LEONARD TACHNER, A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION Leonard Tachner, Esq. (State Bar No. 058436) 17961 Sky Park Circle, Suite 38-E 1 2 Irvine, California 92614-6364 (949) 752-8525 Telephone (949) 955-2415 Telefax 3 4 Attorney for Plaintiff 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 9 SACV11-01309-DOC(ANx) Case No. JAMES R. GLIDEWELL DENTAL CERAMICS, INC. DBA GLIDEWELL LABORATORIES, a 10 **COMPLAINT FOR** 11 California corporation, (1) INFRINGEMENT OF FEDERALLY REGISTERED 12 Plaintiff TRADEMARK. (2) FALSE DESIGNATION OF 13 **ORIGIN UNDER LANHAM ACT** VS. SECTION 43(a), AND 14 KEATING DENTAL ARTS, INC., a (3) UNFAIR COMPETITION California corporation, UNDER CALIFORNIA BUSINESS 15 AND PROFESSIONS CODE, WITH EXHIBITS A-C 16 Defendant. 17 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 18 19 20 21 For its Complaint, Plaintiff alleges as follows: 22 23 **PARTIES** 24 Plaintiff James R. Glidewell, Inc. dba Glidewell Laboratories 25 (Plaintiff Glidewell) is a California corporation having its principal place of 26 business at 4141 MacArthur Boulevard, Newport Beach, California 92660. 27 Plaintiff Glidewell provides dental restorative products primarily to dentists.

- Such products include bridges, caps, crowns, inlays, onlays and prostheses.

 Plaintiff Glidewell has been providing such dental products for about forty

 (40) years and has become one of the most successful and well-known
 restorative dental product providers in the United States. Plaintiff Glidewell is
 seeking monetary damages and injunctive relief with respect to the claims
 presented in this Complaint.
 - 2. Defendant Keating Dental Arts, Inc. (Defendant Keating) is a California corporation having its principal place of business at 16881 Hale Avenue, Irvine, California 92606. Defendant Keating also provides dental restorative products primarily to dentists and is a direct competitor of Plaintiff Glidewell by offering essentially the same products to essentially the same purchasers in the same market place. In addition, both Plaintiff Glidewell and Defendant Keating advertise in dental industry publications and present their respective products at dental industry trade shows.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and 1338(a) as it arises under Acts of Congress related to trademarks. Additionally, the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the federal trademark infringement claim pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1121.
- 4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Keating as it is a resident of this judicial district and does business in this district including the acts of trademark infringement alleged herein.
- 5. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) in that Defendant Keating has its principal offices and has committed acts of infringement in this District.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 6. Plaintiff Glidewell has been selling dental bridges, dental caps, dental crowns, dental inlays, dental onlays and dental prostheses under the trademark BRUXZIR® in interstate commerce since at least June 2009. Plaintiff Glidewell obtained U.S. Federal Trademark Registration of its mark BRUXZIR® under Registration No. 3,739,663 on the Principal Register on January 19, 2010 based on its application filed on June 12, 2009. A true and correct copy of its Registration No. 3,739,663 is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit A.
- 7. Since June 2009 Plaintiff Glidewell's use of its trademark BRUXZIR® has been continuous and without any periods of non-use. Plaintiff Glidewell has since June, 2009 amassed sales of BRUXZIR® dental restorative products in amounts of tens of millions of dollars throughout the United States and in numerous foreign countries.
- 8. In November 2009 Plaintiff Glidewell began selling dental ceramics in block form under the BRUXZIR® trademark. Such products are sold in pre-sintered condition, that is, they are sufficiently soft to be machinable by the customer and then hardened by final sintering after being milled or otherwise shaped into a dental restoration that is especially adapted to a particular patient's dental requirements. Since November 2009 Plaintiff Glidewell has been continuously selling such dental ceramics under the BRUXZIR® trademark in addition to the dental restorative products sold under the BRUXZIR® trademark since June 2009. Additional millions of dollars in sales of dental ceramics have contributed further to the extremely positive reputation of Plaintiff Glidewell's BRUXZIR® products in the dental industry.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

9.

