Hariri Law Group 402 West Broadway, Floor 22 San Diego, CA 92101	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		ES DISTRICT COURT IRICT OF CALIFORNIA CASE NO. '19CV0839 AJB WVG CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF, INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, RESTITUTION AND DAMAGES UNDER THE FOURTH AMENDMENT (42 U.S.C § 1983) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL						
		Defendants.							
	23								
	25	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>							
	26	Each day, each week and each month, citizens living in cities, counties and municipalities							
	27	throughout the State of California receive parking tickets. These tickets are generally given to							
	28	citizens lawfully.							
	20								

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

However, the enforcement and operation of parking enforcement has been taken a *step* further, in actions that violate protections provided by the U.S. and California Constitutions – specifically protections provided under the 4th Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article I, of the California State Constitution. Parking enforcement officers working on behalf of these cities, counties and municipalities, have in the past, and continue to do so, use tools to "mark" or "tag" vehicles of un-consenting citizens and without their knowledge, to ultimately determine whether a vehicle has been parked beyond the authorized permitted time and to issue government sanctions or fines on the owner of the vehicle.

In fact the marking or tagging of vehicles occur when the citizen is parked *legally*, meaning they have purchased a parking permit, or paid a meter, within the time limits allowed, and the parking permit or parking meter has yet to expire. Once the unconstitutional act is done, a ticket is issued demanding a penalty or fine to be paid.

No law allows these local governments or their parking enforcement officials to mark, touch, place or intrude on a private vehicle without the owner's consent, unless certain exceptions apply. Engaging in such conduct on a private vehicle without the consent, or a formal notice or warning is unconstitutional act done without a warrant under United States v. Jones 565 U.S. 400 (2012).

Local government entities engaging in these unconstitutional acts have collected enormous amounts of penalties and fines. In fact, these government entities have denied numerous parking ticket "appeals" and doubled, if not tripled fine amounts when the penalty or fine is not paid; all on the basis of violating a citizen's constitutional rights and without any legal authority to do so.

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff ANDRE VERDUN ("Plaintiff") was, at all relevant times, an individual residing in the State of California.
- Plaintiff IAN ANOUSH GOLKAR ("Plaintiff") was, at all relevant times, an 2. individual residing in the State of California.
 - 3. Defendant CITY OF SAN DIEGO is now, and at all times mentioned in this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Complaint, was a local government agency and subdivision of the State of California. Defendant CITY OF SAN DIEGO, through its agents the Mayor, City Council, City Attorney, Parking Enforcement, San Diego Police Department, and the Police Chief undertakes to cite Plaintiffs and Class members for parking violations. Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO and SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT implement the ticketing and impoundment of Plaintiffs' and Class members' vehicles.

- 4. Defendant SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT is the City's law enforcement department, which is involved in enforcement of the City's parking regulations through various means, including the marking or tagging of vehicles' tires.
- 5. Plaintiffs are currently unaware of the true names and capacities of the defendants and/or parking enforcement officers sued in this action and therefore have named them by the fictitious names DOES 1 through 150, inclusive. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of such fictitiously named defendants when they are ascertained.
- 6. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and on that basis allege that each defendant sued in this action, including each defendant sued by the fictitious names DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, is responsible in some manner for the occurrences, controversies and damages alleged below. Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO; SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT and DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants".)

