 312360

Nidah@OLFLA.com

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION

5743 Corsa Ave., Suite 123,

Westlake Village, CA 91362

Telephone: (818) 293-5623

Facsimile: (888) 850-1310

Attorney for Plaintiff,

Ike Ceralde, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the general public

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
4/21/2023 4:37 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By D. Jackson Aubry, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

IKE CERALDE, on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated, and on behalf of the
general public,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SP PLUS CORPORATION, a Delaware
Corporation, and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO. **23STCV09036**

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE § 226.7, 512 and 558);**
- 2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE § 226.7, 512 and 558);**
- 3. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2);**
- 4. KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS (LABOR CODE § 226(a), (e), 1174(d);**
- 5. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DUE AT TERMINATION (LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);**
- 6. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY EMPLOYEES IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 204(a)(b);**
- 7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR BUSINESS EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE § 2802);**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

8. **FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL HOURS WORKED, INCLUDING OVERTIME HOURS WORKED IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE § 210, 218);**

9. **FAILURE TO PROVIDE PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT THAT IS SAFE AND HEALTHFUL IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE §§ 6400, 6401, 6403, 6404, 6407, 8 CCR 3202);**

10. **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF, Ike Ceralde (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and other “aggrieved employees” complains of Defendants as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Class Action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of Plaintiff and certain individuals who are employed by, or were formerly employed by, SP Plus Corporation and any subsidiaries or affiliated companies (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) within California.

2. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the present (the “liability period”).

3. Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods and were also unable to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were forced to continue working through their meal and rest breaks in order to assist Defendant’s needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were unable to take their required meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages of one hour’s pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

1 4. Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-
2 exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in
3 excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a
4 workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of
5 Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per
6 week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate.
7 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for
8 all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all
9 overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

10 5. Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately
11 itemized wage statements. As Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendants' California
12 employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all
13 gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of
14 Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable
15 hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of
16 Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. These
17 violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants'
18 California employees.

19 6. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's
20 California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code §
21 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and
22 Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not accurately
23 reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest
24 premiums, and total hour worked.

25 7. Our client further alleges that Defendants paid him and Defendant's California
26 employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they
27 were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of
28 Defendants' failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they
were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates
Labor Code §§ 201-203.

 8. Defendant pays Plaintiff and it's California employees on a bi-weekly basis and has

1 failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must
2 be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the
3 violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of
4 their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b).

5 9. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the
6 equipment they purchased to perform work for Defendant such as face masks. Moreover, Defendant
7 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for their uniform and uniform
8 maintenance. Defendant further failed to reimburse its California employees for using their personal
9 cell phones for the benefit of Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall
10 indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in
11 direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties." As such, Plaintiff and Defendant's
12 California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job
13 duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

14 10. Defendants failed to continue to take precautions to ensure employee safety after the
15 onset of COVID. Under LC §6409.6(a)(1). "COVID-19" means severe acute respiratory syndrome
16 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, directly after the
17 onset of COVID, were required to partake in mandatory temperature and health checks, but these
18 activities were not enforced or practiced quickly after the onset of COVID and when COVID was
19 still a health risk to the employees. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were also
20 required to provide their own masks at the workplace. As a result of these practices, Defendants have
21 violated Cal. Labor Code §§ 6400, 6401, 6402, 6403, 6404, and 6407 for failure to provide a safe
22 and healthful environment for their Employees, as outlines above. Defendants are liable for civil
23 penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 2699 *et seq.*

24 11. Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California
25 employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these
26 practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked,
27 including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages
28 owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendants are liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure
to pay wages as required by law.

12. Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees bring this claim pursuant to *Business &*

1 *Professions Code* § 17200, et seq. The conduct of all Defendants as alleged above has been and
2 continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees.

3 13. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all proposed Plaintiff Class members (specifically,
4 the "California Class" as defined herein), brings this action pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,
5 and 558, Labor §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, Labor § 226(a)(e), 1174(d), Labor Code § 201-203, Labor
6 Code § 204(a)(b), Labor § 2802, Labor § 210, 218, Labor § 6400.

7 14. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to Code
8 of Civil Procedure § 395. Defendants operate within the State of California. The unlawful acts
9 alleged herein took place in Los Angeles, California.

10 **II. PARTIES**

11 **A. PLAINTIFF**

12 15. Plaintiff Ike Ceralde is a resident of Glendale, California. At all times relevant
13 herein, he was employed by Defendants in Los Angeles County, California. Plaintiff was employed
14 by Defendants as a non-exempt, hourly employee in California, including in and around the city of
15 Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles. During Plaintiff's employment:

- 16 A. Plaintiff did not receive final wages upon termination.
- 17 B. Plaintiff and the Class were not paid in a timely manner pertaining to the waiting time
18 penalties in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201-203.
- 19 C. Plaintiff was forced to receive inaccurately itemized and deficient wage statements, in
20 violation of Labor Code § 226(a).
- 21 D. Plaintiff did not receive his compensation in accordance with Labor Code Section 204 in
22 that Defendant failed to issues wages to its employees within seven (7) calendar days
23 after the pay period ended.
- 24 E. Plaintiff was required to work without meal and rest periods, nor compensation in lieu
25 thereof, as required by the Labor Code and relevant Wage Orders.
- 26 F. Plaintiff was required to work either in excess of eight hours per workday or in excess of
27 forty hours per workweek without receiving compensation at a rate of one and one half
28 the regular rate of pay.
- G. Defendant also failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for
reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job duties, in violation of Labor
Code § 2802.

1 **B. DEFENDANTS**

2 16. Defendant SP Plus Corporation is doing business in Los Angeles, California. It
3 operates within the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff and similarly situated
4 employees within California. The violations alleged herein arose in Los Angeles, California.

5 17. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
6 of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who
7 therefore sues Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is
8 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a
9 DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will
10 seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the
11 Defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

12 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant
13 acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint
14 scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are
15 legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants in all respects acted as the
16 employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the proposed Class.

17 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

18 19. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were routinely unable, and not
19 authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods and were also unable to take an uninterrupted 30-
20 minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and Defendant's California
21 employees were forced to continue working through their meal and rest breaks in order to assist
22 Defendant's needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were unable to
23 take their required meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages of one
24 hour's pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees
25 who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558,
26 and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

27 20. Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-
28 exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in
excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a
workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of
Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per

1 week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate.
2 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for
3 all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all
4 overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

5 21. Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately
6 itemized wage statements. As Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendants' California
7 employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all
8 gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of
9 Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable
10 hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of
11 Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. These
12 violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants'
13 California employees.

14 22. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's
15 California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code §
16 226 and keep accurate records as required by § 1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and
17 Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not accurately
18 reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest
19 premiums, and total hour worked.

20 23. Our client further alleges that Defendants paid him and Defendant's California
21 employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they
22 were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of
23 Defendants' failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they
24 were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates
25 Labor Code §§ 201-203.

26 24. Defendant pays Plaintiff and its California employees on a bi-weekly basis and has
27 failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must
28 be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the
violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of
their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b).

25. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the

1 equipment they purchased to perform work for Defendant such as face masks. Moreover, Defendant
2 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for their uniform and uniform
3 maintenance. Defendant further failed to reimburse its California employees for using their personal
4 cell phones for the benefit of Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall
5 indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in
6 direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties." As such, Plaintiff and Defendant's
7 California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job
8 duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

9 26. Defendants failed to continue to take precautions to ensure employee safety after the
10 onset of COVID. Under LC §6409.6(a)(1). "COVID-19" means severe acute respiratory syndrome
11 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, directly after the
12 onset of COVID, were required to partake in mandatory temperature and health checks, but these
13 activities were not enforced or practiced quickly after the onset of COVID and when COVID was
14 still a health risk to the employees. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were also
15 required to provide their own masks at the workplace. As a result of these practices, Defendants have
16 violated Cal. Labor Code §§ 6400, 6401, 6402, 6403, 6404, and 6407 for failure to provide a safe
17 and healthful environment for their Employees, as outlines above. Defendants are liable for civil
18 penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 2699 *et seq.*

19 27. Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California
20 employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these
21 practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked,
22 including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages
23 owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendants are liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure
24 to pay wages as required by law.