- Defendant Keating has begun offering for sale dental restorative products under the trademark KDZ BRUXER. An advertisement that has already been published in ADA News (American Dental Association News) announcing Defendant Keating's introduction of dental prosthetic products under the KDZ BRUXER trademark is attached hereto as Exhibit B. Upon information and belief, Defendant Keating has made sales of such dental prosthetic products being advertised under their trademark. The extent of such sales by Defendant Keating is not currently known to Plaintiff Glidewell and will be ascertained during this Action.
- 10. Upon information and belief, Defendant Keating has intentionally begun using the trademark "KDZ BRUXER" on virtually the same products being offered and sold to virtually the same market for the express purpose of creating a likelihood of public confusion and/or an initial interest confusion between Plaintiff Glidewell's BRUXZIR® dental products and Defendant Keating's KDZ BRUXER dental products. Moreover, upon information and belief, Defendant Keating's actions in regard to its trademark KDZ BRUXER are intended to dilute and diminish the value of Plaintiff's Glidewell's successful trademark BRUXZIR®, to the unfair benefit of Defendant Keating's directly competing products.
- In May 2011 Plaintiff Glidewell learned that Defendant Keating 11. had filed an "intent-to-use" application with the U.S. Trademark Office to register the trademark KDZ BRUXER and design alleging that it intended to use that trademark on dental prosthetic products. Responsive thereto, Plaintiff Glidewell had its attorney send a letter dated May 31, 2011 to Defendant Keating's attorney of record. A copy of that letter is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit C. The letter expressly warns Defendant Keating through its attorney, that any actual use of that trademark on dental prostheses

7 8

would be regarded as creating a likelihood of public confusion for which Plaintiff Glidewell would file this Action.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – INFRINGEMENT OF A FEDERALLY REGISTERED TRADEMARK

- 12. By this reference, Plaintiff Glidewell repeats and incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 11 above.
- BRUXER as a trademark in connection with advertising of, sale of, or offer to sell competing dental prostheses. Such use in relation to Plaintiff Glidewell's use of the BRUXZIR® trademark will likely cause confusion or mistake, or will likely deceive the relative purchasing public as to Defendant Keating's products being associating or identified with or being the same as those of Plaintiff Glidewell. Defendant Keating's advertising of its KDZ BRUXER trademark is intentionally designed to cause an initial confusion to attract the attention of dentist buyers who are previously aware of Plaintiff Glidewell's well-known trademark.
- 14. Plaintiff Glidewell did not consent to or authorize Defendant Keating's adoption or commercial use of the KDZ BRUXER trademark for dental prostheses or any other goods or services.
- 15. Defendant Keating therefore infringed Plaintiff Glidewell's BRUXZIR® trademark in violation of Plaintiff Glidewell's federal trademark rights under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §1051 et seq., particularly 15 U.S.C. §1114(1).
- 16. Plaintiff Glidewell's BRUXZIR® trademark is strong in light of its substantial marketing and promotion of that trademark for its dental restorative and prosthetic products, its substantial sales volume of products

1

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

24

sold by Plaintiff Glidewell under that trademark, its acclaim and public recognition.

- 17. Upon information and belief, Defendant Keating knew at all times relevant to this Action, of Plaintiff Glidewell's prior adoption and prior widespread commercial use of the BRUXZIR® trademark in connection with Plaintiff Glidewell's dental products including those specified in the federal registration of Plaintiff Glidewell stated above. Defendant Keating's infringement of the BRUXZIR® trademark is therefore willful, knowing and deliberate.
- 18. Plaintiff Glidewell has no control over the composition or quality of the goods sold under the confusingly similar trademark by Defendant Keating. As a result, to the extent Defendant's products are inferior to Plaintiff Glidewell's products, Plaintiff Glidewell's valuable goodwill, developed at great expense and effort by Plaintiff Glidewell, is being harmed by Defendant Keating's unauthorized use of the confusingly similar trademark, and is at risk of further damage.
- 19. The goodwill of Plaintiff Glidewell's dental products business under the BRUXZIR® trademark is of enormous value and Plaintiff Glidewell will suffer irreparable harm, diminution of reputation and pecuniary damages should Defendant Keating's infringement be allowed to continue.
 - 20. Defendant Keating's infringement will continue unless enjoined.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION - FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN UNDER SECTION 43(a) OF THE LANHAM ACT

