

- Rascal's valuable trademarks. Old Topco's performance under the License Agreement declined over the years, and since at least 2008 Topco was frequently unable to fulfill customer orders in a timely manner, among other problems. In March 2011 Rascal terminated the License Agreement pursuant to its terms. Old Topco disputed Rascal's termination but stopped paying Rascal royalties under the License Agreement after September, 2011.
- 2. In July 2012, Rascal learned that Old Topco had purported to make a general assignment for the benefit of creditors ("ABC"). Rascal also learned that the assignee had sold all of the assets of Old Topco to defendant WSMI, which is owned, at least in part, by the owners of Old Topco. WSMI thereupon commenced doing business as "Topco Sales" (i.e., New Topco) in the same location and with many of the same employees as Old Topco. Notwithstanding Rascal's termination of the License Agreement with Old Topco, New Topco purports to have acquired the License Agreement from Old Topco's assignee, and continues to exploit the trademarks licensed to Old Topco. Rascal seeks an order from this Court declaring the License Agreement terminated, enjoining New Topco from further infringing Rascal's marks, and setting aside the fraudulent transfer of Old Topco's assets to New Topco. Rascal also seeks damages from Old Topco for breach of contract for unpaid royalties under the License Agreement and damages from New Topco for its willful infringement of Rascal's marks.

#### THE PARTIES

3. Plaintiff Rascal is a limited liability corporation organized under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California. Rascal produces and distributes adult films under its trademarks and trade names, including CHANNEL 1 RELEASING, CHI CHI LARUE (including the physical likeness of Larry Paciotti, who performs under the stage name "CHI CHI LARUE"), RASCAL VIDEO, and LIVE AND RAW (collectively, the "RASCAL MARKS"). Rascal, through a predecessor in interest, also owns trademark rights in

the mark DIRK YATES.

- 4. Rascal is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that defendant WSMI is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California. WSMI is currently doing business as Topco Sales, and under that name is engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing, selling, and marketing adult novelty products and sexual aids. Rascal is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that WSMI is owned and/or controlled, in whole or in part, by the owners of defendant Vast Resources.
- 5. Rascal is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that defendant Vast Resources is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California. Until about July, 2012, Vast Resources did business as Topco Sales, and under that name engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing, selling, and marketing adult novelty products and sexual aids.
- 6. Rascal is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that defendant Tucker is an individual residing in the County of Los Angeles, California. Rascal is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Tucker owns all or part of Old Topco and New Topco, and that Tucker controls, or has the right to control, Old Topco and New Topco.
- 7. Defendant DOE 1 is the assignee to whom Old Topco assigned its assets, and which sold those assets in turn to New Topco. When Rascal ascertains the true name of defendant DOE 1, Rascal will amend this Complaint accordingly.
- 8. Plaintiff does not know the true names and capacities of defendants DOES 2-10, inclusive, and sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that each of the defendants fictitiously named as DOES 2-10 is responsible in some manner for and caused the damages herein alleged. When Plaintiff ascertains the true names and capacities of

DOES 2-10, it will amend this Complaint accordingly.

9. On information and belief, each defendant aided and abetted the actions of one or more of the other defendants as set forth below, in that each defendant had knowledge of the actions or omissions of the other defendants and encouraged, assisted or facilitated those acts or omissions. Each of the defendants was the agent of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency and with the permission and consent of the other defendants.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court because this litigation arises under federal law, namely 17 U.S.C. § 1051 *et seq.* (Lanham Act). The Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a), (b) (trademark and unfair competition). This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Rascal's state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over defendants WSMI and Vast Resources (the "Corporate Defendants") because the Corporate Defendants are formed and operated under the laws of the State of California and have a principal place of business in this judicial district.
- 12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Tucker because Tucker resides in and/or can be found within this judicial district.
  - 13. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1391(c).

### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

- 14. Since at least as early as 1990, Rascal (or its predecessor) began using the RASCAL MARKS and the DIRK YATES mark on goods in commerce. By virtue of its longstanding use of the RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark, Rascal has developed a valuable reputation for quality and goodwill associated with its marks.
  - 15. On or about May 6, 2004, Rascal entered into a trademark license

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

21

23

24

25

27

- 16. The License Agreement required Old Topco to make quarterly royalty payments to Rascal with accompanying royalty statements no later than forty-five (45) days after the end of the preceding calendar quarter.
- 17. The License Agreement also required Old Topco to obtain design approval from Rascal for all products sold under the RASCAL MARKS.
- 18. The License Agreement allows Rascal to terminate the License Agreement after 60 days written notice if, *inter alia*, Old Topco becomes insolvent or "makes an assignment for benefit of creditors or similar disposition of its assets."
- 19. The License Agreement provides for an initial term from May 10 2004 to May 9, 2012 (subject to earlier termination pursuant to other terms of the License Agreement). The License Agreement further provides that upon expiration of the original term, Old Topco shall have the right to extend the term of the License Agreement an additional eight years, so long as Old Topco is not in default under the terms of the License Agreement at the time of exercise.
- 20. The License Agreement provides that after expiration or termination of the License Agreement, the RASCAL MARKS are to revert to Rascal. Old Topco is authorized to continue selling inventory existing at the time of expiration or termination for an additional one year thereafter (and to pay royalties thereupon to Rascal), but not to create, manufacture or distribute new products or manufacture additional existing products.
- 21. In or about 2008, Old Topco began to manufacture and distribute goods under the DIRK YATES mark, without Rascal's authorization or consent.
- 22. On March 11, 2011, Rascal notified Old Topco that it was terminating the License Agreement for, among other things, failure to pay royalties and provide

- 23. On May 19, 2011, Rascal reiterated its termination of the License Agreement, and noted that Old Topco had failed to cure within 60 days of demand its default of its obligation to provide royalty statements.
- 24. Old Topco paid Rascal a royalty payment for the third quarter of 2011 but thereafter ceased royalty payments to Rascal under the License Agreement.
- 25. On or about July 2012, Rascal learned that Old Topco had purported to make a general assignment for the benefit of creditors ("ABC"), and that its assignee had thereafter sold the assets of Old Topco to New Topco.
- 26. At the time of the purported ABC, Old Topco was in default of the fourth quarter 2011 royalty payment and the first quarter 2012 royalty payment, as well as the required royalty statements associated with those payments.
- 27. At the time of the purported ABC, Old Topco owed Rascal at least \$60,000 in unpaid royalties under the License Agreement.
- 28. Rascal never received formal notice of the assignment. Rascal never received a final statement of sales through the date of the ABC, has not received any instructions on how to submit a claim to the assignee, and has not received any response to its request for an inventory of licensed product in the possession of Old Topco at the time of the ABC.
- 29. On information and belief, New Topco is owned and controlled, in whole or in part, by the same person(s) who own Old Topco. New Topco operates from the same offices as had Old Topco, with all or almost all of the same employees. Among others, defendant Tucker was the president of Old Topco and is the CEO of New Topco.
- 30. On information and belief, the transfer of Old Topco's assets to New Topco was "in place," that is, possession of the assets was never taken by the assignee.

2

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 31. On information and belief, New Topco did not pay fair value for the assets of Old Topco.
- 32. In July 2012, Rascal again notified Old Topco that the License Agreement was terminated.
- 33. In July 2012, Rascal notified New Topco that it was not authorized to distribute goods under the RASCAL MARKS or the DIRK YATES mark and demanded that it cease and desist from further infringement of Rascal's marks.
- 34. Since the ABC, New Topco has denied any obligation to pay the royalties due from Old Topco prior to the ABC. However, defendant Tucker has told Rascal that New Topco would pay the Old Topco royalties to Rascal if Rascal agreed to enter into a new agreement with New Topco.
- 35. On information and belief, New Topco falsely represents to others that it is authorized to manufacture and distribute goods under the RASCAL MARKS and the DIRK YATES mark.
- 36. On information and belief, New Topco has manufactured and distributed and continues to manufacture and distribute goods under the Rascal Mark after the termination of the License Agreement.
- 37. On information and belief, New Topco has manufactured and distributed and continues to manufacture and distribute goods under the DIRK YATES mark without authorization from Rascal.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

(Declaratory Relief Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201)

(Against Old Topco and New Topco)

- 38. Rascal hereby repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1-37 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 39. An actual case or controversy has arisen between Rascal, on the one hand, and Vast Resources and WSMI, on the other hand, regarding their respective

rights and obligations under the License Agreements (if any).