25 28. Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees bring this claim pursuant to *Business &*
26 *Professions Code* § 17200, *et seq.* The conduct of all Defendants as alleged above has been and
27 continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees.

28 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

29 29. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a
30 Class Action pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

31 30. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class composed of and defined as follows:

THE CALIFORNIA CLASS

31. All current and former California employees of Defendants since the date four (4) year prior to the filing of this complaint.

32. Plaintiff reserves the right under Rule 3.765, California Rules of Court, to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues.

33. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under the provisions of § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed Class is easily ascertainable.

A. NUMEROSITY

34. The potential members of the proposed Class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all the members of the proposed Class is impracticable. While the precise number of proposed Plaintiff Class members has not been determined at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants currently employ, and during the relevant time periods employed, over seventy-five (75) Class members in the State of California.

35. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant periods necessarily increases this number substantially. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' employment records would provide information as to the number and location of all proposed Plaintiff Class members. Joinder of all members of the proposed Class is not practicable.

B. COMMONALITY

36. There are questions of law and fact common to the proposed Class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class members. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation, whether Defendants failed to provide members of the Class with wage statements that fully and accurately itemize the requirements set forth in Labor Code §226(a), accurate final wages, and final wages on the day of termination and or within seventy-two (72) hours of separation and whether the rest periods were timely made available.

C. TYPICALITY

37. The claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the proposed Class. Plaintiff and all members of the proposed Class sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of laws, regulations that have the

force and effect of law, and statutes as alleged herein.

D. ADEQUACY OF REPRESENTATION

38. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the proposed Class. Counsel who represents Plaintiff is competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions.

E. SUPERIORITY OF CLASS ACTION

39. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all proposed Plaintiff Class members is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the proposed Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the proposed Class. Each member of the proposed Class has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendant's failure to comply with Labor Code 226(a).

40. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system. Plaintiffs are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512 and 558)**

41. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 40 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

42. Plaintiff is entitled to one hour of pay for each day that Defendants failed to properly provide one or more meal periods as set forth in the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 558.

43. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to continue working through their meal breaks in order to assist Defendant's needs. Specifically, Plaintiff and other California employees were further forced to keep their cell phones on during their meal breaks in case of emergencies or to address the needs of Defendants' personnel. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees

1 were unable to take their required meal breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages
2 of one hour's pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant's California
3 employees who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,
4 and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

5 44. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 558 Plaintiff seeks the payment of all meal
6 period compensations, which he was owed since he commenced to work for Defendant, according to
7 proof.

8 45. Additionally, Plaintiff is entitled to, and seeks, attorney's fees and costs, and
9 prejudgment interest.

10 46. Wherefore, Plaintiff seeks to represent request relief as described below.

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF** 13 **(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512 and 558)**

14 47. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 46 of this Complaint as though fully set
15 forth herein.

16 48. Plaintiff is entitled to one hour of pay for each day that Defendants failed to properly
17 provide one or more rest periods as set forth in the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512
18 and 558.

19 49. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were routinely unable, and not
20 authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods for every shift they worked. Plaintiff and Defendant's
21 California employees were forced to continue working through rest breaks in order to assist
22 Defendant's needs. Specifically, Plaintiff and other California employees were further forced to keep
23 their cell phones on during their rest breaks in case of emergencies or to address the needs of
24 Defendants' personnel. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were unable
25 to take their required rest breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages of one hour's
26 pay for each missed rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees who were denied
27 timely rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001,
28 Section 12.

50. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 558 Plaintiff seeks the payment of all rest
period compensations, which he was owed since he commenced to work for Defendant, according to
proof.

1 51. Additionally, Plaintiff is entitled to, and seeks, attorney's fees and costs, and
2 prejudgment interest.

3 52. Wherefore, Plaintiff seeks to represent request relief as described below.

4 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES IN VIOLATION OF**
6 **(LABOR CODE §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2)**

7 53. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set
8 forth herein.

9 54. During the liability period, Defendant failed to pay all wages to Plaintiff and
10 Defendant's California employees.

11 55. Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-
12 exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in
13 excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a
14 workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of
15 Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per
16 week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate.
17 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for
18 all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all
19 overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

20 56. As a result, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were not paid for all
21 hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages
22 constitute violations of Labor Code § 510 and 1194.

23 57. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants in willfully filing to pay all alleges,
24 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees have been deprived of wages in amounts to be
25 determined at trial, and are entitled to restitution and recovery of such amounts, plus interest thereon,
26 attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and liquidated damages pursuant to Labor
27 Code § 1194.2.

28 ///

///

///

///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
**KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED
EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS (LABOR CODE § 226(a),(e), 1174(d))**

58. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

59. Section 226(a) of the California Labor Code requires Defendants to provide wage statements to employees. In those wage statements, Defendants must accurately set forth, among other things, the total gross and net wages earned, and all hourly rates in effect, for Plaintiff. Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).

60. Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately itemized wage statements. As Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. These violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees.

61. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code § 226 and keep accurate records as required by § 1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest premiums, and total hours worked.

62. The wage statements provided to Plaintiff and members of the Class fail to accurately itemize in wage statements total gross and net wages earned, and all hourly rates in effect for Plaintiff. Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 226(a) are knowing and intentional, and Plaintiff has suffered injury as a result of the receipt of defective wage statements, thereby entitling them to penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e).

///

///

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**FAILURE TO PAY WAGES DUE AT THE TIME OF DISCHARGE IN VIOLATION
OF LABOR CODE §§ 201-202, RESULTING IN SECTION 203 WAGES AND
PENALTIES (WAITING TIME PENALTIES)**

63. Plaintiff hereby incorporates preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

64. At all times material herein, the California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, and 203 were in effect and binding on Defendant.

65. California Labor Code § 202 requires employers to pay employees all wages due within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation. California Labor Code § 201 states in pertinent part that “if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.” California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to timely pay such wages the employer must, as penalty, continue to pay the subject employee’s wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced. The penalty cannot exceed 30 days of wages.

66. Plaintiff was entitled to compensation for unpaid wages, but to date has not received such compensation. Specifically, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff all wages due to Plaintiff at the time of his separation of employment from Defendant’s. Thus, since Defendant failed to promptly pay Plaintiff all wages due to Plaintiff at the time of his separation of employment, Defendant violated Section 201 of the Labor Code and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 203.

67. More than 30 days have passed since Plaintiff’s employment ended with Defendant.

68. As a consequence of Defendant’s willful conduct in not paying wages owed to Plaintiff, Plaintiff is entitled to 30 days of wages as a penalty pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for Defendant’s failure to timely pay legal wages, together with attorney’s fees and cost of suit, and interest pursuant to California Labor Code Section 218.5.

///

///

///

///

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY EMPLOYEES IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 204(a)(b)

69. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

70. At all times relevant herein, Labor Code § 204 was in full force and effect and binding on Defendants.

71. Wages must be paid according to a regularly set schedule. (Labor Code § 204). All earned wages must be paid at least twice a month, on days designated in advance by the employer. Work performed between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and 26th day of the same month. Work performed between the 16th and the last day of the month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. (Labor Code § 204). Weekly or bi-weekly (every two weeks) payroll must be paid within seven (7) days of the end of the pay period in which the wages were earned (Labor Code §§ 204(a), 204(b)).

72. Defendants pay Plaintiff and its California employees on a bi-weekly basis and have failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b).

