

MAY 16 2008

JOHN A. CLAHRE, CLERK  
*Mona C. Jennings*  
BY M. ANDERSON-JENNINGS

**PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD**

A Professional Corporation  
Theodore A. Pinnock, Esq. Bar #: 153434  
David C. Wakefield, Esq. Bar #: 185736  
3033 Fifth Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92103  
Telephone: 619.858.3671  
Facsimile: 619.858.3646

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

**JON CARPENTER,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**TAERYONG PARK; EUNHYE G.  
PARK; RIVERSIDE PARK  
PHARMACY, INC. DBA RIVERSIDE  
PHARMACY; And DOES 1  
THROUGH 10, Inclusive**

**Defendants.**

Case No.

**EC 047311**

**CIVIL COMPLAINT:**

**DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN  
PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS**

**[42 U.S.C. 12182(a) ET. SEQ; CIVIL  
CODE 51, 52, 54, 54.1, 54.3]**

**UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE -  
PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

**NAMED DEFENDANTS AND NAMED PLAINTIFF**

1. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are, and, at all times mentioned herein, were, a business or corporation or franchise organized and existing and/or doing business under the laws of the State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants TAERYONG PARK; EUNHYE G. PARK; RIVERSIDE PARK PHARMACY, INC. DBA RIVERSIDE PHARMACY are the owner, operator, and/or lessor/lessee of the real property and the public accommodation located thereon at the Property Address: 11655 RIVERSIDE DR, LOS ANGELES, CA 91602; Assessor's Parcel Number: 2354-010-036. Defendants TAERYONG PARK; and EUNHYE G. PARK are located at 778 TUOLUMNE AVE, THOUSAND OAKS, CA 91360. Defendant RIVERSIDE PARK

1 PHARMACY, INC. DBA RIVERSIDE PHARMACY c/o Registered Agent: TAERYONG  
2 PARK, located at 11655 RIVERSIDE DR, N HOLLYWOOD, CA 91602.

3 2. The words Plaintiff and Plaintiffs as used herein specifically include JON CARPENTER.

4 3. Defendants Does 1 through 10, were at all times relevant herein subsidiaries, employers,  
5 employees, agents, of Defendants TAERYONG PARK; EUNHYE G. PARK; RIVERSIDE  
6 PARK PHARMACY, INC. DBA RIVERSIDE PHARMACY. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true  
7 names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore  
8 sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will pray leave of the court to amend  
9 this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the Does when ascertained.

10 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants and each of them  
11 herein were, at all times relevant to the action, the owner, lessor, lessee, franchiser, franchisee,  
12 general partner, limited partner, agent, employee, representing partner, or joint venturer of the  
13 remaining Defendants and were acting within the course and scope of that relationship. Plaintiff  
14 is further informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each of the Defendants herein gave  
15 consent to, ratified, and/or authorized the acts alleged herein to each of the remaining Defendants.

16 **CONCISE SET OF FACTS**

17 5. Plaintiff JON CARPENTER (hereinafter "Plaintiff") has physical impairments and due to  
18 these impairments he has learned to successfully operate a wheelchair for mobility. Plaintiff said  
19 physical impairments substantially limit one or more of the following major life activities  
20 including but not limited to: walking.

21 6. Plaintiff has physical impairments because their conditions affect one or more of the  
22 following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, and/or  
23 cardiovascular. Further, Plaintiff said physical impairments substantially limits one or more of  
24 the following major life activities. In addition, Plaintiff cannot perform one or more of the said  
25 major life activities in the manner, speed, and duration when compared to the average person.  
26 Moreover, Plaintiff has a history of or has been classified as having a physical impairment as  
27 required by 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2)(A).