- 6 -

21. Plaintiff Glidewell realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 20, as if set forth fully herein.

Complaint with Exhibits A-C

- 22. Defendant Keating has used and is using the infringing trademark KDZ BRUXER in commerce in connection with the advertising, sale, and provision of dental prostheses in such a manner as to create a likelihood of confusion among prospective purchasers and to unfairly compete with Plaintiff Glidewell. Defendant Keating's use of the infringing trademark induces purchasers and others to believe, contrary to the fact, that the products sold by Defendant Keating are rendered, sponsored or otherwise approved by, or connected with Plaintiff Glidewell. Defendant Keating's acts have damaged, impaired and diluted that part of Plaintiff Glidewell's goodwill symbolized by its trademark BRUXZIR® to Plaintiff Glidewell's immediate and irreparable damage.
- 23. Defendant Keating's unauthorized use of the infringing trademark in connection with the advertising, sale and provision of Defendant Keating's dental products constitutes use of a false designation of origin and a false description within the meaning of Section 43(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946, 15 U.S.C. §1125(a).
- 24. Defendant Keating's acts of false designation of origin and false description have caused Plaintiff Glidewell irreparable injury, damage to its reputation and pecuniary damages. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendant Keating will continue the acts of false designation of origin and false description complained of herein to Plaintiff Glidewell's immediate and irreparable damage.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER CALIFORNIA BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE §17200 et seq.

25. Plaintiff Glidewell realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 24, as if set forth fully herein.

- 26. Defendant Keating's activities, as described above, constitute unfair competition in violation of California Business & Professions Code \$17200, et seq. As alleged above, Defendant Keating has infringed and intends to continue infringing Plaintiff Glidewell's trademark.
- 27. Defendant Keating's activities are likely to confuse or mislead the public as to the origin of sponsorship of Defendant Keating's goods.
- 28. Defendant Keating has attempted and is attempting to trade on the goodwill associated with Plaintiff Glidewell's trademark.
- 29. Defendant Keating's wrongful acts have proximately caused and will continue to cause Plaintiff substantial injury, including loss of profits, confusion of potential customers, damage to Plaintiff Glidewell's goodwill and reputation, and diminution in the value of Plaintiff Glidewell's trademark.
- 30. In doing the acts alleged, Defendant Keating acted with a malicious intent, and as such, Plaintiff Glidewell is entitled to exemplary and punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Glidewell demands judgment against Defendant Keating as follows:

- A. For an order permanently enjoining Defendant Keating and its owners, officers, directors, agents, servants, attorneys and employees and all other persons acting in concert with them, from:
- (1) committing any further acts of trademark infringement, including using the KDZ BRUXER name in connection with any dental products;
- (2) using any term that is likely to be confused with the BRUXZIR® trademark asserted in this Complaint;

- (3) representing directly or indirectly in any form or manner whatsoever that any product it offers for sale is associated with or approved by Plaintiff Glidewell when, in fact, it is not; and/or
- (4) passing off or inducing or enabling others to sell or pass off any Keating product as a Glidewell product or as a product endorsed or approved by Plaintiff Glidewell.
- B. For an order directing Defendant Keating to file with this Court and to serve on Plaintiff Glidewell within thirty (30) days after service on Defendant Keating of each injunction granted herein, or such extended period as the Court may direct, a report in writing, under oath, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which Defendant Keating has complied with the injunction and order of the Court;
- C. For a judgment that Defendant Keating shall pay to Plaintiff Glidewell damages in an amount equal to all of the profits derived from the infringement of Plaintiff Glidewell's trademark together with an amount that Plaintiff Glidewell has been damaged as a result of such infringement;
- D. For a judgment that Defendant Keating willfully and deliberately infringed Plaintiff Glidewell's rights and that this is an exceptional case entitling Plaintiff Glidewell to enhanced damages under the Trademark Laws of the United States;
- E. For an award of costs, including attorney's fees, incurred in bringing this action;
- F. For a judgment awarding to Plaintiff Glidewell prejudgment and postjudgment interest until the award is fully paid;
- G. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and equitable under the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Leonard Tachher
Attorney for Plaintiff