73. Defendants have failed to comply with the above-section because they waited longer than ten days from the close of the pay period to pay its bi-weekly paid employees.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR BUSINESS EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2802

74. Plaintiff hereby incorporates preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

75. Labor Code § 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties."

76. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the equipment they purchased to perform work for Defendant such as face masks. Moreover, Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for their uniform

1 and uniform maintenance. Defendant further failed to reimburse its California employees for
2 using their personal cell phones for the benefit of Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides
3 that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses
4 incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.” As
5 such, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary
6 expenses in the course of their job duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant, in violation
of Labor Code § 2802.

7 77. Plaintiff is entitled to reimbursement for these necessary expenditures, plus
8 interest and attorneys’ fees and cost, under Labor Code § 2802.

9 78. Plaintiff also requests relief as described below.

10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL HOURS WORKED, INCLUDING OVERTIME HOURS WORKED IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODES §§ 210, 218)**

12 79. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully
13 set forth herein.

14 80. Section 2(K) or Wage Order 5 defines “hours worked” as “the rime during
15 which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and including all the time the
16 employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Labor Code §§
17 1194 and 1197 required employers to compensate Plaintiff for all hours worked at least at a
18 minimum wage ad established by the Wage Order. Defendants did not pay for all hours worked
19 and frequently required Plaintiff to work off the clock. Defendants have been engaged in many
20 unlawful employment practices which resulted in underpayment for hours worked each pay
period as more set forth below:

21 81. Failure to Pay All Wages Owed Twice Per Month. Defendants were required to
22 pay Plaintiff all wages earned twice during each calendar month pursuant to Labor Code §
23 204(a). Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff as a result of the unlawful
24 employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these practices, Plaintiff was
25 underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment
26 resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendants are
liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure to pay wages as required by law.

27 ///

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PROVIDE PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT THAT IS SAFE AND
HEALTHFUL IN VIOLATION OF
(LABOR CODE §§ 6400, 6401, 6402, 6403, 6404, 6407, 8 CCR 3202)

82. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

83. Cal. Labor Code § 6400(a) provides that every employer shall furnish employment and a place of employment that is safe and healthful for Plaintiff therein. Cal. Labor Code § 6401 provides that “every employer shall furnish and use safety devices and safeguard, and shall adopt and use practices, means, methods, operations, and processes which are reasonably adequate to render such employment and place of employment safe and healthful. Every employer.

84. Pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 6402, no employer shall require, or permit any employee to go or be in any employment or place of employment which is not safe and healthful. Cal. Labor Code § 6403 states that no employer shall fail or neglect to provide and use safety devices and safeguard reasonably adequate to render the employment and place of employment safe, or adopt and use methods and processes reasonably necessary to protect the life, safety, and health of Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees.

85. Cal. Labor Code § 6404 provides that no employer shall occupy or maintain any place pf employment that is not safe and healthful. Cal. Labor Code § 6407 provides that every employer and every employee shall comply with occupational safety and health standards, with Section 25910 of the Health and Safety Code, and with all rules, regulations, and orders pursuant to this division which are applicable to his own actions and conduct. Defendants failed to continue to take precautions to ensure employee safety after the onset of COVID. Under LC §6409.6(a)(1). “COVID-19” means severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Plaintiff, directly after the onset of COVID, were required to partake in mandatory temperature and health checks, but these activities were not enforced or practiced quickly after the onset of COVID and when COVID was still a health risk to Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees. Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees was also required to provide their own masks at the workplace.

86. As a result of these practices, Defendants have violated Cal. Labor Code §§

1 6400, 6401, 6402, 6403, 6404, and 6407 for failure to provide a safe and healthful environment
2 for Plaintiff, as outlines above.

3 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **UNFAIR COMPETITION PURSUANT TO**
5 **BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**

6 87. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully
7 set forth herein.

8 88. This is an Action for Unfair Business Practices. Plaintiff Ike Ceralde brings this
9 claim pursuant to *Business & Professions Code* § 17200, et seq. The conduct of all Defendants
10 as alleged in this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to
11 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees as a result of Defendant's failure to comply
12 with the labor code sections as set out above including but not limited to Labor Code Sections
13 6400, 6401, 6402, 6403, 6404, 6407. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees seek to
14 enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of *Code of Civil*
15 *Procedure* § 1021.5.

16 89. Plaintiff is a "person" within the meaning of *Business & Professions Code* §
17 17204, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive relief, restitution,
18 and other appropriate equitable relief.

19 90. *Business & Profession Code* § 17200 et. seq. prohibits unlawful and unfair
20 business practices.

21 91. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct
22 alleged in this Complaint, Defendants, and each of them, have acted contrary to these public
23 policies, have violated specific provisions of the *Labor Code*, and have engaged in other
24 unlawful and unfair business practices in violation of *Business & Professions Code* § 17200, et
25 seq., depriving Plaintiff, of rights, benefits, and privileges guaranteed to Plaintiff under law.

26 92. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes unfair competition in
27 violation of § 17200 et. seq. of the *Business & Professions Code*.

28 93. As a proximate result of the above mentioned acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has
been damaged in a sum as may be proven.

94. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to engage in the
unlawful conduct as alleged above. Pursuant to *Business & Professions Code*, this Court should

1 make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary
2 to prevent the use or employment, by Defendants, their agents, or Plaintiff, of any unlawful or
3 deceptive practice prohibited by the *Business & Professions Code*, and/or, including but not
4 limited to, disgorgement of profits which may be necessary to restore Plaintiff to the money
Defendants have unlawfully failed to pay.

5 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

7 1. For a money judgment representing compensatory damages including lost
8 wages, earnings, retirement benefits and other employee benefits, and all other sums of money,
9 together with interest on these amounts, according to proof;

10 2. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 203 for
failure to timely pay wages due at termination.

11 3. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 226(e)
12 for failure to comply with itemized employee wage statement provisions.

13 4. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code §
14 1174(d) for failure to comply with itemized employee wage statement provisions.

15 5. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 226.7
16 for failure to provide meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof.

17 6. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 510 for
failure to pay all wages.

18 7. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 1194.2
19 for failure to pay all wages.

20 8. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 204(b)
21 for failure to timely pay employees.

22 9. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 2802
23 for failure to reimburse for business expenses.

24 10. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 210 for
failure to pay all hours worked, including overtime hours worked.

25 11. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 6400
26 for failure to provide a place of employment that is safe and healthful.

27 12. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Business and

1 Professions Code § 17200 et seq.;

2 13. An award of prejudgment and post-judgment interest;


3 14. An award providing for payment of costs of suit;

4 15. An award of attorneys' fees; and

5 16. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

6 Dated: April 21, 2023

7 OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM,
A Law Corporation

8
9 By: 

10 ROMAN OTKUPMAN
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff

12 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

13 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of his claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

14 Dated: April 21, 2023

15 OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM,
A Law Corporation

16
17 By: 

18 ROMAN OTKUPMAN
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Roman Otkupman, Esq. Bar No. 249423; Nidah Farishta, Esq. Bar No. 312360 Otkupman Law Firm, ALC 5743 Corsa Ave, Suite 123 Westlake Village, CA 91362 TELEPHONE NO.: (818) 293-5623 FAX NO.: (888) 850-1310 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Ike Ceralde		FOR COURT USE ONLY Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles 4/21/2023 4:37 PM David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, By D. Jackson Aubry, Deputy Clerk	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los Angeles STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90012 BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk Courthouse			
CASE NAME: Ike Ceralde v. SP Plus Corporation			
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ☒ Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000) ☐ Limited (Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)		Complex Case Designation ☐ Counter ☐ Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	CASE NUMBER: 23STCV09036 JUDGE: DEPT:

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 ☐ Auto (22) ☐ Uninsured motorist (46) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort ☐ Asbestos (04) ☐ Product liability (24) ☐ Medical malpractice (45) ☐ Other PI/PD/WD (23) Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort ☐ Business tort/unfair business practice (07) ☐ Civil rights (08) ☐ Defamation (13) ☐ Fraud (16) ☐ Intellectual property (19) ☐ Professional negligence (25) ☐ Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) Employment ☐ Wrongful termination (36) ☒ Other employment (15)	Contract ☐ Breach of contract/warranty (06) ☐ Rule 3.740 collections (09) ☐ Other collections (09) ☐ Insurance coverage (18) ☐ Other contract (37) Real Property ☐ Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14) ☐ Wrongful eviction (33) ☐ Other real property (26) Unlawful Detainer ☐ Commercial (31) ☐ Residential (32) ☐ Drugs (38) Judicial Review ☐ Asset forfeiture (05) ☐ Petition re: arbitration award (11) ☐ Writ of mandate (02) ☐ Other judicial review (39)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403) ☐ Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) ☐ Construction defect (10) ☐ Mass tort (40) ☐ Securities litigation (28) ☐ Environmental/Toxic tort (30) ☐ Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41) Enforcement of Judgment ☐ Enforcement of judgment (20) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint ☐ RICO (27) ☐ Other complaint (<i>not specified above</i>) (42) Miscellaneous Civil Petition ☐ Partnership and corporate governance (21) ☐ Other petition (<i>not specified above</i>) (43)
---	--	--

2. This case ☐ is ☒ is not complex 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 issues that will be time-consuming to resolve | e. ☐ Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court |
| c. ☐ Substantial amount of documentary evidence | f. ☐ Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision |
3. Remedies sought (*check all that apply*): a. ☒ monetary b. ☐ nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. ☒ punitive
4. Number of causes of action (*specify*): Ten (10)
5. This case ☒ is ☐ is not a class action suit.
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (*You may use form CM-015.*)

Date: April 21, 2023
 Roman Otkupman

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)

NOTICE

- 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.

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

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

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

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

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

Auto Tort

Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death
Uninsured Motorist (46) (*if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto*)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort

Asbestos (04)
Asbestos Property Damage
Asbestos Personal Injury/Wrongful Death
Product Liability (*not asbestos or toxic/environmental*) (24)
Medical Malpractice (45)
Medical Malpractice—Physicians & Surgeons
Other Professional Health Care Malpractice
Other PI/PD/WD (23)
Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)
Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism)
Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress
Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business Practice (07)
Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (*not civil harassment*) (08)
Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13)
Fraud (16)
Intellectual Property (19)
Professional Negligence (25)
Legal Malpractice
Other Professional Malpractice (*not medical or legal*)
Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

Employment

Wrongful Termination (36)
Other Employment (15)

Contract

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)
Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (*not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction*)
Contract/Warranty Breach—Seller Plaintiff (*not fraud or negligence*)
Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty
Other Breach of Contract/Warranty
Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09)
Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff
Other Promissory Note/Collections Case
Insurance Coverage (*not provisionally complex*) (18)
Auto Subrogation
Other Coverage
Other Contract (37)
Contractual Fraud
Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)
Wrongful Eviction (33)
Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)
Writ of Possession of Real Property
Mortgage Foreclosure
Quiet Title
Other Real Property (*not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure*)

Unlawful Detainer

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

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)
Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)
Writ of Mandate (02)
Writ—Administrative Mandamus
Writ—Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter
Writ—Other Limited Court Case Review
Other Judicial Review (39)
Review of Health Officer Order
Notice of Appeal—Labor
Commissioner Appeals

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400–3.403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)
Construction Defect (10)
Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)
Securities Litigation (28)
Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)
Insurance Coverage Claims (*arising from provisionally complex case type listed above*) (41)

Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20)
Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)
Confession of Judgment (*non-domestic relations*)
Sister State Judgment
Administrative Agency Award (*not unpaid taxes*)
Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes
Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

RICO (27)
Other Complaint (*not specified above*) (42)
Declaratory Relief Only
Injunctive Relief Only (*non-harassment*)
Mechanics Lien
Other Commercial Complaint Case (*non-tort/non-complex*)
Other Civil Complaint (*non-tort/non-complex*)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate Governance (21)
Other Petition (*not specified above*) (43)
Civil Harassment
Workplace Violence
Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse
Election Contest
Petition for Name Change
Petition for Relief From Late Claim
Other Civil Petition

SHORT TITLE: Ike Ceralde v. SP Plus Corporation

CASE NUMBER
23STCV09036

**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 2.3 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

Step 1: After completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet (Judicial Council form CM-010), find the exact case type in Column A that corresponds to the case type indicated in the Civil Case Cover Sheet.

Step 2: In Column B, check the box for the type of action that best describes the nature of the case.

Step 3: In Column C, circle the number which explains the reason for the court filing location you have chosen.

Applicable Reasons for Choosing Court Filing Location (Column C)

1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Central District.
2. Permissive filing in central district.
3. Location where cause of action arose.
4. Mandatory personal injury filing in North District.
5. Location where performance required or defendant resides.
6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.
7. Location where petitioner resides.
8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
9. Location where one or more of the parties reside.
10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office.
11. Mandatory filing location (Hub Cases – unlawful detainer, limited non-collection, limited collection, or personal injury).

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1, 4, 11
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1, 4, 11
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	☐ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage ☐ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	1, 11 1, 11
	Product Liability (24)	☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1, 4, 11
	Medical Malpractice (45)	☐ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons ☐ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	☐ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)	1, 4, 11
		☐ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) ☐ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress ☐ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11

SHORT TITLE: Ike Ceralde v. SP Plus Corporation	CASE NUMBER
---	-------------

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above	
Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1, 2, 3	
	Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1, 2, 3	
	Defamation (13)	☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1, 2, 3	
	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	1, 2, 3	
Employment	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	
Contract	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 ☐ A6034 Collections Case-Purchased Debt (Charged Off Consumer Debt Purchased on or after January 1, 2014)	5, 6, 11 5, 11 5, 6, 11	
	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, 9	
	Real Property	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels_____	2, 6
		Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2, 6
Other Real Property (26)		☐ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure ☐ A6032 Quiet Title ☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2, 6 2, 6 2, 6	
Unlawful Detainer		Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	6, 11
	Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	6, 11	
	Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	☐ A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2, 6, 11	
	Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2, 6, 11	

SHORT TITLE: Ike Ceralde v. SP Plus Corporation	CASE NUMBER
--	-------------

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above	
Judicial Review	Asset Forfeiture (05)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2, 3, 6	
	Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2, 5	
	Writ of Mandate (02)	☐ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus ☐ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter ☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2, 8 2 2	
	Other Judicial Review (39)	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2, 8	
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1, 2, 8	
	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction Defect	1, 2, 3	
	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1, 2, 8	
	Securities Litigation (28)	☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1, 2, 8	
	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	☐ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1, 2, 3, 8	
	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	☐ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1, 2, 5, 8	
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	☐ A6141 Sister State Judgment ☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment ☐ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) ☐ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) ☐ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax ☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2, 5, 11 2, 6 2, 9 2, 8 2, 8 2, 8, 9	
	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1, 2, 8	
	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only ☐ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) ☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) ☐ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1, 2, 8 2, 8 1, 2, 8 1, 2, 8	
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2, 8	
	Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	☐ A6121 Civil Harassment ☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment ☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case ☐ A6190 Election Contest ☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name/Change of Gender ☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law ☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2, 3, 9 2, 3, 9 2, 3, 9 2 2, 7 2, 3, 8 2, 9

SHORT TITLE: Ike Ceralde v. SP Plus Corporation	CASE NUMBER
--	-------------

Step 4: Statement of Reason and Address: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected. Enter the address which is the basis for the filing location, including zip code. (No address required for class action cases).

REASON: ☒ 1. ☒ 2. ☒ 3. ☐ 4. ☐ 5. ☐ 6. ☐ 7. ☐ 8. ☐ 9. ☐ 10. ☐ 11.			ADDRESS: 2005 N. Highland Ave
CITY: Los Angeles	STATE: CA	ZIP CODE: 90068	

Step 5: Certification of Assignment: I certify that this case is properly filed in the Central District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., §392 et seq., and Local Rule 2.3(a)(1)(E)].

