

Dept. # 53 Assigned Halm

1 Michael A. Goldfeder, SBN 162381  
2 Attorney at Law  
3 400 Continental Boulevard, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
4 El Segundo, CA. 90245  
5 (310) 374-7011

6 Attorney for Plaintiff,  
7 CAREN MANDOYAN

FILED  
Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles

AUG 27 2018

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk  
By \_\_\_\_\_ Deputy  
Shaniva Golden

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES-STANLEY MOSK  
COURTHOUSE-UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

11 Caren Mandoyan ) CASE NO.: BC 719337  
12 )  
13 Plaintiff, ) CIVIL COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES  
14 )  
15 vs. ) FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
16 ) VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA  
17 ) INVASION OF PRIVACY ACT  
18 ) (CIPA) CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE  
19 ) §§ 630, A FELONY, ET SEQ.  
20 )  
21 Defendants. ) SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
22 ) THE UNLAWFUL PRACTICE OF  
23 ) LAW IN VIOLATION OF THE  
24 ) CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND  
25 ) PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 6125,  
26 ) A MISDEMEANOR ET, SEQ.  
27 )  
28 )

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR  
ILLEGALLY PRACTICING A  
BUSINESS WITHOUT A  
REQUIRED BUSINESS LICENSE,  
A MISDEMEANOR, BUSINESS &  
PROFESSIONS CODE § 16240

CIT/CASE: BC719337  
LEA/DEF#:

26 UNDERLYING FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

27  
28  
Michael A. Goldfeder,  
Attorney at Law  
400 Continental Boulevard  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
El Segundo, CA. 90245

29 CIVIL COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

\$435.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	310
----------	--------	--------	--------	-----

1           1. Plaintiff Caren Mandoyan is, and at all times mentioned in this complaint  
2 was, a Deputy Sheriff (Employee # 473892) for the County of Los Angeles  
3 employed continuously for more than eleven (11) years of service with a hire  
4 date of October 2, 2006 and at the time of the events alleged in this matter was  
5 working as a patrol deputy at the South Los Angeles Station facility.  
6

7           2. At all times mentioned herein the defendant County of Los Angeles was,  
8 and is, a legal and political entity established under the laws of the State of  
9 California and the Charter for the County of Los Angeles County, with all the  
10 powers specified and necessarily implied by the Constitution and laws of the  
11 State of California, exercised by a duly elected Board of Supervisors along with  
12 its agents and officers. In such capacity the County of Los Angeles is  
13 responsible for, among other things; the employment, formulation, promulgation,  
14 adoption, application, implementation, administration, purpose, and enforcement  
15 of all applicable provisions of the State of California Constitution and statutory  
16 laws.

17           3. Christine Roam still is, and at all times mentioned in this complaint was  
18 employed by the defendant as a Deputy Sheriff with the rank of Sergeant for the  
19 County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department currently assigned to the civil  
20 advocacy unit for the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

21           4. Chad Smeltzer still is, and at all times mentioned in this complaint was  
22 employed by the defendant as a Deputy Sheriff with the rank of Lieutenant for the  
23 County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department currently assigned at the risk  
24 management unit.

25           5. Amber Taylor (Employee # 279947) no longer is, but at all times mentioned  
26 in this complaint was, employed by the defendant as a Deputy Sheriff for the  
27 County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department assigned as a patrol Deputy at the  
28

1 West Hollywood Sheriff's Station.

2       6. That the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate,  
3 associate, or otherwise, of Defendants, DOES 1 through DOES 25, inclusive, are  
4 unknown to plaintiff at this time, and plaintiff therefore sues said defendants by  
5 such fictitious names, and when the true names or capacities of said defendants  
6 are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint accordingly. Plaintiff is  
7 informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of the defendants  
8 designated herein as a DOE is responsible in some manner for the events and  
9 happenings herein referred to and caused injury and damages proximately  
10 thereby to the plaintiff as herein alleged.