28 7. On March 13, 2008, Plaintiff JON CARPENTER wanted to visite Defendants' public  
accommodation facilities located at Property Address: 11655 RIVERSIDE DR, LOS ANGELES,

1 CA 91602; Assessor's Parcel Number: 2354-010-036 to utilize their goods and/or services. When  
2 Plaintiff JON CARPENTER patronized Defendants' public accommodation facilities, he was  
3 unable to use and/or had difficulty using the public accommodations' facilities including but not  
4 limited to the barriers to access listed herein and said facilities were not accessible because they  
5 failed to comply with ADA Access Guidelines For Buildings and Facilities (hereafter referred to  
6 as "ADAAG" and codified in 28 C.F.R. Part 36, App. A) and/or California's Title 24 Building  
7 Code Requirements. Defendants failed to remove barriers to equal access within their public  
8 accommodation facilities as required.

9 8. Plaintiff JON CARPENTER was deterred from visiting the property due to said access  
10 barriers as listed herein to the present Complaint at Defendants' public accommodation facilities  
11 located on the Property and/or has knowledge of said access barriers and is presently deterred  
12 from accessing the public accommodation. Plaintiff alleges that these known barriers to access  
13 are not an exhaustive list of the barriers to access that exist at Defendants' facilities.

14 9. Defendants failed to provide auxiliary aids and services that are necessary to ensure equal  
15 access to the goods, services, privileges, or accommodations that it offers. Title 28, part 36.303  
16 of Code of Federal Regulations states:

17 (a) General. A public accommodation shall take those steps that may be necessary to ensure that  
18 no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated  
19 differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the  
20 public accommodation can demonstrate that taking those steps would fundamentally alter the  
21 nature of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations being offered  
22 or would result in an undue burden, i.e., significant difficulty or expense.

23 (b) Examples. The term "auxiliary aids and services" includes:

24 (1) Qualified interpreters, notetakers, computer-aided transcription services, written  
25 materials, telephone handset amplifiers, assistive listening devices, assistive listening  
26 systems, telephones compatible with hearing aids, closed caption decoders, open and  
27 closed captioning, telecommunications devices for deaf persons (TDD's), videotext  
28 displays, or other effective methods of making aurally delivered materials available to

1 individuals with hearing impairments;

2 (2) Qualified readers, taped texts, audio recordings, Brailled materials, large print  
3 materials, or other effective methods of making visually delivered materials available to  
4 individuals with visual impairments;

5 (3) Acquisition or modification of equipment or devices; and

6 (4) Other similar services and actions.

7 (c) Effective communication. A public accommodation shall furnish appropriate auxiliary aids  
8 and services where necessary to ensure effective communication with individuals with  
9 disabilities.

10 10. Plaintiff can prove these barriers as Plaintiff conducted a preliminary survey of  
11 Defendants' facility. Plaintiff specifically alleges that Defendants knew, to a substantial  
12 certainty, that the architectural barriers precluded equal access. First, Plaintiff will prove that  
13 Defendants had actual knowledge that the architectural barriers precluded equal access and that  
14 the noncompliance with ADAAG as to accessible entrances was intentional. Second, due to the  
15 abundance of ADA information and constant news covers of ADA lawsuits, Defendants had  
16 actual knowledge of the ADA and decided deliberately not to remove architectural barriers.  
17 Third, Defendants have no plans to remodel. Fourth, Defendants had actual knowledge of ADA  
18 given all the ADA public awareness campaigns, the abundance of free ADA information and the  
19 media's constant ADA coverage. Fifth, a human being acting for the defendants made a  
20 conscious decision as to how to proceed given the presence of the architectural barriers. Plaintiff  
21 alleges any alternative methods preclude integration of disabled patrons, as it requires them to use  
22 second-class facilities. Also, expert testimony will show the facility contained inaccessible  
23 features. Plaintiff alleges businesses often state that they have few customers with disabilities.  
24 Plaintiff alleges such customers avoid patronizing inaccessible businesses and are deterred from  
25 patronizing such businesses.

26 11. For example, there is no accessible parking of any kind and no signs. These violations  
27 deterred the Plaintiff's access to the pharmacy.  
28

1 12. Plaintiff intends to return to Defendants' public accommodation facilities in the immediate  
2 future. Plaintiff was deterred and is presently deterred from returning due to his knowledge of the  
3 barriers to access that exist at Defendants' facilities.