Dated: April 21, 2023


 (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.
4. Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 02/16).
5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless there is court order for waiver, partial or scheduled payments.
6. 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.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 04/21/2023 David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court By: <u>D. Jackson Aubry</u> Deputy
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS: Spring Street Courthouse 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012		
NOTICE OF CASE ASSIGNMENT UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE		
Your case is assigned for all purposes to the judicial officer indicated below.		CASE NUMBER: 23STCV09036

THIS FORM IS TO BE SERVED WITH THE SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

	ASSIGNED JUDGE	DEPT	ROOM		ASSIGNED JUDGE	DEPT	ROOM
✓	David S. Cunningham III	11					

Given to the Plaintiff/Cross-Complainant/Attorney of Record **David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court**

on 04/24/2023
(Date)

By D. Jackson Aubry, Deputy Clerk

INSTRUCTIONS FOR HANDLING UNLIMITED CIVIL CASES

The following critical provisions of the California Rules of Court, Title 3, Division 7, as applicable in the Superior Court, are summarized for your assistance.

APPLICATION

The Division 7 Rules were effective January 1, 2007. They apply to all general civil cases.

PRIORITY OVER OTHER RULES

The Division 7 Rules shall have priority over all other Local Rules to the extent the others are inconsistent.

CHALLENGE TO ASSIGNED JUDGE

A challenge under Code of Civil Procedure Section 170.6 must be made within **15** days after notice of assignment for all purposes to a judge, or if a party has not yet appeared, within 15 days of the first appearance.

TIME STANDARDS

Cases assigned to the Independent Calendaring Courts will be subject to processing under the following time standards:

COMPLAINTS

All complaints shall be served within 60 days of filing and proof of service shall be filed within 90 days.

CROSS-COMPLAINTS

Without leave of court first being obtained, no cross-complaint may be filed by any party after their answer is filed. Cross-complaints shall be served within 30 days of the filing date and a proof of service filed within 60 days of the filing date.

STATUS CONFERENCE

A status conference will be scheduled by the assigned Independent Calendar Judge no later than 270 days after the filing of the complaint. Counsel must be fully prepared to discuss the following issues: alternative dispute resolution, bifurcation, settlement, trial date, and expert witnesses.

FINAL STATUS CONFERENCE

The Court will require the parties to attend a final status conference not more than 10 days before the scheduled trial date. All parties shall have motions in limine, bifurcation motions, statements of major evidentiary issues, dispositive motions, requested form jury instructions, special jury instructions, and special jury verdicts timely filed and served prior to the conference. These matters may be heard and resolved at this conference. At least five days before this conference, counsel must also have exchanged lists of exhibits and witnesses, and have submitted to the court a brief statement of the case to be read to the jury panel as required by Chapter Three of the Los Angeles Superior Court Rules.

SANCTIONS

The court will impose appropriate sanctions for the failure or refusal to comply with Chapter Three Rules, orders made by the Court, and time standards or deadlines established by the Court or by the Chapter Three Rules. Such sanctions may be on a party, or if appropriate, on counsel for a party.

This is not a complete delineation of the Division 7 or Chapter Three Rules, and adherence only to the above provisions is therefore not a guarantee against the imposition of sanctions under Trial Court Delay Reduction. Careful reading and compliance with the actual Chapter Rules is imperative.

Class Actions

Pursuant to Local Rule 2.3, all class actions shall be filed at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse and are randomly assigned to a complex judge at the designated complex courthouse. If the case is found not to be a class action it will be returned to an Independent Calendar Courtroom for all purposes.

***Provisionally Complex Cases**

Cases filed as provisionally complex are initially assigned to the Supervising Judge of complex litigation for determination of complex status. If the case is deemed to be complex within the meaning of California Rules of Court 3.400 et seq., it will be randomly assigned to a complex judge at the designated complex courthouse. If the case is found not to be complex, it will be returned to an Independent Calendar Courtroom for all purposes.



Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR) INFORMATION PACKAGE

THE PLAINTIFF MUST SERVE THIS ADR INFORMATION PACKAGE ON EACH PARTY WITH THE COMPLAINT.

CROSS-COMPLAINANTS must serve this ADR Information Package on any new parties named to the action with the cross-complaint.

What is ADR?

ADR helps people find solutions to their legal disputes without going to trial. The main types of ADR are negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and settlement conferences. When ADR is done by phone, videoconference or computer, it may be called Online Dispute Resolution (ODR). These alternatives to litigation and trial are described below.

Advantages of ADR

- **Saves Time:** ADR is faster than going to trial.
- **Saves Money:** Parties can save on court costs, attorney's fees, and witness fees.
- **Keeps Control** (with the parties): Parties choose their ADR process and provider for voluntary ADR.
- **Reduces Stress/Protects Privacy:** ADR is done outside the courtroom, in private offices, by phone or online.

Disadvantages of ADR

- **Costs:** If the parties do not resolve their dispute, they may have to pay for ADR, litigation, and trial.
- **No Public Trial:** ADR does not provide a public trial or a decision by a judge or jury.

Main Types of ADR

1. **Negotiation:** Parties often talk with each other in person, or by phone or online about resolving their case with a settlement agreement instead of a trial. If the parties have lawyers, they will negotiate for their clients.
2. **Mediation:** In mediation, a neutral mediator listens to each person's concerns, helps them evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of their case, and works with them to try to create a settlement agreement that is acceptable to all. Mediators do not decide the outcome. Parties may go to trial if they decide not to settle.

Mediation may be appropriate when the parties

- want to work out a solution but need help from a neutral person.
- have communication problems or strong emotions that interfere with resolution.

Mediation may not be appropriate when the parties

- want a public trial and want a judge or jury to decide the outcome.
- lack equal bargaining power or have a history of physical/emotional abuse.

How to Arrange Mediation in Los Angeles County

Mediation for **civil cases** is voluntary and parties may select any mediator they wish. Options include:

a. **The Civil Mediation Vendor Resource List**

If all parties in an active civil case agree to mediation, they may contact these organizations to request a "Resource List Mediation" for mediation at reduced cost or no cost (for selected cases).

- **ADR Services, Inc.** Case Manager Elizabeth Sanchez, elizabeth@adrservices.com
(949) 863-9800
- **Mediation Center of Los Angeles** Program Manager info@mediationLA.org
(833) 476-9145

These organizations cannot accept every case and they may decline cases at their discretion. They may offer online mediation by video conference for cases they accept. Before contacting these organizations, review important information and FAQs at www.lacourt.org/ADR.Res.List

NOTE: The Civil Mediation Vendor Resource List program does not accept family law, probate or small claims cases.

b. **Los Angeles County Dispute Resolution Programs**

<https://hrc.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/DRP-Fact-Sheet-23October19-Current-as-of-October-2019-1.pdf>

Day of trial mediation programs have been paused until further notice.

Online Dispute Resolution (ODR). Parties in small claims and unlawful detainer (eviction) cases should carefully review the Notice and other information they may receive about (ODR) requirements for their case.

c. Mediators and ADR and Bar organizations that provide mediation may be found on the internet.