11       4. On July 17, 2017 a letter was received at the office of the Attorney for  
12 Caren Mandoyan (Plaintiff) written by Sergeant Christine Roam (Hereinafter  
13 "Roam") dated July 14, 2017 on the Letterhead for the "Office of the Sheriff  
14 County of Los Angeles; Jim McDonnell, Sheriff. Sergeant Roam affixes the title  
15 "Advocate" after her Departmental deputy sheriff sergeant position. Sergeant  
16 Roam is not a member of the State Bar of California. She has never been a  
17 member of the State Bar of California, nor is she a member of the State Bar from  
18 any other jurisdiction. Yet she wrote this correspondence in response to a  
19 motion filed by the Plaintiff's attorney as part of a Civil Service Hearing stating:  
20 "The Appellant's motion to exclude testimony is without merit inasmuch as the  
21 information he seeks was not relied on by the Department's decision maker, and  
22 therefore was not part of the Skelly file. There is no due process violation and  
23 absolutely no legal authority to grant Appellant's motion to exclude the entire  
24 testimony of Witness Taylor and "all of her derivative statements and exemplars"  
25 [Petitioner Motion page 2]...and the Department intends to introduce this  
26 evidence as part of its case in chief...Additionally, the following materials were  
27  
28

1 also redacted from the investigative file and are being produced to counsel, as it  
2 is the Department's intent to also use those items in its case in chief, to wit: 3. A  
3 recording of a phone conversation between Deputy Taylor and Appellant (one  
4 file); 4. A transcript of the recorded phone conversation;...Because there has  
5 been no due process violation and there is absolutely no legal authority for  
6 granting Appellant's motion, the Department respectfully requests it be denied.  
7  
8 Respectfully, JIM McDONNELL, SHERIFF (signature of Sergeant Christin Roam,  
9 Advocate)."

10 5. After receiving this July 14, 2017 correspondence from the Defendant,  
11 Counsel for the Plaintiff filed a motion at the Civil Service Commission on July  
12 19, 2017 to have the Plaintiff's Administrative matter dismissed for outrageous  
13 government conduct by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department in violating  
14 the State of California Penal Code §§ 632, Et Seq., in suppressing a Felony  
15 crime by their employee, Deputy Sheriff Amber Taylor ("Taylor"), who illegally  
16 and without Plaintiff's consent surreptitiously recorded a phone conversation with  
17 the Plaintiff. Incredibly, the Defendant unequivocally stated in their July 14, 2017  
18 letter that they (Defendant) fully intended to use this illegal Felony phone call at  
19 Plaintiff's Civil Service Hearing, that was recorded by their employee (Taylor).  
20 Perpetuating this Felony crime against the Plaintiff at his Civil Service Hearing in  
21 order to end his career as a Deputy Sheriff.

22 6. When this Felony crime that was committed by the Defendant's employee,  
23 Deputy Sheriff Amber Taylor, was brought to the attention of both Sergeant  
24 Roam and Lieutenant Chad Smeltzer, Supervisors for the Defendant, neither of  
25 them wrote a Felony crime report as mandated under the law, nor did either of  
26 them make an arrest of Deputy Sheriff Amber Talyor pursuant to Penal Code  
27 Section 836 for this criminal offense. Moreover, neither of them made a request  
28

1 to report this Felony conduct through their Internal Criminal Investigation Bureau  
2 ("ICIB"). Instead, acting as ostensible agents and Supervisor employees of the  
3 Defendant, they ignored a Felony crime committed by a Deputy Sheriff (Taylor),  
4 endeavoring instead to utilize it illegally against the Plaintiff, by having it included  
5 in their Departmental binder of exhibits they submitted to the Hearing Officer  
6 assigned to preside over the Plaintiff's matter. Given that the Defendant  
7 intended to have Deputy Sheriff Amber Taylor testify as their witness against the  
8 Plaintiff in his Civil Service Administrative Hearing, and she did testify, the  
9 Defendant acted in concert and in unison with their Supervisors, and concluded  
10 that it was not in their best interests to write a mandatory Felony crime report as  
11 to Taylor's illegal actions. Or open an Internal Criminal Investigation by the  
12 Defendant's Sheriff's Department Internal Criminal Investigations Bureau (ICIB).