4 13. Pursuant to federal and state law, Defendants are required to remove barriers to their  
5 existing facilities. Further, Defendants had actual knowledge of their barrier removal duties  
6 under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Civil Code before January 26, 1992. Also,  
7 Defendants should have known that individuals with disabilities are not required to give notice to  
8 a governmental agency before filing suit alleging Defendants failed to remove architectural  
9 barriers.

10 14. Plaintiff believes and herein alleges Defendants' facilities have access violations not  
11 directly experienced by Plaintiff which would preclude or limit access by Plaintiff potentially  
12 including but not limited to violations of the ADA, ADA Accessibility Guidelines (Codified in 28  
13 C.F.R. Part 36, App. A) and Title 24 of the California Building Code. Plaintiff alleges  
14 Defendants are required to utilize the ADA checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal  
15 approved by the United States Department of Justice and created by Adaptive Environments.  
16 Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief to remove all barriers to access that are related to his  
17 disability even those barriers that are only known to exist but are not directly experienced by  
18 plaintiff. *Doran v 7-Eleven Inc*, 2007 U.S.App.Lexis 26143 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2007).

19 15. Based on these facts, Plaintiff alleges he was discriminated against each time he  
20 patronized and/or was deterred from patronizing Defendants' facilities. Plaintiff was extremely  
21 upset due to Defendants' conduct.

22 16. Plaintiff is not required to provide notice to the defendants prior to filing a complaint  
23 and/or to recover attorney fees and costs. *Botosan v. Paul McNally Realty*, 216 F.3d 827, 832  
24 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2000). *Skaff v Meridien*, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 25516 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2007).

25 **WHAT CLAIMS ARE PLAINTIFF ALLEGING AGAINST EACH NAMED**  
26 **DEFENDANT**

27 17. Defendants TAERYONG PARK; EUNHYE G. PARK; RIVERSIDE PARK  
28

1 PHARMACY, INC. DBA RIVERSIDE PHARMACY and Does 1 through 10 will be referred to  
2 collectively hereinafter as "Defendants."

3 18. Plaintiff avers that the Defendants are liable for the following claims as alleged below:

4 **DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS**

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS- Claims Under The Americans**  
6 **With Disabilities Act Of 1990**

7 **Claim I**

8 19. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of  
9 disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages,  
10 or accommodations of any place of public accommodation as Defendants own, lease (or lease  
11 to), or operate a place of public accommodation in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

12 **Claim II**

13 20. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff directly, or  
14 through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the  
15 individual or class to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges,  
16 advantages, or accommodations of an entity in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

17 **Claim III**

18 21. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as it is  
19 discriminatory to afford an individual or class of individuals, on the basis of a disability or  
20 disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other  
21 arrangements with the opportunity to participate in or benefit from a good, service, facility,  
22 privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is not equal to that afforded to other individuals in  
23 violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

24 **Claim IV**

25 22. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as it is  
26 discriminatory to provide an individual or class of individuals, on the basis of a disability or  
27 disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other  
28

1 arrangements with a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is  
2 different or separate from that provided to other individuals.

3 Claim V

4 23. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendants  
5 failed to afforded to an individual with a disability in the most integrated setting appropriate to  
6 the needs of the individual in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

7 Claim VI

8 24. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendants  
9 utilized standards or criteria or methods of administration that have the effect of discriminating on  
10 the basis of disability; or that perpetuate the discrimination of others who are subject to common  
11 administrative control in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

12 Claim VII

13 25. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as it is  
14 discriminatory to exclude or otherwise deny equal goods, services, facilities, privileges,  
15 advantages, accommodations, or other opportunities to an individual or entity because of the  
16 known disability of an individual with whom the individual or entity is known to have a  
17 relationship or association in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182. See Niece v. Fitzner 922 F. Supp.  
18 1208 (1996)

19 Claim VIII

20 26. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendants  
21 engaged in the specific prohibitions as stated in 42 U.S.C. §12182.