- 40. On information and belief, Vast Resources and WSMI contend that Rascal did not effectively terminate the License Agreement, that Old Topco renewed the License Agreement for an additional eight years on May 9, 2012, prior to the ABC, and that the License Agreement has now been assigned to New Topco.
- 41. Rascal asserts that the License Agreement was terminated on, at the latest, May 11, 2011; that even if the License Agreement was not effectively terminated in May 2011, it terminated by its terms on May 9, 2012 (because Old Topco was in default of its payment obligations and not entitled to renew on that date), and that as such New Topco was not assigned the License Agreement under the ABC and has no rights thereunder.
- 42. New Topco has announced that it intends to, and has continued to, manufacture, distribute, sell, and market adult products internationally under the RASCAL MARKS despite termination of the License Agreement.
- 43. Rascal has suffered and will continue to suffer harm in the absence of a declaration of the parties' respective rights under the License Agreement.
- 44. Rascal desires a judicial determination that: (i) the License Agreement was terminated by Rascal on or about March 11, 2011, and such termination became effective no later than May 10, 2011; (ii) in the alternative, in the event that the Court determines that the License Agreement was not effectively terminated in March 2011, that it expired by its terms on May 9, 2012 and could not have been renewed at that time because Old Topco was in default of the License Agreement on that date; and (iii) that the terminated License Agreement was not properly transferred to New Topco in the ABC, and New Topco has no rights thereunder.

25		/
	11	

26 || //

27 || //.

28 | ///

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION SET ASIDE OF FRAUDULENT TRANSFER

(Uniform Fraudulent Transfers Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 3439 et seq.)

(Against Old Topco, New Topco, and DOE 1)

- 45. Rascal hereby repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1-44 above as though fully set forth herein.
  - 46. Rascal is a creditor of Old Topco to whom a debt is owed by Old Topco.
- 47. On information and belief, Old Topco's general assignment of assets to DOE 1 was made with actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud Rascal.
- 48. On information and belief, Old Topco's general assignment of assets to DOE 1 was made without receiving equivalent value and when Old Topco was insolvent.
- 49. On information and belief, New Topco conspired with and aided and abetted Old Topco's fraud in order to obtain the assets of Old Topco at less than their fair value in order to defraud and hinder the creditors of Old Topco.
- 50. Rascal has been harmed by the conduct described herein, in that the ABC put beyond Rascal's reach property that would have otherwise been available to satisfy Old Topco's debt to Rascal.
- 51. Rascal requests that the purported ABC be voided and set aside, that New Topco and Tucker be enjoined from further transfers of Old Topco's assets, and that a receiver be assigned to manage Old Topco.
- 52. Rascal requests its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with this Second Cause of Action.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF CONTRACT

(Against Old Topco)

53. Rascal hereby repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1-51 above as though fully set forth herein.

- 54. The License Agreement is a terminated valid and binding contract between Rascal and Old Topco.
  - 55. Rascal has fully performed its obligations under the License Agreement
- 56. Pursuant to the terms of the License Agreement, Old Topco is required to pay royalties to Rascal on a quarterly basis no later than forty-five (45) days after the end of the preceding calendar quarter.
- 57. Pursuant to the terms of the License Agreement, Old Topco is required to provide Rascal with a complete and accurate royalty statement with each quarterly payment.
- 58. Old Topco breached the License Agreement by failing to pay royalties for sales of licensed products from October 1, 2011 through the date of the purported ABC.
- 59. As a result of the foregoing conduct, Rascal is entitled to damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

# FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN AND UNFAIR COMPETITON

(15 U.S.C. § 1125(a); Lanham Act § 43(a))

(Against New Topco and Tucker)

- 60. Rascal hereby repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1-59 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 61. Since at least 1990, Rascal has been using the RASCAL MARKS and the DIRK YATES mark in commerce. Consumers recognize the RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark as originating from Rascal. Rascal has established significant common law trademark rights in connection with its RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark.
- 62. By virtue of its longstanding use of the RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark, Rascal has developed a valuable reputation for quality and goodwill associated with its marks.