13 7. Subsequently, on July 24, 2017 the Defendant's employee, Sergeant  
14 Roam, filed with the Civil Service Commission the: "Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
15 Department's Response to Appellant's July 19, 2017 Motion to Dismiss." That  
16 document contained within it several Penal Code sections that contained grossly  
17 distorted and misplaced legal arguments in an improper and misguided fashion  
18 with the edict: "The Department will be seeking to introduce them at hearing  
19 whether or not Appellant now intends to use them...This recording was legally  
20 obtained and should be allowed at hearing. The Appellant's motion is completely  
21 without merit and should be denied."

22 8. At the Administrative Hearing itself that commenced on July 24, 2017,  
23 Sergeant Roam included this Felony phone call along with a transcription, and  
24 had it placed into the Department's evidence binder that was submitted to the  
25 Hearing Officer assigned to preside over this case. This was all done with the  
26 knowledge, ratification, and approval of the Defendant who employed both of  
27  
28

1 these individuals as Supervisors for the Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
2 Department.  
3

4 9. Ironically, two days before Deputy Sheriff Amber Taylor appeared for her  
5 cross-examination at the Plaintiff's Civil Service Hearing on September 27, 2017,  
6 she suddenly resigned from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department for  
7 unknown reasons. Perhaps that was due in part to her direct testimony on  
8 July 26, 2017 whereby she revealed that she had illegally recorded this phone  
9 call with the Plaintiff, and committed this Felony crime in 2013 while she was on  
10 duty, in uniform, and working for the Defendant. Along with many other actions  
11 and revelations that impacted her veracity as a witness in the case against the  
12 Plaintiff.  
13

14 10. The Plaintiff was relieved of duty on July 10, 2015, and terminated from  
15 his employment with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department on September  
16 14, 2016 based on allegations made by Deputy Sheriff Amber Taylor. At the time  
17 of his separation from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, the Plaintiff  
18 was earning \$119,886.47 according to his W-2 statement issued by the  
19 Defendant.  
20

21 11. The Plaintiff's termination from the Department was upheld at Civil  
22 Service as a consequence of this illegal Felony crime committed by Deputy  
23 Sheriff Amber Taylor in recording a phone call without his consent or knowledge,  
24 that was improperly provided to the Hearing Officer by the Defendant's  
25 Supervisors.  
26

27 12. A timely written claim for damages to person and property was filed with  
28 the defendants in conformity with Government Code Section 911.2 et seq. on  
January 16, 2018. A written denial of the aforesaid claim was deemed denied by  
operation of law on March 2, 2018 by the defendant(s), and mailed to the  
29  
30

plaintiff's legal representative on that same date, making the filing of this civil complaint timely under Government Code Sections 900-915.4 et seq.

## **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

## **VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INVASION OF PRIVACY ACT**

**CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE §§ 630, et seq.**

13. Plaintiff re-pleads and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs and and incorporates them by reference as though fully set forth herein.

14. The California Invasion of Privacy Act, Cal. Pen. Code §§ 630, et seq. ("CIPA"), states that "The Legislature hereby declares that advances in science and technology have led to the development of new devices and techniques for purpose of eavesdropping upon private communications and that the invasion of privacy resulting from the continual and increasing use of such devices and techniques has created a serious threat to the free exercise of personal liberties and cannot be tolerated in a free and civilized society."

15. Penal Code § 632. (a) A person who, intentionally and without the consent of all parties to a confidential communication, uses an electronic amplifying or recording device to eavesdrop upon or record the confidential communication, whether the communication is carried on among the parties in the presence of one another or by means of a telegraph, telephone, or other device, except a radio, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500) per violation, or imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding one year, or in the state prison, or by both that fine and imprisonment.

If the person has previously been convicted of a violation of this section or Section 631, 632.5, 632.6, 632.7, or 636, the person shall be punished by a fine not exceeding ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) per violation, by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding one year, or in the state prison, or by both that fine and

28

1 imprisonment.

2 (b) For the purposes of this section, "person" means an individual, business  
3 association, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or other legal  
4 entity, and an individual acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of any  
5 government or subdivision thereof, whether federal, state, or local, but excludes  
6 an individual known by all parties to a confidential communication to be  
7 overhearing or recording the communication.

