**COMPLAINT** 

Plaintiff Kerr Corporation ("Plaintiff") states the following for its complaint against Tri Dental, Inc., Tri Dental Innovators Corporation and Ahn Luu:

**JURISDICTION** 

1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(b). This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because the acts complained of occurred and are occurring in interstate commerce in this District and as Plaintiff is suffering injuries within this District as a result of Defendants' conduct.

#### **VENUE**

2. Venue is properly laid in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 as the acts complained of occurred and are occurring in interstate commerce in the Central District of California and as Plaintiff has a place of business within the Southern Division of this District.

#### THE PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business located within this District at 1717 W. Collins Ave., Orange, California 92867.
- 4. Plaintiff manufactures high technology dental restorative materials and consumables. Plaintiff's products are consistent sales and technology leaders in the dental restorative industry.
- 5. Tri Dental Inc. ("TDI") was a corporation that dissolved on or about February 1, 2012. TDI had an office and principal place of business located at 13902 West Street, Garden Grove, California 92843. This action is brought against TDI pursuant to Section 2011 of the California Corporations Code.
- 6. Tri Dental Innovators Corporation ("TDIC") was a corporation that dissolved on or about June 23, 2008. TDIC had an office and principal place of business located at 13902 West Street, Garden Grove, California 92843. This action is brought against TDIC pursuant to Section 2011 of the California Corporations

///

4 5

6 7

9 10

8

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

///

Code. On information and belief, TDI is or was the successor in interest or alter ego of TDIC.

- On information and belief, and notwithstanding their purported 7. dissolution, TDI and TDIC continued to operate and commit the prohibited acts identified herein after the dates of their dissolutions. Accordingly, TDI and TDIC are also sued, in the alternative, as unknown business entities.
- Ahn Luu is an individual citizen of California. Luu is a former 8. executive of Kerr Corporation, and a founder of TDI. Luu is also TDI's former designated agent for service of process. On information and belief, Luu is also a former officer, director, employee or shareholder of TDIC. This action is brought against Luu individually and pursuant to Section 2011 of the California Corporations Code.
- The true names of TDI and/or TDIC's former shareholders, sued 9. pursuant to Section 2011 of the California Corporations Code and individually herein as Does 1-10, are unknown to Plaintiff, which therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend its pleadings to allege their true names and capacities when the same are ascertained.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Since at least 1905, Plaintiff has used the KERR trademark in 10. connection with dental materials, namely, impression compounds, impression-trays, dental waxes, investment compounds for use in the investment casting of dental articles, Plaster of Paris for use in the creation of dental articles, sealing agents for dental purposes; dental instruments, namely, pulp-canal instruments, broach holders, mouth-mirrors, handles for dental instruments, articulators, dental spatulas, and engine-drills. The KERR mark is a nonfunctional and an inherently distinctive indicator of origin that additionally has acquired distinctiveness through Plaintiff's widespread sales under, and advertising of, the mark.

- 11. Since at least 1986, Plaintiff has used the HERCULITE mark in connection with a dental composite. The HERCULITE mark is a nonfunctional and an inherently distinctive indicator of origin that additionally has acquired distinctiveness through Plaintiff's widespread sales under, and advertising of, the mark.
- 12. Since at least 1992, Plaintiff has used the OPTIBOND mark in connection with a dental adhesive. The OPTIBOND mark is a nonfunctional and an inherently distinctive indicator of origin that additionally has acquired distinctiveness through Plaintiff's widespread sales under, and advertising of, the mark.
- 13. Since at least 1994, Plaintiff has used the REVOLUTION trademark in connection with a dental composite filling material. The REVOLUTION mark is a nonfunctional and an inherently distinctive indicator of origin that additionally has acquired distinctiveness through Plaintiff's widespread sales under, and advertising of, the mark.
- 14. Since at least 1996, Plaintiff has used the NEXUS trademark in connection with dental resin cement. The NEXUS mark is a nonfunctional and an inherently distinctive indicator of origin that additionally has acquired distinctiveness through Plaintiff's widespread sales under, and advertising of, the mark.
- 15. Since at least 2004, Plaintiff has used the PREMISE trademark in connection with a universal dental restorative composite compound in a flowable configuration. The PREMISE mark is a nonfunctional and an inherently distinctive indicator of origin that additionally has acquired distinctiveness through Plaintiff's widespread sales under, and advertising of, the mark.
- 16. Since at least 2008, Plaintiff has used the MAXCEM ELITE trademark in connection with a self-etch, self-adhesive, resin dental cement. The MAXCEM ELITE mark is a nonfunctional and an inherently distinctive indicator of origin that