- 63. New Topco's use of the RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark in connection with the continuing manufacture, distribution, sale, and promotion of goods is not authorized by Rascal and is likely to cause, and has caused, a likelihood of confusion among members of the public regarding the origin, sponsorship, and endorsement of goods sold or offered by New Topco.
- 64. As a direct and proximate result of New Topco's unlawful conduct, Rascal has and will continue to suffer substantial harm and injury to its business, goodwill, and reputation. Unless enjoined, New Topco's conduct will continue to cause Rascal immediate and irreparable injury.
- 65. By engaging in the conduct alleged herein, New Topco intended to trade on Rascal's reputation, thereby entitling Rascal to New Topco's profits, Rascal's damages, and the costs of the action.
- 66. Defendant Tucker actively and knowingly caused the conduct of New Topco alleged herein, thereby rendering him individually liable for the harm such conduct caused to Rascal.

# FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION COMMON LAW TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

(Against New Topco and Tucker)

- 67. Rascal hereby repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1-66 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 68. Rascal is the senior user of the common law RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark.
- 69. The general public has come to associate the RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark with Rascal and with goods and services endorsed by Rascal.
- 70. Rascal has built up considerable goodwill in the RASCAL marks and DIRK YATES mark.
- 71. On information and belief, since about July 2011 New Topco has been using the RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark without Rascal's permission

2

3

4

5

7

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

26

27

28

or consent, and in competition with Rascal on identical or similar goods.

- 72. New Topco's unlawful acts violate Rascal's trademark rights under California common law and are likely to cause consumer confusion as to the sponsorship of the goods sold or offered by New Topco.
- 73. New Topco's acts of trademark infringement have been committed with the intent to, and have caused, confusion, mistake, or deception.
- 74. As a direct and proximate result of New Topco's unlawful conduct, Rascal has suffered and will continue to suffer substantial harm and injury to its business, goodwill, and reputation. Unless enjoined, New Topco's conduct will continue to cause Rascal immediate and irreparable injury.
- 75. New Topco's acts of trademark infringement are willful, intentional, and committed with malice to harm Rascal's business. Rascal therefore seeks to recover enhanced damages and attorneys' fees.
- 76. Tucker actively and knowingly directed the infringing conduct of New Topco alleged herein, thereby rendering him individually liable for the harm such infringement caused to Rascal.

# SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION

(Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200)

(Against New Topco)

- 77. Rascal hereby repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1-38 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 78. New Topco has infringed, appropriated, used and adopted the RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark with the intent of causing confusion, mistake, and deception as to the source of its goods and with the intent of causing harm to Rascal's business.
- 79. New Topco's conduct constitutes an "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice" and an "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising"

within the meaning of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200.

- 80. Rascal has been damaged by New Topco's conduct as alleged herein.
- 81. As a consequence of New Topco's unlawful actions, Rascal is entitled to injunctive relief and an order that New Topco disgorge any and all profits made on the manufacture, use, display, or sale of its infringing goods.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Rascal respectfully prays the following relief:

- A declaratory judgment that the License Agreement was terminated on May 11, 2011;
- 2. In the alternative, a declaratory judgment that the License Agreement expired by its terms on May 9, 2012, and Old Topco was not entitled to renew because of its default on its payment obligations;
- 3. A declaratory judgment that New Topco does not have any rights under the License Agreement;
- 4. An order permanently enjoining New Topco, its subsidiaries, officers, affiliates, agents, directors, shareholders, parent corporations, employees, partners, representatives, licensees, related companies, assigns, attorneys and any and all persons, entities, or agents in active concert or participation with Defendant, to refrain from manufacturing, distributing, selling, marketing, or in any other way exploiting the RASCAL MARKS and DIRK YATES mark, and from competing unfairly with Rascal in any manner and from otherwise damaging Rascal's goodwill or business reputation:
- 5. An order requiring New Topco to destroy and cease exploiting in any way the molded body parts that embody Rascal's intellectual property rights;
- 6. Order an accounting from both New Topco and Old Topco identifying

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

all sales of products under the License Agreement and an inventory of all product manufactured under or in violation of the License Agreement;

- 7. Order that New Topco be required to account for any and all profits earned as a result of its unlawful acts;
- 8. Award Rascal damages and lost profits in amount to be proven at trial;
- 9. Grant an award of punitive damages for the willful and wanton nature of Defendant's infringement of Rascal's intellectual property;
- 10. Grant an award of Rascal's costs, expenses, and reasonable attorneys' fees in this action;
- 11. Grant such other further relief to which Rascal may be entitled as a matter of law or equity, or which the Court determines to be just and proper.