8 (c) For the purposes of this section, "confidential communication" means any  
9 communication carried on in circumstances as may reasonably indicate that any  
10 party to the communication desires it to be confined to the parties thereto, but  
11 excludes a communication made in a public gathering or in any legislative,  
12 judicial, executive, or administrative proceeding open to the public, or in any  
13 other circumstance in which the parties to the communication may reasonably  
14 expect that the communication may be overheard or recorded.

15 (d) Except as proof in an action or prosecution for violation of this section,  
16 evidence obtained as a result of eavesdropping upon or recording a confidential  
17 communication in violation of this section is not admissible in any judicial,  
18 administrative, legislative, or other proceeding.

19 16. The Defendant County of Los Angeles is the legal entity that employed  
20 Deputy Sheriff Amber Taylor, Sergeant Christine Roam, and Lieutenant Chad  
21 Smeltzer, and falls with the ambit of a "person" as defined under the California  
22 Invasion of Privacy Act § 632 (b).

23 17. Defendant County of Los Angeles through its on duty employees and  
24 Supervisors as their ostensible agents, violated the CIPA when they listened to,  
25 recorded, stored, and then disclosed without permission a private and  
26 confidential phone call made by Deputy Sheriff Amber Taylor while on duty and  
27  
28

1 in uniform, between herself and the Plaintiff, and then provided said phone  
2 conversation to the Defendant's Supervisors; Sergeant Christine Roam and  
3 Lieutenant Chad Smeltzer who in turn provided that illegal recording to a Civil  
4 Service Commission Hearing Officer without permission of the Plaintiff in order to  
5 terminate the career of the Plaintiff.

6       18. The Defendant and its employees did not have express or implied  
7 permission of all parties to eavesdrop upon or record private confidential  
8 telephone calls without warning.

9       19. California Penal Code Section 637.2 provides in pertinent part: "(a) Any  
10 person who has been injured by a violation of this chapter may bring an action  
11 against the person who committed the violation for the greater of the following  
12 amounts:

13       (1) Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) per violation.

14       **(2) Three times the amount of actual damages, if any, sustained by the**  
15 **plaintiff.**

16       20. As a result of this illegal Felony crime committed by Deputy Sheriff Amber  
17 Taylor in recording a phone call without Plaintiff's consent or knowledge, that in  
18 turn was improperly provided to the Hearing Officer by the Defendant's  
19 Supervisors; Sergeant Roam and Lieutenant Smeltzer, the Plaintiff has accrued  
20 actual damages based on his termination of employment as a consequence of  
21 this Felony violation of the California Invasion of Privacy Act that was improperly  
22 used at his Civil Service Hearing. The Plaintiff was earning \$119,886.47 at the  
23 time of his termination, an amount that will increase with collective bargaining  
24 pay increases throughout the time of his retirement from the Los Angeles County  
25 Sheriff's Department that would have continued on for approximately twenty (20)  
26 more years.

1           21. Entitling the Plaintiff to damages pursuant to California Penal Code  
2           Section 637.2 (a) (2) in the sum of three times his amount of actual damages.  
3

4           22. The Defendant violated the State of California Invasion of Privacy Act,  
5           Cal. Pen. Code §§ 630, *et seq.* ("CIPA") on multiple occasions against the  
6           Plaintiff.  
7

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

### THE UNLAWFUL PRACTICE OF LAW ("UPL") IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 6125; AND § 6126 A

#### MISDEMEANOR

12           23. Plaintiff re-pleads and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs and  
13           incorporates them by reference as though fully set forth herein.

15           24. The Defendant apparently hired Sergeant Christine Roam as a Deputy  
16           Sheriff/peace officer. Yet for unknown reasons has now authorized her to  
17           practice law without a license in violation of Business and Professions Code §  
18           6125 that specifically states: "No person shall practice law in California unless  
19           the person is an active member of the State Bar."