3. Arbitration: Arbitration is less formal than trial, but like trial, the parties present evidence and arguments to the person who decides the outcome. In "binding" arbitration, the arbitrator's decision is final; there is no right to trial. In "nonbinding" arbitration, any party can request a trial after the arbitrator's decision. For more information about arbitration, visit <http://www.courts.ca.gov/programs-adr.htm>

4. Mandatory Settlement Conferences (MSC): MSCs are ordered by the Court and are often held close to the trial date or on the day of trial. The parties and their attorneys meet with a judge or settlement officer who does not make a decision but who instead assists the parties in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the case and in negotiating a settlement. For information about the Court's MSC programs for civil cases, visit <http://www.lacourt.org/division/civil/C10047.aspx>

Los Angeles Superior Court ADR website: <http://www.lacourt.org/division/civil/C10109.aspx>
For general information and videos about ADR, visit <http://www.courts.ca.gov/programs-adr.htm>

VOLUNTARY EFFICIENT LITIGATION STIPULATIONS



Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles



Los Angeles County
Bar Association
Litigation Section

Los Angeles County
Bar Association Labor and
Employment Law Section




Consumer Attorneys
Association of Los Angeles



Southern California
Defense Counsel



Association of
Business Trial Lawyers



California Employment
Lawyers Association

The Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation, Discovery Resolution Stipulation, and Motions in Limine Stipulation are voluntary stipulations entered into by the parties. The parties may enter into one, two, or all three of the stipulations; however, they may not alter the stipulations as written, because the Court wants to ensure uniformity of application. These stipulations are meant to encourage cooperation between the parties and to assist in resolving issues in a manner that promotes economic case resolution and judicial efficiency.

The following organizations endorse the goal of promoting efficiency in litigation and ask that counsel consider using these stipulations as a voluntary way to promote communications and procedures among counsel and with the court to fairly resolve issues in their cases.

◆Los Angeles County Bar Association Litigation Section◆

◆ Los Angeles County Bar Association Labor and Employment Law Section◆

◆Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles◆

◆Southern California Defense Counsel◆

◆Association of Business Trial Lawyers◆

◆California Employment Lawyers Association◆

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:		STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
TELEPHONE NO.: E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		FAX NO. (Optional):	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:			
PLAINTIFF:			
DEFENDANT:			CASE NUMBER:
STIPULATION – EARLY ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING			

This stipulation is intended to encourage cooperation among the parties at an early stage in the litigation and to assist the parties in efficient case resolution.

The parties agree that:

1. The parties commit to conduct an initial conference (in-person or via teleconference or via videoconference) within 15 days from the date this stipulation is signed, *to discuss and consider whether there can be agreement on the following*:
 - a. Are motions to challenge the pleadings necessary? If the issue can be resolved by amendment as of right, or if the Court would allow leave to amend, could an amended complaint resolve most or all of the issues a demurrer might otherwise raise? If so, the parties agree to work through pleading issues so that a demurrer need only raise issues they cannot resolve. Is the issue that the defendant seeks to raise amenable to resolution on demurrer, or would some other type of motion be preferable? Could a voluntary targeted exchange of documents or information by any party cure an uncertainty in the pleadings?
 - b. Initial mutual exchanges of documents at the “core” of the litigation. (For example, in an employment case, the employment records, personnel file and documents relating to the conduct in question could be considered “core.” In a personal injury case, an incident or police report, medical records, and repair or maintenance records could be considered “core.”);
 - c. Exchange of names and contact information of witnesses;
 - d. Any insurance agreement that may be available to satisfy part or all of a judgment, or to indemnify or reimburse for payments made to satisfy a judgment;
 - e. Exchange of any other information that might be helpful to facilitate understanding, handling, or resolution of the case in a manner that preserves objections or privileges by agreement;
 - f. Controlling issues of law that, if resolved early, will promote efficiency and economy in other phases of the case. Also, when and how such issues can be presented to the Court;
 - g. Whether or when the case should be scheduled with a settlement officer, what discovery or court ruling on legal issues is reasonably required to make settlement discussions meaningful, and whether the parties wish to use a sitting judge or a private mediator or other options as

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------	--------------

discussed in the “Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Information Package” served with the complaint;

- h. Computation of damages, including documents, not privileged or protected from disclosure, on which such computation is based;
 - i. Whether the case is suitable for the Expedited Jury Trial procedures (see information at www.lacourt.org under “Civil” and then under “General Information”).
2. The time for a defending party to respond to a complaint or cross-complaint will be extended to _____ for the complaint, and _____ for the cross-complaint, which is comprised of the 30 days to respond under Government Code § 68616(b), and the 30 days permitted by Code of Civil Procedure section 1054(a), good cause having been found by the Civil Supervising Judge due to the case management benefits provided by this Stipulation. A copy of the General Order can be found at www.lacourt.org under “Civil”, click on “General Information”, then click on “Voluntary Efficient Litigation Stipulations”.

(INSERT DATE) (INSERT DATE)
 3. The parties will prepare a joint report titled “Joint Status Report Pursuant to Initial Conference and Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation, and if desired, a proposed order summarizing results of their meet and confer and advising the Court of any way it may assist the parties’ efficient conduct or resolution of the case. The parties shall attach the Joint Status Report to the Case Management Conference statement, and file the documents when the CMC statement is due.
 4. References to “days” mean calendar days, unless otherwise noted. If the date for performing any act pursuant to this stipulation falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Court holiday, then the time for performing that act shall be extended to the next Court day

The following parties stipulate:

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

➤

(ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)

➤

(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

➤

(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

➤

(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

➤

(ATTORNEY FOR _____)

➤

(ATTORNEY FOR _____)

➤

(ATTORNEY FOR _____)

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:		STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
TELEPHONE NO.: E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		FAX NO. (Optional):	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:			
PLAINTIFF:			
DEFENDANT:			CASE NUMBER:
STIPULATION – DISCOVERY RESOLUTION			

This stipulation is intended to provide a fast and informal resolution of discovery issues through limited paperwork and an informal conference with the Court to aid in the resolution of the issues.

The parties agree that:

1. Prior to the discovery cut-off in this action, no discovery motion shall be filed or heard unless the moving party first makes a written request for an Informal Discovery Conference pursuant to the terms of this stipulation.
2. At the Informal Discovery Conference the Court will consider the dispute presented by parties and determine whether it can be resolved informally. Nothing set forth herein will preclude a party from making a record at the conclusion of an Informal Discovery Conference, either orally or in writing.
3. Following a reasonable and good faith attempt at an informal resolution of each issue to be presented, a party may request an Informal Discovery Conference pursuant to the following procedures:
 - a. The party requesting the Informal Discovery Conference will:
 - i. File a Request for Informal Discovery Conference with the clerk's office on the approved form (copy attached) and deliver a courtesy, conformed copy to the assigned department;
 - ii. Include a brief summary of the dispute and specify the relief requested; and
 - iii. Serve the opposing party pursuant to any authorized or agreed method of service that ensures that the opposing party receives the Request for Informal Discovery Conference no later than the next court day following the filing.
 - b. Any Answer to a Request for Informal Discovery Conference must:
 - i. Also be filed on the approved form (copy attached);
 - ii. Include a brief summary of why the requested relief should be denied;

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------	--------------

- iii. Be filed within two (2) court days of receipt of the Request; and
 - iv. Be served on the opposing party pursuant to any authorized or agreed upon method of service that ensures that the opposing party receives the Answer no later than the next court day following the filing.
- c. No other pleadings, including but not limited to exhibits, declarations, or attachments, will be accepted.
- d. If the Court has not granted or denied the Request for Informal Discovery Conference within ten (10) days following the filing of the Request, then it shall be deemed to have been denied. If the Court acts on the Request, the parties will be notified whether the Request for Informal Discovery Conference has been granted or denied and, if granted, the date and time of the Informal Discovery Conference, which must be within twenty (20) days of the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference.
- e. If the conference is not held within twenty (20) days of the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference, unless extended by agreement of the parties and the Court, then the Request for the Informal Discovery Conference shall be deemed to have been denied at that time.
4. If (a) the Court has denied a conference or (b) one of the time deadlines above has expired without the Court having acted or (c) the Informal Discovery Conference is concluded without resolving the dispute, then a party may file a discovery motion to address unresolved issues.
5. The parties hereby further agree that the time for making a motion to compel or other discovery motion is tolled from the date of filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference until (a) the request is denied or deemed denied or (b) twenty (20) days after the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference, whichever is earlier, unless extended by Order of the Court.
- It is the understanding and intent of the parties that this stipulation shall, for each discovery dispute to which it applies, constitute a writing memorializing a “specific later date to which the propounding [or demanding or requesting] party and the responding party have agreed in writing,” within the meaning of Code Civil Procedure sections 2030.300(c), 2031.320(c), and 2033.290(c).
6. Nothing herein will preclude any party from applying *ex parte* for appropriate relief, including an order shortening time for a motion to be heard concerning discovery.
7. Any party may terminate this stipulation by giving twenty-one (21) days notice of intent to terminate the stipulation.
8. References to “days” mean calendar days, unless otherwise noted. If the date for performing any act pursuant to this stipulation falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Court holiday, then the time for performing that act shall be extended to the next Court day.