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38 Rascal hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: November 9, 2012

DYKEMA GOSSETT LLP S. Christopher Winter Walead Esmail

S. Christopher Winter Attorneys for Plaintiff RASCAL VIDEO, LLC

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action	
UNITED STATES D	DISTRICT COURT
for th Central Distric	ne tof California
RASCAL VIDEO, LLC, a Calfironia  limited liability company.  Plaintiff  V.  World Sexy Media Invostment  CCC Attached Defendant  SUMMONS IN A C	CV12 09675 SVW GC
To: (Defendant's name and address)	BY FAX
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you are the United States or a United States agency, or an office P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answ the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion whose name and address are:	wer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT
1.1.010	CHRISTOPHER POWERS
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

1 2 3 4 5	DYKEMA GOSSETT LLP S. Christopher Winter, SBN: 190474 kwinter@dykema.com Walead Esmail, SBN: 266632 wesmail@dykema.com 333 South Grand Ave, Suite 2100 Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel.: (213) 457-1800 Fax: (213) 457-1850	
6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiff RASCAL VIDEO, LLC	
8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
9	CENTRAL DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
10	WESTER	N DIVISION
11	RASCAL VIDEO, LLC, a California	Case No.
12	limited liability company,	Case 140.
13	Plaintiff,	
14	vs.	
15	WORLD SEXY MEDIA INVESTMENT, LLC, a California	
16	limited liability company; VAST RESOURCES, INC., a California corporation; SCOTT TUCKER, an individual, and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	
17	individual, and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	
18	Defendants.	
19		
<ul><li>20</li><li>21</li></ul>		
<ul><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>		
24		
25		
26		
27		
	11	

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2	ΑO	440 (Rev.	12/09)	Summons	in a	Civil	Action	(Page 2	2
---	----	-----------	--------	---------	------	-------	--------	---------	---

Civil Action No.

### PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(1))

	This summons for (nat	me of individual and title, if a	ny)			
was re	ceived by me on (date)		•			
	I personally served	I the summons on the inc	dividual at (place)			
	•					
	I left the summons	s at the individual's resid	ence or usual pla	ce of abode with	(name)	
		,	a person of suitab	ole age and discret	ion who resides th	iere,
	on (date)	, and mailed a	copy to the indiv	vidual's last know	n address; or	
	I served the summ	ons on (name of individual)				, who is
	designated by law to acc	cept service of process of	n behalf of (name	of organization)		
			01	1 (date)	; or	
	I returned the sum	mons unexecuted because	se			; or
	Other (specify):					
	Carer (operagy).					
	My fees are \$	for travel and	\$	for services, for a	total of \$	
	wiy ices are w	Tor traver and	¥	20. 00. 1.20., 20. 1		
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this infor	mation is true.			
		· •				
Date:		_		G		
				Server's signatu	re	
				Printed name and	title	
		<del></del>		Server's addres	es .	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