20           25. As well as Business and Professions Code § 6126: "(a) Any person  
21           advertising or holding himself or herself out as practicing or entitled to practice  
22           law or otherwise practicing law who is not an active member of the State Bar, or  
23           otherwise authorized pursuant to statute or court rule to practice law in this state  
24           at the time of doing so, is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by up to one year  
25           in a county jail or by a fine of up to one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or by both that  
26           fine and imprisonment."

27           26. With the consent and approval of the Defendant, Sergeant Roam has  
28

been authorized and allowed to undertake such functions as preparing legal pleadings, creating false legal analysis and nonsensical positions, and in this instance perpetuating a Felony crime in violation of the CIPA, and act in an unprofessional and corrupt manner as it relates to using such illegal materials procured through fraudulent means. Thereby adding a Misdemeanor crime to her unlicensed status.

27. Being an immoral novice who has no concern with State Bar oversight or discipline as she has never been an attorney licensed in any jurisdiction or a member of any State Bar, she can proceed without the specter of criminal consequences and act as unethically as she chooses with the approval of her Defendant employer. In fact, she is free to ignore all of the State of California Bar Rules that apply to actual licensed attorneys. After all, Sergeant Roam cannot be disbarred as no license can be revoked that was never issued.

28. Just as she flaunted any regard for Rule 3-210 that provides: "A member shall not advise the violation of any law, rule, or ruling of a tribunal unless the member believes in good faith that such law, rule, or ruling is invalid. A member may take appropriate steps in good faith to test the validity of any law, rule, or ruling of a tribunal." Since she isn't a member of the State Bar, she can go ahead and perpetuate a Felony crime that several of the Defendant's other employees created and ignored, then use it against the Plaintiff. Because she has no consequences as the Defendant has empowered her to engage in the Unlawful Practice of Law ("UPL"). Especially when she was authorized by the Defendant to use a Felony violation of the CIPA committed against the Plaintiff by providing that illegal material to a Hearing Officer. A legal strategy endorsed and validated by the Defendant.

29. Then during the Plaintiff's Civil Service Hearing purposely chose to ignore

Michael A. Goldfeder,  
Attorney at Law  
400 Continental Boulevard  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
EL SEGUNDO, CA. 90245

**CIVIL COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

1 the State of California Evidence Code that explicitly prevents any testimony by a  
2 purported intimate batterer expert in any proceeding except a criminal case  
3 under very limited circumstances by insisting that she was somehow entitled to  
4 bring in any expert witness she wanted, even when such testimony is explicitly  
5 barred outside of a criminal courtroom. The Plaintiff had to spend most of the  
6 day in his Hearing opposing and arguing against the admission of such  
7 inadmissible testimony. Consequently, the Hearing to be continued for an two  
8 (2) months at great expense to the Plaintiff who had to reschedule an additional  
9 days to complete his Hearing as this impermissible and utterly flawed analysis of  
10 the law by a non-attorney wasted an inordinate of time. Again, it was all done by  
11 Sergeant Roam with the go-ahead by her Defendant employer.

12 30. Evidence Code Section 1107: "**(a) In a criminal action**, expert testimony  
13 is admissible by either the prosecution or the defense regarding intimate partner  
14 battering and its effects, including the nature and effect of physical, emotional, or  
15 mental abuse on the beliefs, perceptions, or behavior of victims of domestic  
16 violence, except when offered against a criminal defendant to prove the  
17 occurrence of the act or acts of abuse which form the basis of the criminal  
18 charge." Yet the Defendant's Supervisor, Christine Roam, enabled by her  
19 employer to engage in the Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL) emphatically  
20 stated that she can bring in any expert she wants at a Civil Service Hearing.

21 31. Just as the California Supreme Court ruled that out-of-state lawyers  
22 without California licenses are engaging in the unauthorized practice of law if  
23 they participate in "sufficient activities in the state" or create a "continuing  
24 relationship with the California client that included legal duties and obligations."  
25 With the help of a fax machine, computer or telephone, lawyers need not even be  
26 physically present in California to violate unauthorized-practice-of-law

restrictions. (*Birbrower, Montalbano, Condon & Frank, P.C., et al. v. The Superior Court of Santa Clara County* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 119)

32. The Defendant violated the State of California Business and Professions Code § 6125 that specifically states: "No person shall practice law in California unless the person is an active member of the State Bar."