22 Claim IX

23 27. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendant  
24 failed to demonstrate that the removal of a barrier is not readily achievable, and made such goods,  
25 services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations available through alternative  
26 methods in a segregated manner in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182. Plaintiff is entitled to  
27 injunctive relief to remove all barriers to access that are related to his disability even those  
28

1 barriers that are only known to exist but are not directly experienced by plaintiff. *Doran v 7-*  
2 *Eleven Inc*, 2007 U.S.App.Lexis 26143 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2007).

3 **Claim X**

4 28. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff as Defendants  
5 altered the use of their establishment in a manner that affected or could have affected the usability  
6 of the facility or part thereof and failed to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum  
7 extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by  
8 individuals with disabilities in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183.

9 29. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff pray for judgment and relief as hereinafter set forth.

10  
11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS - CLAIMS UNDER**  
12 **CALIFORNIA ACCESSIBILITY LAWS**

13 **CLAIM I: Denial Of Full And Equal Access**

14 30. Based on the facts plead above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff was denied full  
15 and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
16 accommodations within a public accommodation owned, leased, and/or operated by Defendants  
17 as required by Civil Code Sections 54 and 54.1.

18 **CLAIM II: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures**

19 31. Based on the facts plead above and elsewhere herein this complaint, Defendants failed and  
20 refused to provide a reasonable alternative by modifying its practices, policies, and procedures in  
21 that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or design to assist Plaintiff and/or others similarly situated  
22 in entering and utilizing Defendants' services as required by Civil Code § 54.1. Thus, Plaintiff  
23 was subjected to discrimination in violation of Civil Code § 54.1.

24 **CLAIM III: Violation Of The Unruh Act**

25 32. Based on the facts plead above and elsewhere herein this complaint and because  
26 Defendants violated the Civil Code § 51 by failing to comply with 42 United States Code §  
27 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2), Defendants did and continue to knowingly  
28 discriminate against Plaintiff and persons similarly situated in violation of Civil Code §§ 51, 52,

1 and 54.1. Plaintiff alleges the access violations alleged here are so obvious as to implicate at least  
2 a prima facie case of discriminatory intent.

3 33. Based on the facts plead above, Claims I, II, and III of Plaintiffs' Second Cause Of  
4 Action above, and the facts elsewhere herein this complaint, Plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm  
5 unless Defendants are ordered to remove architectural, non-architectural, and communication  
6 barriers at Defendants' public accommodation. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' discriminatory  
7 conduct is capable of repetition, and this discriminatory repetition adversely impacts Plaintiff and  
8 a substantial segment of the disability community. Plaintiff alleges there is a state and national  
9 public interest in requiring accessibility in places of public accommodation. Plaintiff has no  
10 adequate remedy at law to redress the discriminatory conduct of Defendants. Plaintiff desires to  
11 return to Defendants' places of business in the immediate future. Accordingly, the Plaintiff  
12 alleges that a structural or mandatory injunction is necessary to enjoin compliance with state civil  
13 rights laws enacted for the benefit of individuals with disabilities.

14 34. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for damages and relief as hereinafter stated.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT FOR RELIEF:  
23

- 24 A. For injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a).  
25 B. For general damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52 or 54.3;  
26 C. For \$4,000 in damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 for each and every offense of  
27 Civil Code § 51, Title 24 of the California Building Code, ADA, and ADA Accessibility  
28 Guidelines (Codified in 28 C.F.R. Part 36, App. A);

1 D. In the alternative to the damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 in Paragraph C above,  
2 for \$1,000 in damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 54.3 for each and every offense of Civil  
3 Code § 54.1, Title 24 of the California Building Code, ADA, and ADA Accessibility Guidelines;

4 E. For treble damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52(a) or 54.3(a);

5  
6 F. For attorneys fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988, 42 U.S.C. § 12205, and Cal. Civil Code  
7 § 52; 54.3;


