

1 **PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD**

2 A Professional Corporation

3 Theodore A. Pinnock, Esq.

4 David C. Wakefield, Esq.

5 Michelle L. Wakefield, Esq.

6 3033 Fifth Avenue, Suite 410

7 San Diego, CA 92103

8 Telephone: 619.858.3671

9 Facsimile: 619.858.3646

Bar #: 153434

Bar #: 185736

Bar #: 200424

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED
CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE 10
CENTRAL DIVISION
2007 AUG 21 P 12:05
SUPERIOR COURT
SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA

11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**
13 **CENTRAL**

14 **LISSA HAYES**

15 **Plaintiff,**

16 **v.**

17 **COMMUNITY PRESCRIPTION**
18 **CENTER INC.**

19 **And DOES 1 THROUGH 10, Inclusive**

20 **Defendants.**

Case No. 37-2007-00072607-cu-cr-ctl

FIRST AMENDED CIVIL
COMPLAINT:
DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN
PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS
[42 U.S.C. 12182(a) ET. SEQ; CIVIL
CODE 51, 52, 54, 54.1]

21 **NAMED DEFENDANTS AND NAMED PLAINTIFF**

22 1. Defendants are, and, at all times mentioned herein, were, a business or
23 corporation or franchise organized and existing and/or doing business under the laws of
24 the State of California.

25 2. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants,
26 **COMMUNITY PRESCRIPTION CENTER INC.**

1 , are the owners, operators, and/or lessors of the real property, as well as the business
2 operated thereon. Company Name: COMMUNITY PRESCRIPTION CTR, INC.

3 Business Address:

4 640 UNIVERSITY AVE
5 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103-3213

6 Mailing Address:

7 5018 CANTERBURY DR
8 SAN DIEGO, CA 92116-2107

9
10 Owner: COMMUNITY PRESCRIPTION CENTER INC (Company/Corporation)

11 Mailing Address: 640 UNIVERSITY AVE, SAN DIEGO, CA 92103

12 Property Address: 640 UNIVERSITY AVE, SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
13

14
15 3. The words "Plaintiffs" and "Plaintiff's Member" as used herein specifically
16 include the organization and TRIPPLE AAA ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN AND
17 ADULTS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES , SUING ON BEHALF OF ITS
18 MEMBERS, ; and persons associated with its Members who accompanied Members to
19 Defendants' facilities.
20

21 4. Defendants Does 1 through 10, were at all times relevant herein subsidiaries,
22 employers, employees, agents, of Defendants COMMUNITY PRESCRIPTION
23 CENTER INC.

24 . Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as
25 Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious
26 names. Plaintiffs will pray leave of the court to amend this complaint to allege the true
27 names and capacities of the Does when ascertained.
28

1 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants and each
2 of them herein were, at all times relevant to the action, the owner, lessor, lessee,
3 franchiser, franchisee, general partner, limited partner, agent, employee, representing
4 partner, or joint venturer of the remaining Defendants and were acting within the course
5 and scope of that relationship. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe, and thereon
6 allege, that each of the Defendants herein gave consent to, ratified, and/or authorized the
7 acts alleged herein to each of the remaining Defendants.
8

9
10 **CONCISE SET OF FACTS**

11 6. Plaintiff has an impairment.

12 7. Defendants failed to provide auxiliary aids and services that are necessary to
13 ensure equal access to the goods, services, privileges, or accommodations that it offers.

14 Title 28, part 36.303 of Code of Federal Regulations states:

15 (a) General. A public accommodation shall take those steps that may be
16 necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied
17 services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals
18 because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the public
19 accommodation can demonstrate that taking those steps would
20 fundamentally alter the nature of the goods, services, facilities, privileges,
21 advantages, or accommodations being offered or would result in an undue
22 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
25 services, written materials, telephone handset amplifiers, assistive
26 listening devices, assistive listening systems, telephones compatible with
27 hearing aids, closed caption decoders, open and closed captioning,
28

1 telecommunications devices for deaf persons (TDD's), videotext displays,
2 or other effective methods of making aurally delivered materials available
3 to individuals with hearing impairments;

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

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

8 (4) Other similar services and actions.

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

12 Defendants failed to comply with Title 28, part 36.303 of Code of Federal Regulations as
13 it failed to provide Qualified readers, taped texts, audio recordings, Brailled materials, or
14 large print materials. Further, Defendants failed to remove architectural barriers as
15 attached as Exhibit A.

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

25 9. Plaintiff's Members expressly intend to patronize the establishment and the
26 property that is the subject of this Complaint in the immediate future.
27
28

1 10. Plaintiff's Member was deterred from patronizing the facility.
2

3 **WHAT CLAIMS ARE PLAINTIFFS ALLEGING AGAINST EACH NAMED**

4 **DEFENDANT**

5 10. Defendants COMMUNITY PRESCRIPTION CENTER INC.

6 and Does 1 through 10 will be referred to collectively hereinafter as "Defendants."