33. As well as Business and Professions Code § 6126 a Misdemeanor, on multiple occasions against the Plaintiff.

34. The California Supreme Court stated the underlying rationale of §§ 6125-6126 is for the protection of California citizens from incompetent or untrained lawyers. Such as the Defendant's Sergeant Christine Roam.

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

**ILLEGALLY PRACTICING A BUSINESS WITHOUT A LICENSE IN**  
**VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 16240 A**

35. Plaintiff re-pleads and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs and incorporates them by reference as though fully set forth herein.

36. Because the practice of law requires a license in California, individuals who wrongly hold themselves out as lawyers are also subject to prosecution under Business and Profession Code § 16240. This misdemeanor statute does not depend on the definition of what constitutes the practice of law. Instead, mere holding oneself out while not actually having a valid certificate is a completed misdemeanor violation.

37. Section 16240 provides that every person **who practices**, offers to practice, or advertises **any** business, trade, **profession**, occupation, or calling, or

1 who uses any title, sign, initials, card, or device to indicate that he or she is  
2 qualified to practice any business, trade, profession, occupation, or calling for  
3 which a license, registration, or certificate is required by any law of this state,  
4 without holding a current and valid license, registration, or certificate as  
5 prescribed by law is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more  
6 than \$1,000, or six months in county jail, or both (see Penal Code §19).  
7

8 38. The Defendant's employee, Sergeant Christine Roam was not in  
9 possession of an actual State of California Bar Card when she engaged in the  
10 Felony and Misdemeanor acts as set forth in paragraphs 1-37 of this complaint  
11 for damages.

12 39. The Defendant also violated the State of California Business and  
13 Professions Code § 16240: "provides that every person **who practices**, offers to  
14 practice, or advertises **any business, trade, profession**, occupation, or calling, or  
15 who uses any title, sign, initials, card, or device to indicate that he or she is  
16 qualified to practice any business, trade, profession, occupation, or calling for  
17 which a license, registration, or certificate is required by any law of this state,  
18 without holding a current and valid license, registration, or certificate as  
19 prescribed by law is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more  
20 than \$1,000, or six months in county jail, or both (see Penal Code §19).  
21

22 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment on all Three (3) causes of action  
23 against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:  
24

25 First Cause of Action:

26 1. Special damages pursuant to California Penal Code Section 637.2 which  
27  
28

1 provides in pertinent part: "(a) Any person who has been injured by a violation of  
2 this chapter may bring an action against the person who committed the violation  
3 (2) Three times the amount of actual damages, if any, sustained by the plaintiff.

4 At the time of this Felony violation of the CIPA, the Plaintiff was earning the  
5 yearly amount of \$119,886.47. He had twenty (20) years remaining for his  
6 retirement for the base sum of \$2,397,729.40. Three times those actual damages  
7 under this statutory section entitles the Plaintiff to a total accrued sum  
8 \$7,193,188.20 in special damages;

9

- 10 2. general damages according to proof at the time of trial;
- 11 3. For all attorney fees incurred;
- 12 4. For prejudgment interest at the maximum legal rate, commencing on the  
first date of violation;
- 13 5. For costs of suit incurred herein;
- 14 6. For overtime lost in an amount according to proof;
- 15 7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

17

18 Second Cause of Action:

19 1. Special damages in the sum of \$119,886.47. Plaintiff still had twenty (20)  
20 years remaining for his retirement for the base sum of \$2,397,729.40;  
21 2. general damages according to proof at the time of trial;  
22 3. For all attorney fees incurred;  
23 4. For prejudgment interest at the maximum legal rate, commencing on the  
first date of violation;  
24 5. For costs of suit incurred herein;  
25 6. For overtime lost in an amount according to proof;  
26 7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

### Third Cause of Action:

1. Special damages in the sum of \$119,886.47. Plaintiff still had twenty (20) years remaining for his retirement for the base sum of \$2,397,729.40;
2. general damages according to proof at the time of trial;
3. For all attorney fees incurred;
4. For prejudgment interest at the maximum legal rate, commencing on the date of violation;
5. For costs of suit incurred herein;
6. For overtime lost in an amount according to proof;
7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