additionally has acquired distinctiveness through Plaintiff's widespread sales under, and advertising of, the mark.

- Since at least 2003, Plaintiff has used the NX3 mark in connection with 17. a permanent dental resin cement system featuring a color-stable adhesive dental resin cement. The NX3 mark is a nonfunctional and an inherently distinctive indicator of origin that additionally has acquired distinctiveness through Plaintiff's widespread sales under, and advertising of, the mark.
- Plaintiff is the owner of numerous registrations from the U.S. Patent 18. and Trademark Office covering the trademarks under which Plaintiff's products are sold. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

Mark	Reg. No.	Reg. Date	Goods
REVOLUTION	3645913	June 30, 2009	dental composite filling
			material
KERR	3443640	June 10, 2008	dental materials, namely,
			impression compounds,
			impression-trays, dental
			waxes, investment
			compounds for use in the
			investment casting of dental
			articles, Plaster of Paris for
			use in the creation of dental
			articles, sealing agents for
			dental purposes; dental
			instruments, namely, pulp-
			canal instruments, broach
			holders, mouth-mirrors,

1	Mark	Reg. No.	Reg. Date	Goods
2				handles for dental
3				instruments, articulators,
4				dental spatulas, engine-
5				drills
6 7	OPTIBOND	2119642	Dec. 9, 1997	dental adhesive
8	NEXUS	2114553	Nov. 18, 1997	dental products, namely,
9				cement
10	KERR	0671899	Dec. 30, 1958	dental tools, dental
11				instruments, and accessories
12				for use therewith
13				

- 19. Because declarations under Section 15 of the federal Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1065, have been filed for the KERR mark, Reg. No. 0671899, the NEXUS mark, Reg. 2114553, and the OPTIBOND mark, Reg. No. 2119642, those registrations are incontestable and therefore constitute conclusive evidence of Plaintiff's ownership of the marks underlying those registrations. Registrations for the REVOLUTION Mark, Reg. No. 3645913 and KERR mark, Reg. No. 3443640, are prima facie evidence of Plaintiff's ownership of the marks underlying those registrations.
- 20. Plaintiff has spent substantial time, money, and effort in promoting its products under the KERR, REVOLUTION, PREMISE, MAXCEM ELITE, NEXUS, NX3, OPTIBOND and HERCULITE marks (collectively, the "Marks," each, a "Mark"). As a result of Plaintiff's extensive and continuous use of the marks, and through the marks' widespread fame, distinctiveness, and favorable public acceptance and recognition, consumers throughout the United States, including in this District and in this Division, associated the marks exclusively with

9

8

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

> 22 23

25

26 27

28 ///

Plaintiff prior to the date Defendants undertook the unlawful conduct described in this Complaint.

- Prior to the date Defendants undertook the unlawful conduct described 21. in this Complaint, the Marks were famous and distinctive in the state of California in light of:
  - Plaintiff's extensive advertising and promotion of the marks a. throughout California;
  - the extensive volume and geographic extent of sales in California b. of goods under the marks;
  - the actual recognition of the marks throughout California; and c.
  - in the case of the KERR, REVOLUTION, NEXUS and d. OPTIBOND marks, their federally registered status.