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

CIVI	E COVER SHEET				
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself)	DEFENDANTS				
RASCAL VIDEO, LLC, a California limited	WORLD SEXY MEDIA INVESTMENT, LLC, VAST				
liability company,	RESOURCES, INC., a CA Corporation, SCOTT				
Traditity Company,					
	TUCKER, an individual and DOES 1-10, incl				
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are represent yourself, provide same.)	enting Attorneys (If Known)				
S. Christopher Winter [SBN 190474]					
DYKEMA GOSSETT LLP					
333 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 2100					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Los Angeles, CA 90071 213-457-1800					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only				
	(Place an X in one hox for plaintiff and one for defendant.)				
	PTF DEF PTF DEF				
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This State				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
2 U.S. Government Defendant	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 of Business in Another State				
	Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6				
	Foreign Country				
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)					
	nstated or 5 Transferred from another district 6 Multi- 7 Appeal to District				
	pened (specify): District Judge from				
	Litigation Magistrate Judge				
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: X Yes	No (Check 'Yes' only if demanded in complaint.)				
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes X No	MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$ [TO BE DETERMINED]				
	filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)				
	·				
DECLARATORY RELIEF (DECLARATORY RELIEF ACT-28 USC \$220	ol); set aside of fradulent transfer (uniform fraud transfers act-				
CA CIV CODE \$3439); BREACH OF CONTRACT; TRADEMARK INE	RINGMENT; UNFAIR COMPETITION (LANHAM ACT \$43(a))				
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)					
	Turnon.				
	ORTS TORTS PRISONER LABOR ALINIURY PERSONAL PETITIONS 710 Fair Labor				
110 distrance	**************************************				
410 Antitrust 2120 Marine 310 Air	rplane 310 Models to				
The state of the s	rplane Product 370 Other Fraud Vacate Sentence 720 Laborrymgmt.  371 Truth in Lending Habeas Corpus Relations				
	sault I ibel & 380 Other Personal 530 General 730 Labor/Mgmt.				
460 Deportation Overpayment & Sia	Property Damage 535 Death Penalty Disclosure Act				
470 Racketeer Influenced Enforcement of 330 Fee	d. Employers   385 Property Damage   540 Mandamus/   740 Railway Lahor Act				
and Corrupt Judgment Lit	Product Liability Other				
Olganizations   151 Medicare Act   345 M	PANKE PICK SOUTH RIGHTS 190 Other Laudi				
Lie 132 Recovery of Defaulted	ability 422 Appeal 28 USC 555 Prison Condition Litigation				
	otor Vehicle 158 FORFETURE/ 91 Empl. Ret. Inc.				
810 Selective Service 1355 M	Old Venicle 1 425 Withdrawal 20				
Exchange Overpayment of	oduct Liability USC 157 610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & 820 Copyrights				
875 Customer Challenge 12 Veteran's Benefits In	inry 441 Voting Drug 830 Patent				
USC 3410 160 Stockholders' Suits 362 Pe	rsonal Injury- ed Malpractice 443 Housing/Acco- ed Malpractice 443 Housing/Acco- Seizure of Social-Secure 173				
690 Office Statebory Actions	co transferior C 3 475 troubing too				
	exsonal Injury- oduct Liability 444 Welfare Property 21 USC 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923)				
Act 196 Franchise 368 Ac	sbestos Personal 445 American with 630 Liquor Laws 863 DIWC/DIWW				
	jury Product Disabilities - 640 R.R. & Truck (405(g))				
894 Energy American Act	ability Employment 650 Airline Regs 864 SSID Title XVI				
233 Meedolli di Ilid. Mai	3RATION 446 American with 660 Occupational 865 RSI (405(g))  attractivation Disabilities - Safety/Health FEDERALTAX SUITS				
	aturalization Other Safety/Health Safety/Health S70 Taxes (U.S.				
	aheas Corous- 440 Other Civil Plaintiff or				
950 Constitutionality of 290 All Other Real Property A	lien Detainee Rights Defendant)				
State Statutes 465 O	ther Immigration 26 USC 7609				
A	ctions 26 USC 7609				
,	<u> </u>				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:  AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.					

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

	IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? X No Yes					
•	list case number(s):  a). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? X No Yes  list case number(s):					
•	l cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:					
IX. VENUE: (When completing	the following inform	nation, use an additional s	sheet if necessary.)			
			State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides.			
	ient, its agencies or o	employees is a named plat	intiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).  California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
County in this District:*  Los Angeles Cour	nty		Cantonna County buside of this District, State, it differ than Cantonna, of Pelotin County			
			State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. endant, If this box is checked, go to item (c).			
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Los Angeles						
		y outside of this District; ocation of the tract of la	State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.			
County in this District:*	tion cases, as the	SOURCE OF THE STATE OF THE STAT	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Los Angeles						
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bei	rnardino, Riverside	, Ventura, Santa Barbai	ra, or San Luis Obispo Countics			
Note: In land condemnation case:	s, use the location of	the tract of land involved				
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER): Date November 13, 2012						
A. BIOTATORES OF THE FOREIG		S. Christoph				
or other paners as required by	law. This form, app	roved by the Judicial Cont	e information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings ference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)			
Key to Statistical codes relating t	to Social Security Ca	ises:				
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement	of Cause of Action			
861	НІА	All claims for health ins Also, include claims by program, (42 U.S.C. 193	surance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the 35FF(b))			
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)				
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
863	DIWW	All claims filed for wid Act, as amended. (42 U	lows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security I.S.C. 405(g))			
864	SSID	All claims for suppleme Act, as amended.	ental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security			
865	RSI  All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))					
CV-71 (05/08)	CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of					