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This is an action for injunctive relief and damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based upon the continuing violations of Plaintiffs and Class member's rights under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 1343 based on 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and questions of federal constitutional law. Jurisdiction also exists under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201(a) and 2202. Supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs and Class members' state law claims is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 8. Venue is proper in the Southern District of California because Defendants reside in the District and all events given rise to Plaintiffs and Class members' claims occurred in the District. The relief Plaintiffs seek is within this Court's power to grant.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 9. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendants on their own behalf and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(2).
- 10. The class is defined as individuals during the relevant statutorily-limited time period who were subject to the unconstitutional methodology of the placement of a chalk mark on one of the four tires of vehicles to obtain information to justify the issuance of thousands of parking tickets that resulted in damages to the individuals, through the territorial limits of the City of San Diego.
- 11. Plaintiffs do not know the exact size or identities of the Class. However, the number of injured individuals who have been constitutionally injured is sufficiently numerous to make class action status the most practical method to secure redress for injuries sustained and class wide equitable relief.
- 12. All members of the Class are subject to Defendants' policies and practice in enforcing parking ordinances. The Class is united in its interests with respect to proof of Defendants' conduct, and the effects caused by Defendants' actions.
- 13. There are clear questions of law and fact raised by Plaintiffs' claim common to, and typical of, those raised by the Class they seeks to represent.
- 14. Named Plaintiffs are asserting claims typical of the claims of the entire class of affected persons described above and do not conflict with the interests of any other members of the Classes. Named Plaintiffs and Class members have been injured by the same wrongful policies, practices, and conduct of Defendants. Named Plaintiffs' claims arise from the same practices and conduct that give rise to the claims of all Class members and are based on the same legal theories.
- 15. Named Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Class, and they have no interests antagonistic to the Class. Named Plaintiffs have retained lawyers who are competent and experienced.
- A class action is preferable and superior to other available methods for the fair 16. and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class treatment will permit the adjudication of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

claims by many Class members who could not afford to individually litigate their claims or vindicate their rights against the government. There are no difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of this case that might preclude its maintenance as a class action, and no superior alternative exists for the fair and efficient adjudication of this matter.

17. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or modify the Class definitions in connection with a motion for class certification and/or with the result of discovery.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 18. Plaintiff ANDRE VERDUN owns or has owned vehicles registered with California.
- 19. Plaintiff ANDRE VERDUN received numerous parking tickets over the course of the past two years for allegedly exceeding the time limit of a parking spots in San Diego.
- 20. The citation numbers are unknown at this time. (The City of San Diego Parking Enforcement maintains the actual database for all tickets and fines issued and payments received from each and every owner of a ticketed vehicles).
- 21. These tickets were issued by parking officers employed or working for Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO and/or SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT.
- 22. Plaintiff ANDRE VERDUN has witnessed parking officers mark his vehicle with chalk and has in fact notified them that their actions were unconstitutional.
- 23. On information and belief, Plaintiff ANDRE VERDUN alleges that parking enforcement officials from Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO and/or SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT regularly and systematically use the placement of a chalk-like substance on one of the vehicles' four tires to surreptitiously obtain information to justify the issuance of numerous parking tickets throughout the territorial limits of the City of San Diego.
- 24. On information and belief, Plaintiff ANDRE VERDUN alleges it is the official custom and practice of Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO and SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT for its parking enforcement officials to use this methodology of placing a chalk mark on one of the four tires of vehicles to obtain information to justify the issuance of parking tickets throughout the territorial limits of the City of San Diego.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 25. Plaintiff IAN ANOUSH GOLKAR owns or has owned a vehicle registered with California.
- 26. Plaintiff IAN ANOUSH GOLKAR received numerous parking tickets over the course of the past two years for allegedly exceeding the time limit of a parking spots in San Diego. The latest was on May 3, 2019, Citation Number 57684531, on his vehicle California Lic#7VIU579.
- 27. The previous citation numbers are unknown at this time. (The City of San Diego Parking Enforcement maintains the actual database for all tickets and fines issued and payments received from each and every owner of a ticketed vehicles).
- These tickets were issued by parking officers employed or working for 28. Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO and/or SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT.
- 29. Plaintiff IAN ANOUSH GOLKAR has witnessed parking officers mark his vehicle with chalk.
- 30. On information and belief, Plaintiff IAN ANOUSH GOLKAR alleges that parking enforcement officials from Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO and/or SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT regularly and systematically use the placement of a chalk-like substance on one of the vehicles' four tires to surreptitiously obtain information to justify the issuance of numerous parking tickets throughout the territorial limits of the City of San Diego.
- 31. On information and belief, Plaintiff IAN ANOUSH GOLKAR alleges it is the official custom and practice of Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO and SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT for its parking enforcement officials to use this methodology of placing a chalk mark on one of the four tires of vehicles to obtain information to justify the issuance of parking tickets throughout the territorial limits of the City of San Diego.