#### **DEFENDANTS' WRONGFUL ACTS**

- Defendants have manufactured and sold dental supplies and materials 22. in this District, including dental supplies and materials bearing counterfeits of the Marks.
- Through its own independent investigation, Plaintiff learned that 23. Defendants had contracted with local printers to produce unauthorized copies of the instruction booklets (called "Directions for Use" or "DFUs") that are included in the packages of Plaintiff's dental products.
- Plaintiff did not authorize Defendants to print DFUs bearing Plaintiff's 24. trademarks, and therefore, the DFUs were counterfeit.
- Defendants have ordered and received between 10,000 and 15,000 25. counterfeit DFUs each month since 2010.
- Defendants can have only one reason for ordering this volume of 26. counterfeit DFUs: to support a massive counterfeit operation distributing millions of dollars of counterfeit product each month.

## <u>COUNT I</u>

23

### FEDERAL TRADEMARK COUNTERFEITING

Without authorization of Plaintiff, Defendants have used in commerce

As a consequence of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff has suffered, and is

**4 5** 

28.

29.

27. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1-26 as if fully set forth here.

6

marks that are identical to, or substantially indistinguishable from, Plaintiff's federally registered KERR, NEXUS, REVOLUTION and OPTIBOND marks.

7 8

Insofar as Defendants deliberately have used spurious copies of Plaintiff's federally

9

registered KERR, NEXUS, REVOLUTION and OPTIBOND marks in connection

10

with goods falling within the scope of Plaintiff's trademark rights, Defendants have

11

intentionally violated 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d).

12 13

continuing to suffer, irreparable harm and damage, including a diversion of sales

14

from it to Defendants and a loss of goodwill. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at

15

16

∏law.

30. Given that Defendants' actions were willful, deliberate, and fraudulent, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of statutory damages and attorneys' fees under 15

18

17

U.S.C. § 1117(c).

19

#### **COUNT II**

20

## FEDERAL TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

2122

31. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1-30 as if fully set forth here.

23

32. Defendants' use in connection with the sale of dental supplies and

24

materials of marks identical or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's KERR, NEXUS,

25

REVOLUTION and OPTIBOND marks is causing and is likely to cause confusion,

26

deception, and mistake by creating the false and misleading impression that Defendants' business and products are affiliated, connected, or associated with

2728

Plaintiff or have the sponsorship, endorsement, or approval of Plaintiff.

28 || / / /

- 33. Defendants' activities constitute infringements of Plaintiff's KERR, NEXUS, REVOLUTION and OPTIBOND marks in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1) that are causing and, unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause a likelihood of confusion and deception and injury to Plaintiff's good will and reputation as symbolized by its KERR, NEXUS, REVOLUTION and OPTIBOND marks, for which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.
- 34. Defendants' actions demonstrate an intentional, willful, and bad faith intent to trade on the good will associated with Plaintiff's KERR, NEXUS, REVOLUTION and OPTIBOND marks to the irreparable injury of Plaintiff.
- 35. Defendants' conduct is causing and is likely to cause substantial injury to the public and to Plaintiff, and Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief, and to recover Defendants' profits, actual damages, costs, and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

#### **COUNT III**

#### FEDERAL UNFAIR COMPETITION

- 36. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1-35 as if fully set forth here.
- 37. Defendants' use in connection with the sale of dental supplies and materials of marks identical or confusingly similar to the Marks is causing, and is likely to cause confusion, deception, and mistake by creating the false and misleading impression that Defendants' business and products are affiliated, connected, or associated with Plaintiff or have the sponsorship, endorsement, or approval of Plaintiff.
- 38. Defendants' activities constitute false representations, false descriptions, and false designations of origin of Defendants' products in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) that are causing and, unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause a likelihood of confusion and deception and injury to Plaintiff's

3

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

good will and reputation as symbolized by the Marks, for which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

- Defendants' actions demonstrate an intentional, willful, and bad faith 39. intent to trade on the good will associated with the Marks to the irreparable injury of Plaintiff.
- Defendants' conduct is causing and is likely to cause substantial injury 40. to the public and to Plaintiff and Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief, and to recover Defendants' profits, actual damages, costs, and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

#### **COUNT IV**

#### VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

- Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations of 41. paragraphs 1-40 as if fully set forth here.
- Through its use of confusingly similar imitations of the Marks, 42. Defendants have engaged in unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business acts or practices within the meaning of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to injunctive relief.