James R. Glidewell Dental Ceramics, Inc.

Dba Glidewell Laboratories

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues raised by the

Dated: λ

Respectfully submitted:

By:

Complaint that are triable by jury.

Leonard Tachner
Attorney for Plaintiff

James R. Glidewell Dental Ceramics, Inc.

Dba Glidewell Laboratories

United States of America United States Patent and Trademark Office

BRUXZIR

Reg. No. 3,739,663 JAMES R. GLIDEWELL, DENTAL CERAMIC, INC. (CALIFORNIA CORPORATION), DBA Registered Jan. 19, 2010 GLIDEWELL LABORATORIES

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 4141 MACARTHUR BLVD.

Int. Cl.: 10 NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

TRADEMARK PRINCIPAL REGISTER

TRADEMARK ONLAYS; DENTAL PROSTHESES, IN CLASS 10 (U.S. CLS. 26, 39 AND 44).

FIRST USE 6-6-2009; IN COMMERCE 6-6-2009.

THE MARK CONSISTS OF STANDARD CHARACTERS WITHOUT CLAIM TO ANY PARTICULAR FONT, STYLE, SIZE, OR COLOR.

SER. NO. 77-761,757, FILED 6-17-2009.

KEVIN CORWIN, EXAMINING ATTORNEY



David J. Kappas

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office





UNCOMPROMISING ESTHETICS. OUTSTANDING STRENGTH. FLAWLESS FIT.



INTRODUCING THE ALL-NEW KDZ BRUXER.
THE LEST FULL-CONTOUR ZIRCONIA SOLUTION AVAILABLE.
EXCLUSIVELY FROM KEATING DENTAL ARTS.

The all-new KDZ Bruxer is so precise and predictable you can prep and rest assured that the job is done the first time, every time. Precision-milled and finished by hand, it fits and functions flawlessly.

"BEST LOOKING

solid zirconia crown out there. The KDZ Bruxer is not just better than gold, these are better looking than some crowns I've received from other labs."

Dr. Ray Davis, Nantucket, MA

855-532-9015 keatingdentalarts.com

THE KDZ BRUXER:

- · Replaces full-cast gold
- · Is perfect for posterior bridges
- · Is the esthetic choice







LEONARD TACHNER A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY 17961 SKY PARK CIRCLE SUITE 38-E IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614-6364

May 31, 2011

PATENTS TRADEMARKS COPYRIGHTS

TEL: (949) 752-8525 FAX: (949) 955-2415

Thomas L. Gourde, Esq. Ray & Gourde, LLP 111 Pacifica Suite 120 Irvine, CA 92618

Re:

Keating Dental Arts, Inc.

Our Docket No. GLIDEWELL-190.

Dear Mr. Gourde:

I represent James R. Glidewell Dental Ceramic, Inc. dba Glidewell Laboratories of Newport Beach, California in regard to trademark matters. My client owns Federal Registration No. 3,739,663 for the mark BRUXZIR® (see enclosed) for dental bridges, dental caps, dental crowns, dental inlays, dental onlays and dental prostheses. My client has learned that Keating Dental Arts has filed an intent to use application for the mark KDZ BRUXER and design for use on dental prostheses and that you are the attorney of record in that application (see enclosed).