DATED: August 27, 2018

By   
MICHAEL A. GOLDFEDER,  
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF,  
CAREN MANDOYAN

Michael A. Goldfeder,  
Attorney at Law  
400 Continental Boulevard  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
EL SEGUNDO, CA. 90245

CIVIL COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

FOR COURT USE ONLY

FILED

Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles

AUG 27 2018

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk  
By \_\_\_\_\_ Deputy  
Shaylene Bolden

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):

MICHAEL A. GOLDFEDER, SBN 162381  
400 CONTINENTAL BOULEVARD, 6TH FLOOR  
EL SEGUNDO, CA. 90245TELEPHONE NO.: 310-374-7011 FAX NO.: 678-245-4272  
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): PLAINTIFF CAREN MANDOYANSUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. HILL STREET  
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. HILL STREET  
CITY AND ZIP CODE: LOS ANGELES, CA. 90012  
BRANCH NAME: STANLEY MOSK COURTHOUSE-UNLIMITEDCASE NAME:  
MANDOYAN v. LOS ANGELES COUNTY

## CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

Unlimited  Limited  
(Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000)  (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:

BC 719337

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 (not specified above) (42)

## Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and corporate governance (21)  
 Other petition (not specified above) (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  
b.  Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve  
c.  Substantial amount of documentary evidence  
d.  Large number of witnesses  
e.  Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court  
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): THREE

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: AUGUST 27, 2018

MICHAEL A. GOLDFEDER

(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

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

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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1, 4, 11	
Uninsured Motorist (46)		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1, 4, 11	
Asbestos/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	<input type="checkbox"/>	A6070 Asbestos Property Damage	1, 11	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	1, 11	
Product Liability (24)		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1, 4, 11	
Medical Malpractice (45)		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons	1, 4, 11	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1, 4, 11	
Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)	1, 4, 11	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1, 4, 11	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress	1, 4, 11	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1, 4, 11	

SHORT TITLE: Mandoyan v. County of Los Angeles	CASE NUMBER
--	-------------

	<b>A</b> Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	<b>B</b> Type of Action (Check only one)	<b>C</b> Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Business Tort (07)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1, 2, 3
	Civil Rights (08)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1, 2, 3
	Defamation (13)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1, 2, 3
	Fraud (16)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1, 2, 3
	Professional Negligence (25)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6017 Legal Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1, 2, 3 1, 2, 3
	Other (35)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	1, 2, 3
	Wrongful Termination (36)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6037 Wrongful Termination	1, 2, 3
Employment	Other Employment (15)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case <input type="checkbox"/> A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1, 2, 3 10
	Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) <input type="checkbox"/> A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) <input type="checkbox"/> A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) <input type="checkbox"/> A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2, 5 2, 5 1, 2, 5 1, 2, 5
	Collections (09)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case <input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1, 2, 5, 8
	Other Contract (37)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6009 Contractual Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> A6031 Tortious Interference <input type="checkbox"/> A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1, 2, 3, 5 1, 2, 3, 5 1, 2, 3, 8, 9
	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels _____	2, 6
	Wrongful Eviction (33)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2, 6
Real Property	Other Real Property (26)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> A6032 Quiet Title <input type="checkbox"/> A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2, 6 2, 6 2, 6
	Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	6, 11
	Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	6, 11
	Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2, 6, 11
	Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2, 6, 11

SHORT TITLE: Mandoyan v. County of Los Angeles

CASE NUMBER

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

SHORT TITLE: Mandoyan v. County of Los Angeles

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:		ADDRESS: Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA. 90012
<input type="checkbox"/> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 7. <input type="checkbox"/> 8. <input type="checkbox"/> 9. <input type="checkbox"/> 10. <input type="checkbox"/> 11.		
CITY: Los Angeles	STATE: CA.	ZIP CODE: 90012

**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: August 27, 2018

  
(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.

GP  
GP  
GP  
GP  
GP  
GP  
GP  
GP