#### **COUNT V**

#### COMMON-LAW UNFAIR COMPETITION

- Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth 43. in paragraphs 1-42 above as if fully set forth here.
- Defendants' use in connection with the sale of dental supplies and 44. materials of marks identical or confusingly similar to the Marks constitute false representations, false descriptions, and false designations of origin of Defendants' products that are causing and, unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause a likelihood of confusion and deception and injury to Plaintiff's good will and reputation as symbolized by the Marks, for which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

- 45. Defendants' actions demonstrate an intentional, willful, and bad-faith intent to trade on the good will associated with the Marks to the irreparable injury of Plaintiff.
- 46. Defendants' conduct is causing and is likely to cause substantial injury to the public and to Plaintiff and Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief, and to recover Defendants' profits, actual damages, costs, and reasonable attorneys' fees.

#### **COUNT VI**

#### TRADEMARK DILUTION AND INJURY TO BUSINESS REPUTATION

- 47. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference all of the allegations of paragraphs 1-46 as if fully set forth here.
- 48. Through its use of confusingly similar imitations of the Marks,
  Defendants have diluted the distinctiveness of those marks by eroding the public's
  exclusive identification of the marks with Plaintiff, thus diminishing the marks'
  distinctiveness, effectiveness, and prestigious connotations. The Marks will
  inevitably be tarnished by Defendants' sale of goods bearing spurious imitations of
  those marks, particularly as the goods sold by Defendants have not been subjected to
  Plaintiff's quality control mechanisms.
- 49. Defendants' conduct is causing and will continue to cause irreparable injury to Plaintiff's good will and business reputation and dilution of the distinctive and valuable quality of the Marks in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247, and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to injunctive relief. Because of the deliberately willful nature of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff is additionally entitled to the remedies set forth in Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14252.

///

///

///

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff therefore respectfully requests:

- 1. that Defendants and all agents, officers, employees, representatives, successors, assigns, attorneys, and all other persons acting for, with, by, through, or under authority from Defendants, or in concert or participation with Defendants, and each of them, be enjoined preliminarily and permanently from:
  - using any copy, reproduction, or colorable imitation or simulation of the Marks in connection with goods not manufactured under Plaintiff's authority;
  - b. using any mark that is a copy, reproduction, colorable imitation, or simulation of or, confusingly similar to Plaintiff's trademarks, or is likely to cause confusion, mistake, deception, or public misunderstanding that Defendants' products are products of Plaintiff, or are sponsored by or in any way related to Plaintiff;
  - c. passing off, palming off, or assisting in passing off or palming off, Defendants' products as those of Plaintiff, or otherwise continuing any and all acts of unfair competition;
- 2. that, in light of the risk to the public health posed by Defendants' conduct, Defendants be compelled to recall any products it has distributed bearing or associated with the Marks and not manufactured under Plaintiff's authority;
- 3. that Defendants be compelled to account to Plaintiff for any and all profits derived by Defendants and for all damages caused to Plaintiff under 15 U.S.C. § 1117 and the common law, and that Plaintiff's award be trebled as provided for by 15 U.S.C. § 1117(b);
- 4. that, in light of Defendants' willful counterfeiting of Plaintiff's KERR, NEXUS, REVOLUTION and OPTIBOND marks, Plaintiff be awarded