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------	--------------

The following parties stipulate:

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



(ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)



(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)



(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)



(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)



(ATTORNEY FOR _____)



(ATTORNEY FOR _____)



(ATTORNEY FOR _____)

Print	Save	Clear
--------------	-------------	--------------

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:		STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
TELEPHONE NO.: E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		FAX NO. (Optional):	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:			
PLAINTIFF:			
DEFENDANT:			CASE NUMBER:
INFORMAL DISCOVERY CONFERENCE (pursuant to the Discovery Resolution Stipulation of the parties)			

- This document relates to:

☐ Request for Informal Discovery Conference
☐ Answer to Request for Informal Discovery Conference
- Deadline for Court to decide on Request: _____ (insert date 10 calendar days following filing of the Request).
- Deadline for Court to hold Informal Discovery Conference: _____ (insert date 20 calendar days following filing of the Request).
- For a Request for Informal Discovery Conference, briefly describe the nature of the discovery dispute, including the facts and legal arguments at issue. For an Answer to Request for Informal Discovery Conference, briefly describe why the Court should deny the requested discovery, including the facts and legal arguments at issue.**

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:		STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
TELEPHONE NO.: E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		FAX NO. (Optional):	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:			
PLAINTIFF:			
DEFENDANT:			CASE NUMBER:
STIPULATION AND ORDER – MOTIONS IN LIMINE			

This stipulation is intended to provide fast and informal resolution of evidentiary issues through diligent efforts to define and discuss such issues and limit paperwork.

The parties agree that:

1. At least ____ days before the final status conference, each party will provide all other parties with a list containing a one paragraph explanation of each proposed motion in limine. Each one paragraph explanation must identify the substance of a single proposed motion in limine and the grounds for the proposed motion.
2. The parties thereafter will meet and confer, either in person or via teleconference or videoconference, concerning all proposed motions in limine. In that meet and confer, the parties will determine:
 - a. Whether the parties can stipulate to any of the proposed motions. If the parties so stipulate, they may file a stipulation and proposed order with the Court.
 - b. Whether any of the proposed motions can be briefed and submitted by means of a short joint statement of issues. For each motion which can be addressed by a short joint statement of issues, a short joint statement of issues must be filed with the Court 10 days prior to the final status conference. Each side's portion of the short joint statement of issues may not exceed three pages. The parties will meet and confer to agree on a date and manner for exchanging the parties' respective portions of the short joint statement of issues and the process for filing the short joint statement of issues.
3. All proposed motions in limine that are not either the subject of a stipulation or briefed via a short joint statement of issues will be briefed and filed in accordance with the California Rules of Court and the Los Angeles Superior Court Rules.

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------	--------------

The following parties stipulate:

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



(ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)



(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)



(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)



(ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)



(ATTORNEY FOR _____)



(ATTORNEY FOR _____)



(ATTORNEY FOR _____)

THE COURT SO ORDERS.

Date: _____

JUDICIAL OFFICER

Print

Save

Clear

FILED
LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT

MAY 11 2011

JOHN A. CLARKE, CLERK
N. Navarro
BY NANCY NAVARRO, DEPUTY

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

General Order Re) ORDER PURSUANT TO CCP 1054(a),
Use of Voluntary Efficient Litigation) EXTENDING TIME TO RESPOND BY
Stipulations) 30 DAYS WHEN PARTIES AGREE
) TO EARLY ORGANIZATIONAL
) MEETING STIPULATION

Whereas the Los Angeles Superior Court and the Executive Committee of the Litigation Section of the Los Angeles County Bar Association have cooperated in drafting "Voluntary Efficient Litigation Stipulations" and in proposing the stipulations for use in general jurisdiction civil litigation in Los Angeles County;

Whereas the Los Angeles County Bar Association Litigation Section; the Los Angeles County Bar Association Labor and Employment Law Section; the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles; the Association of Southern California Defense Counsel; the Association of Business Trial Lawyers of Los Angeles; and the California Employment Lawyers Association all "endorse the goal of promoting efficiency in litigation, and ask that counsel consider using these stipulations as a voluntary way to promote communications and procedures among counsel and with the court to fairly resolve issues in their cases;"

1 Whereas the Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation is intended to encourage
2 cooperation among the parties at an early stage in litigation in order to achieve
3 litigation efficiencies;

4 Whereas it is intended that use of the Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation
5 will promote economic case resolution and judicial efficiency;

6
7 Whereas, in order to promote a meaningful discussion of pleading issues at the
8 Early Organizational Meeting and potentially to reduce the need for motions to
9 challenge the pleadings, it is necessary to allow additional time to conduct the Early
10 Organizational Meeting before the time to respond to a complaint or cross complaint
11 has expired;

12
13 Whereas Code of Civil Procedure section 1054(a) allows a judge of the court in
14 which an action is pending to extend for not more than 30 days the time to respond to
15 a pleading "upon good cause shown";

16 Now, therefore, this Court hereby finds that there is good cause to extend for 30
17 days the time to respond to a complaint or to a cross complaint in any action in which
18 the parties have entered into the Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation. This finding
19 of good cause is based on the anticipated judicial efficiency and benefits of economic
20 case resolution that the Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation is intended to
21 promote.
22

23
24 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, in any case in which the parties have entered
25 into an Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation, the time for a defending party to
26 respond to a complaint or cross complaint shall be extended by the 30 days permitted
27
28

1 by Code of Civil Procedure section 1054(a) without further need of a specific court
2 order.

3
4 DATED: May 11, 2011

Carolyn B. Kuhl
Carolyn B. Kuhl, Supervising Judge of the
Civil Departments, Los Angeles Superior Court

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

MAY 03 2019

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
 By Rizalinda Mina, Deputy

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

IN RE LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT) FIRST AMENDED GENERAL ORDER
 – MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING)
 FOR CIVIL)

On December 3, 2018, the Los Angeles County Superior Court mandated electronic filing of all documents in Limited Civil cases by litigants represented by attorneys. On January 2, 2019, the Los Angeles County Superior Court mandated electronic filing of all documents filed in Non-Complex Unlimited Civil cases by litigants represented by attorneys. (California Rules of Court, rule 2.253(b).) All electronically filed documents in Limited and Non-Complex Unlimited cases are subject to the following:

1) DEFINITIONS

- a) **“Bookmark”** A bookmark is a PDF document navigational tool that allows the reader to quickly locate and navigate to a designated point of interest within a document.
- b) **“Efiling Portal”** The official court website includes a webpage, referred to as the efiling portal, that gives litigants access to the approved Electronic Filing Service Providers.
- c) **“Electronic Envelope”** A transaction through the electronic service provider for submission of documents to the Court for processing which may contain one or more PDF documents attached.
- d) **“Electronic Filing”** Electronic Filing (eFiling) is the electronic transmission to a Court of a document in electronic form. (California Rules of Court, rule 2.250(b)(7).)