7 11. Plaintiffs aver that the Defendants are liable for the following claims as alleged
8 below:
9

10 **DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS**

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

13 Claim I

14 12. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs on the
15 basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities,
16 privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation as
17 Defendants own, lease (or lease to), or operate a place of public accommodation in
18 violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.
19

20 Claim II

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

26 Claim III

27 14. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs as it
28

1 is discriminatory to afford an individual or class of individuals, on the basis of a disability
2 or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or
3 other arrangements with the opportunity to participate in or benefit from a good, service,
4 facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is not equal to that afforded to other
5 individuals in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

6 Claim IV

7 15. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs as it
8 is discriminatory to provide an individual or class of individuals, on the basis of a
9 disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual,
10 licensing, or other arrangements with a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or
11 accommodation that is different or separate from that provided to other individuals.

12 Claim V

13 16. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs as
14 Defendants failed to afford to an individual with a disability in the most integrated
15 setting appropriate to the needs of the individual in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182.

16 Claim VI

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

21 Claim VII

22 18. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs as it
23 is discriminatory to exclude or otherwise deny equal goods, services, facilities, privileges,
24 advantages, accommodations, or other opportunities to an individual or entity because of
25 the known disability of an individual with whom the individual or entity is known to have
26 a relationship or association in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182. See Niece v. Fitzner 922 F.
27

28

1 Supp. 1208 (1996)

2 Claim VIII

3 19. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs as
4 Defendants engaged in the specific prohibitions as stated in 42 U.S.C. §12182.

5 Claim IX

6 20. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs as
7 Defendant failed to demonstrate that the removal of a barrier is not readily achievable,
8 and made such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations
9 available through alternative methods in a segregated manner in violation of 42 U.S.C.
10 §12182.

11 Claim X

12 21. Based on the facts stated above, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs as
13 Defendants altered the use of their establishment in a manner that affected or could have
14 affected the usability of the facility or part thereof and failed to make alterations in such a
15 manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are
16 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals
17 who use wheelchairs in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183.

18 22. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment and relief as hereinafter set forth.
19

20 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS - CLAIMS UNDER**
21 **CALIFORNIA ACCESSIBILITY LAWS**

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

23 23. Based on the facts plead above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiff's
24 Member and Plaintiff(s) was denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services,
25 facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations within a public accommodation
26 owned, leased, and/or operated by Defendants as required by Civil Code Sections 54 and
27 54.1.

1 disabilities.

2 27. Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for damages and relief as hereinafter stated.
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

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


DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT FOR RELIEF:

- A. For injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a).
- B. For attorneys fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988, 42 U.S.C. § 12205, and Cal. Civil Code § 51, 52; 54.3;
- C. A Jury Trial and;
- D. For such other further relief as the court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted:

PINNOCK & WAKEFIELD, A.P.C.

Dated: August 20, 2007

By: 

THEODORE A. PINNOCK, ESQ.
MICHELLE L. WAKEFIELD, ESQ.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**ACCESSIBILITY SURVEY
ADA TITLE III**

Disability Compliance Documentation

Reported August, 2007

COMMUNITY PRESCRIPTION CENTER, INC.

Community Prescription Center, Inc.

640 University Ave.

San Diego, CA 92103

(619) 295-6688

37-2007-00072607-cv-cr-ctf

Report of Findings

I. IN GENERAL

This report focuses on architectural barriers and the provision of auxiliary aids which may challenge access to goods or services. This is only a preliminary report conducted to comply with Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Exhibit A

- II. **AUXILIARY AIDS:** The pharmacy provides written information to customers without offering large print, Braille or taped text. Written information in the form of medicine instructions is given to customers to take home.

A pharmacy must provide the Auxiliary Aids as

follows:

a. **Purchase Braille Translation Software:** The industry leading multi-platform, multi-language Braille translator for anyone from the casual user to the power user. Approximate Cost Price: \$580.00. The purpose of the device is to translate current word documents to be printed as Braille.

b. **Purchase or provide Digital Dictating Machine/Voice.** Approximate Cost Price: \$15.00. The purpose of this machine is to provide taped text to customers that are blind that do not read Braille.

c. **Provide large Print by using Microsoft Word.**

Large Print is 16 point or greater upon customer request.

d. **Provide Qualified Reader - A trained employee who reads the prescriptions. Costs –none.**

e. **Provide signage as to the availability of auxiliary aids;**

Exhibit A

- f. Provide staff training as to how to provide auxiliary aids and to provide staff training to recognize customers with sight impairments to offer available auxiliary aids.

III. ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

A. VIOLATIONS

This report contains a number of serious violations to the accessibility Standards as outlined in the ADA Act of 1990 Title III, and the California Accessibility Standards Title 24. However, more violations could, and perhaps do exist. A more detailed study must be conducted to identify all violations. Such a study is beyond the scope of the violations noted in this survey.