1		statutory damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c) in the amount of					
2		\$2,000,000 for each of those marks for a total of \$8,000,000 in					
3		statutory damages;					
4	5.	that, in light of Defendants' willful and deliberate infringement of the					
5		Marks, Plaintiff be awarded punitive damages in connection with its					
6		California law causes of action;					
7	6.	that Defendants be required to pay to Plaintiff the costs of this action					
8		and its reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117;					
9	7.	that Defendants be required to pay prejudgment and post-judgment					
10		interest on the foregoing damages and profits awards; and					
11	8.	that Defendants be ordered to deliver up for destruction all bags, boxes,					
12		labels, signs, packages, receptacles, advertising, promotional material					
13		or the like in possession, custody, or under the control of Defendants					
14		that are found to adopt, to infringe, or likely to dilute any of Plaintiff's					
15		trademarks or that otherwise unfairly compete with Plaintiff; and					
16	9.	that Plaintiff have such other and further relief as the Court may deem					
17		just.					
		ne 5, 2012 SCHEPER KIM & HARRIS LLP MARC S. HARRIS					
19		ALEXANDER H. COTE					
20							
21							
22		By: <u>MMM Joh</u> Alexander H. Cote					
23		Attorneys for Plaintiff KERR					
24		CORPORATION					
25							
26							
27							
28							

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** Plaintiff Kerr Corporation hereby demands that all issues be determined by jury. DATED: June 5, 2012 SCHEPER KIM & HARRIS LLP MARC S. HARRIS ALEXANDER H. COTE By: Alexander H. Cote Attorneys for Plaintiff KERR CORPORATION 

COMPLAINT

#### 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 James V. Selna and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Arthur Nakazato.

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

SACV12- 891 JVS (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 motion	s should be noticed on the c	alendar of the Magistrate Judge
	NOTICE TO COUNS	
A copy of this notice must be served filed, a copy of this notice must be se	with the summons and complaint rved on all plaintiffs).	on all defendants (if a removal action is
Subsequent documents must be filed	I at the following location:	
☐ Western Division	[X] Southern Division	[ ] Eastern Division

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

312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8

Los Angeles, CA 90012

411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053

Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134

Riverside, CA 92501

Case 8:12-cv-00891-DOC-Cyv Document 1	Filed 06/05/12 Page 16 of 18 Page ID #:20
Name & Address: SCHEPER KIM & HARRIS LLP MARC S. HARRIS (SBN #136647) mharris@scheperkim.com ALEXANDER H. COTE (SBN #211558) acote@scheperkim.com 601 West Fifth Street, 12th Floor	
Los Angeles CA 90071-2025	
Telephone: (213) 613-4655 Facsimile: (213) 613-4656  UNITED STATES I CENTRAL DISTRIC	DISTRICT COURT T OF CALIFORNIA
KERR CORPORATION,	CASE NUMBER
PLAINTIFF(S) V.	SACVIZ-891-IVS LANA
TRI DENTAL INC.; TRI DENTAL INNOVATORS CORPORATION; AHN LUU; and DOES 1-10,	SUMMONS
DEFENDANT(S).	
must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached counterclaim cross-claim or a motion under Rule 1 or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney,	2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer Alexander H. Cote, whose address is the Fl., Los Angeles, CA 90071-2025. If you fail to do so,
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
Dated: JUN - 5 2012	By:MARILYN DAVI
	Deputy Clerk
	(Seal of the Court)
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United State 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	es agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed

SUMMONS

CV-01A (10/11

## Case 8:12-cv-00891-DOC-CW Document 1 Filed 06/05/12 Page 17 of 18 Page ID #:21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □)  KERR CORPORATION			TRI DENTAL INC.; TRI DENTAL INNOVATORS CORPORATION; AHN LUU; and DOES 1-10			
yourself, provide same.) Alexander H. Cote (SBN SCHEPER KIM & HAR. 601 West Fifth Street, 12 Los Angeles, CA 90071.	#211558) Telephone: (21 RIS Facsimile: (213 th Floor	3) 613-4655	Unknown			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION		III. CITIZEN (Place an	ISHIP OF PRINCIPAL PART  X in one box for plaintiff and or	TIES - For Diversity Cases ne for defendant.)	Only	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This		DEF ☐ 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business in this	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	<ul><li>4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh of Parties in Item III)</li></ul>	ip Citizen of And	ther State $\square$ 2	☐ 2 Incorporated and I of Business in An		
		Citizen or Sub	ject of a Foreign Country 3	□ 3 Foreign Nation	□6 □6	
Proceeding State Co  V. REQUESTED IN COMPL.	AINT: JURY DEMAND: Yes	Reopened	5 Transferred from another dis es' only if demanded in complain	Distri Litiga nt.)	ct Judge from tion Magistrate Judge	
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cita Lanham Act, 15	the U.S. Civil Statute under which y					
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place						
OTHER STATUTES    400   State Reapportionment     410   Antitrust     430   Banks and Banking     450   Commerce/ICC     Rates/etc.     460   Deportation     470   Racketeer Influenced     and Corrupt     Organizations     480   Consumer Credit     490   Cable/Sat TV     810   Selective Service     850   Securities/Commodities/Exchange     875   Customer Challenge 12     USC 3410     890   Other Statutory Actions     891   Agricultural Act     892   Economic Stabilization     Act     893   Environmental Matters     894   Energy Allocation Act     950   Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal     Access to Justice     950   Constitutionality of     State Statutes	□ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability	TORTS PERSONAL INJUF 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Prod Liability 320 Assault, Libel Slander 330 Fed. Employe Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Produ Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liabi 360 Other Persona Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 368 Asbestos Pers Injury Product Liabi 368 Asbestos Pers Injury Product Liabi 368 Asbestos Pers Injury Product Liability IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application 463 Other Immigi Actions	PROPERTY    370 Other Fraud   371 Truth in Lending   371 Truth in Lending   372 Property Damage   373 Property Damage   374 Property Damage   375 Property	□ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty □ 540 Mandamus/ Other □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition FORFEITURE / PENALTY □ 610 Agriculture □ 620 Other Food & Drug □ 625 Drug Related Seizure of	LABOR  □ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act □ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations □ 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 790 Other Labor Litigation □ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Case Number: 5 A	CV12-	89/			

Page 1 of 2

# Case 8:12-cv-00891-DOC-CW Document 1 Filed 06/05/12 Page 18 of 18 Page ID #:22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has If yes, list case number(s):						
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s): SAC	any cases been prev	riously filed in this court that and SACV 11-1.	t are related to the prese	ent case? 🗆 No	X Yes	_
Civil cases are deemed related if a p (Check all boxes that apply)  (X) B. C  XI C. F	reviously filed case Arise from the same Call for determination	e and the present case:	ns, happenings, or even y related or similar que ation of labor if heard b	ts; or stions of law a y different jud	nd fact; or ges; or	
IX. VENUE: (When completing the						
(a) List the County in this District; C X Check here if the government, its	California County ou agencies or employ	utside of this District; State is yees is a named plaintiff. If	this box is checked, go	to item (U).	untry, in which EACH named plaintiff resides.	$\neg$
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Orange County						
(b) List the County in this District; C X Check here if the government, it	California County or s agencies or emplo	utside of this District; State i	f other than California; If this box is checked, g	or Foreign Co o to item (c).	untry, in which EACH named defendant resides.	
County in this District:*			California County outs	side of this Dist	rict; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	$\dashv$
Orange County						
(c) List the County in this District; (	California County or	utside of this District; State i	if other than California;	or Foreign Co	untry, in which EACH claim arose.	
Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land invo			California County out	side of this Dist	rict; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	$\exists$
Orange County						
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar	dino, Riverside, Vo	entura, Santa Barbara, or	San Luis Obispo Cour	ıties		
Note: In land condemnation cases, us X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (		/ Whan	Hlak	Date	June 5, 2012	
Notice to Counsel/Parties: Th	e CV-71 (JS-44) C	and buthe Indicial Conterent	ce of the United States II	i Sentember 15	ce nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings 174, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)	
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	ocial Security Cases					
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	of 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	Act, as amended.			pon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Securi	.ty
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))				

CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2

CV-71 (05/08)