8 G. A Jury Trial and;

9 H. For such other further relief as the court deems proper.

10 Respectfully submitted:

11 Dated: May 2, 2008

**PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD, A.P.C.**

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

**THEODORE A. PINNOCK, ESQ.**

**DAVID C. WAKEFIELD, ESQ.**

**Attorneys for Plaintiff**

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, state bar number, address)
Theodore A. Pinnock, Esq. Bar #: 150004, David C. Wakefield, Esq. Bar #: 185736
Michelle L. Wakefield, Esq. Bar #: 200424
3033 Fifth Avenue, Suite 410 San Diego, CA 92103
TELEPHONE NO 619.858.3671 FAX NO 619.858.3646
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional)
ATTORNEY FOR (Name) PLAINTIFF

FOR COURT USE ONLY
FILED
LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
MAY 16 2008
JOHN A. CLARKE, CLERK
BY M. ANDERSON-JENNINGS

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
STREET ADDRESS 300 East Olive Avenue
MAILING ADDRESS
CITY AND ZIP CODE Burbank, California 91502
BRANCH NAME North Central District Burbank Courthouse

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: JON CARPENTER

DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: TAERYONG PARK; ET AL
ORDER ON APPLICATION FOR WAIVER OF COURT FEES AND COSTS

CASE NUMBER EC 047311

1. The application was filed on (date): 5/5/08
2. The application was filed by (name): JON CARPENTER
3. IT IS ORDERED that the application is granted in whole

- a. No payments. Payment of all the fees and costs listed in California Rules of Court, rule 985(i), is waived. The applicant shall pay all the fees and costs listed in California Rules of Court, rule 985(i), EXCEPT the following:
(1) Filing papers.
(2) Certification and copying.
(3) Issuing process and certification.
(4) Transmittal of papers.
(5) Court-appointed interpreter.
(6) Sheriff and marshal fees.
(7) Reporter's fees\* (valid for 60 days).
(8) Telephone appearance (Gov. Code, § 68070.1)
(9) Other (specify code section):
Reporter's fees are per diem pursuant to Code Civ. Proc., §§ 269, 274c, and Gov. Code, §§ 69947, 69948, and 72195.

c. Method of payment. The applicant shall pay all the fees and costs when charged, EXCEPT as follows:
(1) Pay (specify): percent. (2) Pay: \$ per month or more until the balance is paid.
d. The clerk of the court, county financial officer, or appropriate county officer is authorized to require the applicant to appear before and be examined by the court no sooner than four months from the date of this order, and not more than once in any four-month period. The applicant is ordered to appear in this court as follows for review of his or her financial status:

Table with 5 columns: Date, Time, Dept., Div., Room

e. The clerk is directed to mail a copy of this order only to the applicant's attorney or to the applicant if not represented.
f. All unpaid fees and costs shall be deemed to be taxable costs if the applicant is entitled to costs and shall be a lien on any judgment recovered by the applicant and shall be paid directly to the clerk by the judgment debtor upon such recovery.

4. IT IS ORDERED that the application is denied in whole in part for the following reasons (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 985):
a. Monthly household income exceeds guidelines (Gov. Code, § 68511.3(a)(6)(B); form 982(a)(17)(A)).
b. Other (Complete line 4b on page 2).
c. The applicant shall pay any fees and costs due in this action within 10 days from the date of service of this order or paper filed by the applicant with the clerk will be of no effect.
d. The clerk is directed to mail a copy of this order to all parties who have appeared in this action.

5. IT IS ORDERED that a hearing be held.
a. The substantial evidentiary conflict to be resolved by the hearing is (specify):
b. The applicant should appear in this court at the following hearing to help resolve the conflict:

Table with 5 columns: Date, Time, Dept., Div., Room

c. The address of the court is (specify):
Same as above
d. The clerk is directed to mail a copy of this order only to the applicant's attorney or to the applicant if not represented.

NOTICE: If item 3d or item 5b is filled in and the applicant does not attend the hearing, the court may revoke or change the order or deny the application without considering information the applicant wants the court to consider.

WARNING: The applicant must immediately tell the court if he or she becomes able to pay court fees or costs during this action. The applicant may be ordered to appear in court and answer questions about his or her ability to pay fees or costs.

Date: MAY 16 2008
M. ANDERSON-JENNINGS, Deputy
JUDICIAL OFFICER