- e) **“Electronic Filing Service Provider”** An Electronic Filing Service Provider (EFSP) is a person or entity that receives an electronic filing from a party for retransmission to the Court. In the submission of filings, the EFSP does so on behalf of the electronic filer and not as an agent of the Court. (California Rules of Court, rule 2.250(b)(8).)
- f) **“Electronic Signature”** For purposes of these local rules and in conformity with Code of Civil Procedure section 17, subdivision (b)(3), section 34, and section 1010.6, subdivision (b)(2), Government Code section 68150, subdivision (g), and California Rules of Court, rule 2.257, the term “Electronic Signature” is generally defined as an electronic sound, symbol, or process attached to or logically associated with an electronic record and executed or adopted by a person with the intent to sign the electronic record.
- g) **“Hyperlink”** An electronic link providing direct access from one distinctively marked place in a hypertext or hypermedia document to another in the same or different document.
- h) **“Portable Document Format”** A digital document format that preserves all fonts, formatting, colors and graphics of the original source document, regardless of the application platform used.

2) MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING

a) Trial Court Records

Pursuant to Government Code section 68150, trial court records may be created, maintained, and preserved in electronic format. Any document that the Court receives electronically must be clerically processed and must satisfy all legal filing requirements in order to be filed as an official court record (California Rules of Court, rules 2.100, et seq. and 2.253(b)(6)).

b) Represented Litigants

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 2.253(b), represented litigants are required to electronically file documents with the Court through an approved EFSP.

c) Public Notice

The Court has issued a Public Notice with effective dates the Court required parties to electronically file documents through one or more approved EFSPs. Public Notices containing effective dates and the list of EFSPs are available on the Court’s website, at www.lacourt.org.

1 d) Documents in Related Cases

2 Documents in related cases must be electronically filed in the eFiling portal for that case type if
3 electronic filing has been implemented in that case type, regardless of whether the case has
4 been related to a Civil case.

5 3) EXEMPT LITIGANTS

6 a) Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 2.253(b)(2), self-represented litigants are exempt
7 from mandatory electronic filing requirements.

8 b) Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6, subdivision (d)(3) and California Rules of
9 Court, rule 2.253(b)(4), any party may make application to the Court requesting to be excused
10 from filing documents electronically and be permitted to file documents by conventional
11 means if the party shows undue hardship or significant prejudice.

12 4) EXEMPT FILINGS

13 a) The following documents shall not be filed electronically:

14 i) Peremptory Challenges or Challenges for Cause of a Judicial Officer pursuant to Code of
15 Civil Procedure sections 170.6 or 170.3;

16 ii) Bonds/Undertaking documents;

17 iii) Trial and Evidentiary Hearing Exhibits

18 iv) Any ex parte application that is filed concurrently with a new complaint including those
19 that will be handled by a Writs and Receivers department in the Mosk courthouse; and

20 v) Documents submitted conditionally under seal. The actual motion or application shall be
21 electronically filed. A courtesy copy of the electronically filed motion or application to
22 submit documents conditionally under seal must be provided with the documents
23 submitted conditionally under seal.

24 b) Lodgments

25 Documents attached to a Notice of Lodgment shall be lodged and/or served conventionally in
26 paper form. The actual document entitled, "Notice of Lodgment," shall be filed electronically.

27 //

28 //

1 5) ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM WORKING PROCEDURES

2 Electronic filing service providers must obtain and manage registration information for persons
3 and entities electronically filing with the court.

4 6) TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

5 a) Electronic documents must be electronically filed in PDF, text searchable format **when**
6 technologically feasible without impairment of the document's image.

7 b) The table of contents for any filing must be bookmarked.

8 c) Electronic documents, including but not limited to, declarations, proofs of service, and
9 exhibits, must be bookmarked within the document pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule
10 3.1110(f)(4). Electronic bookmarks must include links to the first page of each bookmarked
11 item (e.g. exhibits, declarations, deposition excerpts) and with bookmark titles that identify the
12 bookedmarked item and briefly describe the item.

13 d) Attachments to primary documents must be bookmarked. Examples include, but are not
14 limited to, the following:

15 i) Depositions;

16 ii) Declarations;

17 iii) Exhibits (including exhibits to declarations);

18 iv) Transcripts (including excerpts within transcripts);

19 v) Points and Authorities;

20 vi) Citations; and

21 vii) Supporting Briefs.

22 e) Use of hyperlinks within documents (including attachments and exhibits) is strongly
23 encouraged.

24 f) Accompanying Documents

25 Each document accompanying a single pleading must be electronically filed as a **separate**
26 digital PDF document.

27 g) Multiple Documents

28 Multiple documents relating to one case can be uploaded in one envelope transaction.

h) Writs and Abstracts

Writs and Abstracts must be submitted as a separate electronic envelope.

i) Sealed Documents

If and when a judicial officer orders documents to be filed under seal, those documents must be filed electronically (unless exempted under paragraph 4); the burden of accurately designating the documents as sealed at the time of electronic submission is the submitting party's responsibility.

j) Redaction

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 1.201, it is the submitting party's responsibility to redact confidential information (such as using initials for names of minors, using the last four digits of a social security number, and using the year for date of birth) so that the information shall not be publicly displayed.

7) ELECTRONIC FILING SCHEDULE

a) Filed Date

i) Any document received electronically by the court between 12:00 am and 11:59:59 pm shall be deemed to have been effectively filed on that court day if accepted for filing. Any document received electronically on a non-court day, is deemed to have been effectively filed on the next court day if accepted. (California Rules of Court, rule 2.253(b)(6); Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b)(3).)

ii) Notwithstanding any other provision of this order, if a digital document is not filed in due course because of: (1) an interruption in service; (2) a transmission error that is not the fault of the transmitter; or (3) a processing failure that occurs after receipt, the Court may order, either on its own motion or by noticed motion submitted with a declaration for Court consideration, that the document be deemed filed and/or that the document's filing date conform to the attempted transmission date.

8) EX PARTE APPLICATIONS

a) Ex parte applications and all documents in support thereof must be electronically filed no later than 10:00 a.m. the court day before the ex parte hearing.

- b) Any written opposition to an ex parte application must be electronically filed by 8:30 a.m. the day of the ex parte hearing. A printed courtesy copy of any opposition to an ex parte application must be provided to the court the day of the ex parte hearing.

9) PRINTED COURTESY COPIES

- a) For any filing electronically filed two or fewer days before the hearing, a courtesy copy must be delivered to the courtroom by 4:30 p.m. the same business day the document is efiled. If the efiled is submitted after 4:30 p.m., the courtesy copy must be delivered to the courtroom by 10:00 a.m. the next business day.
- b) Regardless of the time of electronic filing, a printed courtesy copy (along with proof of electronic submission) is required for the following documents:
- i) Any printed document required pursuant to a Standing or General Order;
 - ii) Pleadings and motions (including attachments such as declarations and exhibits) of 26 pages or more;
 - iii) Pleadings and motions that include points and authorities;
 - iv) Demurrers;
 - v) Anti-SLAPP filings, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16;
 - vi) Motions for Summary Judgment/Adjudication; and
 - vii) Motions to Compel Further Discovery.
- c) Nothing in this General Order precludes a Judicial Officer from requesting a courtesy copy of additional documents. Courtroom specific courtesy copy guidelines can be found at www.lacourt.org on the Civil webpage under "Courtroom Information."

10) WAIVER OF FEES AND COSTS FOR ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOCUMENTS

- a) Fees and costs associated with electronic filing must be waived for any litigant who has received a fee waiver. (California Rules of Court, rules 2.253(b)(), 2.258(b), Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(d)(2).)
- b) Fee waiver applications for waiver of court fees and costs pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6, subdivision (b)(6), and California Rules of Court, rule 2.252(f), may be electronically filed in any authorized action or proceeding.

11) SIGNATURES ON ELECTRONIC FILING

For purposes of this General Order, all electronic filings must be in compliance with California Rules of Court, rule 2.257. This General Order applies to documents filed within the Civil Division of the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

This First Amended General Order supersedes any previous order related to electronic filing, and is effective immediately, and is to remain in effect until otherwise ordered by the Civil Supervising Judge and/or Presiding Judge.

DATED: May 3, 2019



Kevin C. Brazile

KEVIN C. BRAZILE
Presiding Judge