Glidewell management believes that KDZ BRUXER, when used in conjunction with dental prostheses or any type of dental restoration product, is likely to cause public confusion with Glidewell's registered mark. They have therefore authorized me to inform you of their intention to oppose the registration of the Keating mark if and when it is published and to assert their rights in the federal district court in the event that Keating is found to have actually used the KDZ BRUXER mark on dental prostheses.

Leonard Tachner
Attorney at Law

LT/jf Encl:

CC:

Glidewell Laboratories

EXHIBIT C (page 1 of 1)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge David O. Carter and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Arthur Nakazato.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV11-1309 DOC (ANx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

| All discovery | related motions | should be | noticed on t | he calendar | of the Magistrate. | Judge |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------------|-------|
| | | | | | | |

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

| \Box | Western Division | [X] |
|--------|----------------------------|-----|
| | 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 | |
| | Los Angeles, CA 90012 | |

[X] Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

| | Eastern Division | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 | | | | |
| | Riverside, CA 92501 | | | | |

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Name & Address:
LEONARD TACHNER
LEONARD TACHNER, a professional law corp.
17961 Sky Park Circle, Suite 38-E
Irvine, CA 92614-6364
(949) 752-8525

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| CENTRAL DISTRIC | CT OF CALIFORNIA |
|---|--|
| JAMES R. GLIDEWELL DENTAL CERAMICS, INC. DBA GLIDEWELL LABORATORIES, a California corporation PLAINTIFF(S) V. | CASE NUMBER SACV11-01309-DOC(ANx) |
| KEATING DENTAL ARTS, INC., a California corporation | |
| | SUMMONS |
| DEFENDANT(S). | |
| TO: DEFENDANT(S): KEATING DENTAL ARTS, | INC. |
| A lawsuit has been filed against you. | |
| must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached ☑ Counterclaim ☐ cross-claim or a motion under Rule | 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer eonard Tachner, whose address is, CA 92614-6364 If you fail to do so. |
| 7. | Clerk, U.S. District Court |
| Dated: (2011 | By: AND ASON Deputy Clerk (Seal of the Court) |
| DH SH H A | 1144 |
| [Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)]. | tes agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowe |
| | |
| | |
| CV-01A (12/07) SUN | MMONS |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) DEFENDANTS JAMES R. GLIDEWELL DENTAL CERAMICS, INC. KEATING DENTAL ARTS, INC., a DBA GLIDEWELL LABORATORIES, a California corporation California corporation (b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number, If you are representing Attorneys (If Known) yourself, provide same.) Leonard Tachner, a professional law corp. 17961 Sky Park Circle, Suite 38-E Irvine, CA 92614 (949) 752-8525 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 box for plaintiff and one for defendant.) □ I U.S. Government Plaintiff ■ 3 Federal Question (U.S.) PTF DEF DEF Government Not a Party) Citizen of This State Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship Citizen of Another State \square 2 $\square 2$ Incorporated and Principal Place 5 **5** of Parties in Item III) of Business in Another State Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country 3 Foreign Nation \square 3 П6 П6 IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.) X 1 Original □ 2 Removed from □ 3 Remanded from □ 4 Reinstated or □ 5 Transferred from another district (specify): □ 6 Multi-☐ 7 Appeal to District Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened Judge from Litigation Magistrate Judge V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND:

Yes

No (Check 'Yes' only if demanded in complaint.) CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$ VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) 15 U.S.C. Section 1121 Infringement of a federally registered trademark VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.) TORTS OTHER STATUTES CONTRACT PRISONER LABOR TORTS PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 110 Insurance **PERSONAL PETITIONS** ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 120 Marine □ 310 Airplane PROPERTY ☐ 510 Motions to ☐ 430 Banks and Banking □ 315 Airplane Product □ 130 Miller Act ☐ 370 Other Fraud Vacate Sentence □ 720 Labor/Mgmt. ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability ☐ 371 Truth in Lending Habeas Corpus Relations □ 320 Assault, Libel & ☐ 530 General Rates/etc. ☐ 150 Recovery of □ 730 Labor/Mgmt. ☐ 380 Other Personal Slander ☐ 460 Deportation Overpayment & Property Damage □ 535 Death Penalty Reporting & □ 330 Fed. Employers' ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced Enforcement of ☐ 385 Property Damage ☐ 540 Mandamus/ Disclosure Act Liability and Corrupt Judgment ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act Product Liability Other □ 340 Marine Organizations ☐ 151 Medicare Act BANKRUPTCY ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 790 Other Labor Marine Product □ 345 ☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC Litigation Liability Student Loan (Excl. FORFEITURE / ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 158 □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 810 Selective Service Veterans) ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 PENALTY Security Act □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ □ 153 PROPERTY RIGHTS Recovery of USC 157 ☐ 610 Agriculture Product Liability Exchange Overpayment of CIVIL RIGHTS ☐ 620 Other Food & □ 820 Copyrights □ 360 Other Personal □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 Veteran's Benefits ☐ 441 Voting Drug □ 830 Patent Injury USC 3410 ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 625 Drug Related ¥840 Trademark □ 362 Personal Injury-☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 443 Housing/Acco-SOCIAL SECURITY Seizure of Med Malpractice □ 891 Agricultural Act □ 195 Contract Product □ 365 Personal Injurymmodations Property 21 USC □ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Liability Product Liability ☐ 444 Welfare 881 ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) Act □ 196 Franchise ☐ 445 American with ☐ 630 Liquor Laws □ 863 DIWC/DIWW Asbestos Personal ☐ 893 Environmental Matters REAL PROPERTY Injury Product Disabilities -☐ 640 R.R. & Truck (405(g))□ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 210 Land Condemnation Liability Employment ☐ 650 Airline Regs □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 895 Freedom of Info. Act □ 220 Foreclosure **IMMIGRATION** □ 446 □ 865 RSI (405(g))

SACV11-01309-DOC(ANx)

American with

Disabilities -

Other

Rights

☐ 440 Other Civil

☐ 660 Occupational

□ 690 Other

Safety /Health

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

Naturalization

Habeas Corpus-

Alien Detainee

Other Immigration

Application

Actions

□ 462

□ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment

□ 245 Tort Product Liability

☐ 290 All Other Real Property

☐ 240 Torts to Land

☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-

nation Under Equal

Access to Justice

☐ 950 Constitutionality of

State Statutes

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

FEDERAL TAX SUITS

☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff

or Defendant)

□ 871 IRS-Third Party 26

USC 7609

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

| If yes, list case number(s): | s, list case number(s): | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? No | | | | | |
| □ C. F | Arise from the same Call for determination For other reasons we | or closely related transaction on of the same or substantially ould entail substantial duplica | s, happenings, or events; or velated or similar questions of law and fact; or tion of labor if heard by different judges; or and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present. | | |
| IX. VENUE: (When completing the | following informati | ion, use an additional sheet if | necessary.) | | |
| | | | other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. his box is checked, go to item (b). | | |
| County in this District:* | | | California County outside of this District; State, if other than California: or Foreign Country | | |
| Orange | | | | | |
| | | | other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. f 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 | | |
| ORANGE | | | | | |
| (c) List the County in this District; (Note: In land condemnation ca | | | f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. | | |
| County in this District:* | | | California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country | | |
| | | | | | |
| * Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us | | | ian Luis Obispo Counties | | |
| X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (| OR PRO PER | ferrand: | Jochus Date 8/38/11 | | |
| or other papers as required by lav | v. This form, appro | ved by the Judicial Conference | mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings e of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.) | | |
| Key to Statistical codes relating to So | ocial Security Cases | : | | | |
| Nature of Suit Code | Abbreviation | Substantive Statement of | f Cause of Action | | |
| 861 | НІА | All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(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 widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g)) | | | |
| 864 | SSID | All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended. | | | |
| 865 | RSI | All claims for retirement (U.S.C. (g)) | old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 | | |
| | 0.5.c. (g)) | | | | |