///

/// 25

26

27

28

San Diego, CA 92101

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOURTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION - UNREASONABLE SEARCH

[42 U.S.C. § 1983; Fourth Amendment]

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 32. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 31, inclusive, above as though fully set forth herein.
- 33. Defendants and their employees and agents violated Plaintiffs ANDRE VERDUN, IAN ANOUSH GOLKAR and Class Member's Fourth Amendment rights to be free from unreasonable search and seizure of their property by marking their vehicles with chalk for the purposes of law enforcement.
- 34. The surreptitious placement of chalk marks on private vehicles (without a valid warrant, consent of the owners, or exigent circumstances) undertaken to physically violate private property to gather information as well as conducting non-overt surveillance on the movement or non-movements of vehicles constituted a violation of the Fourth Amendment.
- 35. The placement of chalk-like marks on private vehicles (without a valid warrant, consent of the owners, or exigent circumstances) undertaken to physically violate private property to gather information as well as conducting surveillance on the movement or nonmovements of vehicles is a policy, custom, and/or practice of Defendants CITY OF SAN DIEGO and SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT sufficient to impose damages and other relief pursuant to Monell v. New York City Department of Social Services and its progeny.
- 36. Plaintiff ANDRE VERDUN, IAN ANOUSH GOLKAR and Class members have experienced constitutional and monetary harm by the unconstitutional processes and procedures undertaken by a policy, custom, and/or practice of Defendants.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 37. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 36, inclusive, above as though fully set forth herein.
- A real and immediate difference exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants 38. regarding Plaintiffs' rights and Defendants' duty owed to Plaintiffs to not partake in unlawful

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

and unco	nstitutional	searche	es. De	efenda	nts have al	SO 1	mad	le cle	ear that	they intend	to	contir	iue the
practices	described	above,	and	have	continued	to	do	so.	Unless	restrained	by	this	Court
Defendar	nts will cont	tinue to	imple	ement	these unlay	vful	l pol	icies	s and pra	actices.			

- 39. Defendants' acts alleged above violate established constitutional rights of Plaintiffs and Class members and Defendants could not reasonably have thought that the conduct of their agents and employees in illegally searching Plaintiffs and Class members' property was lawful.
- 40. An actual controversy exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants in that Defendants, their agents and employees, have engaged in the unlawful and unconstitutional acts alleged herein and intend to continue to do so. Plaintiffs' claim that these acts are contrary to law and seek a declaration of their rights with regard to this controversy.
- 41. As a direct and proximate consequence of the acts of Defendants' agents and employees, Plaintiffs and Class members have suffered and will continue to suffer damages.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

- 1. For a temporary restraining order, preliminary and permanent injunction, enjoining and restraining Defendants from engaging in the policies, practices and conduct complained of herein;
- 2. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants' policies, practices and conduct as alleged herein violate Plaintiffs' rights under the United States and California constitutions and the laws of California;
- 3. For damages in an amount according to proof;
- For costs of suit and attorneys' fees provided by law; 4.
- 5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Case 3:19-cv-00839-AJB-WVG Document 1 Filed 05/03/19 PageID.9 Page 9 of 9

Case 3:19-cv-00839-AJB-WVG Document 1-1 Filed 05/03/19 PageID.10 Page 1 of 2

JS 44 (Rev. 02/19)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS								
Andre Verdun; lan Anous	sh Golkar		CITY OF SAN DIEGO; SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT; DOES									
(b) County of Residence o	of First Listed Plaintiff S	an Diego		1-150 County of Residence of First Listed Defendant San Diego								
	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ISES ONLY)						
					NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.							
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name	Address and Telephone Number	•)		Attorneys (If Known)		19CV0839 AJB WVG						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Hariri Law Group, 402 W	est Broadway, Floor 2	2, San Diego, CA 9	92101	l manage (4) and may								
Khashayar Law Group,12	2636 High Bluff Drive,	Suite 400, San Die	ego, CA									
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF PR	RINCIPAL PART	IES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff						
☐ 1 U.S. Government	≱ 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only) PT	F DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF						
Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)			Citize	Citizen of This State Image: Citizen of This State								
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant				Citizen of Another State								
				en or Subject of a preign Country	3	ion						
IV. NATURE OF SUIT					Account to the same of the sam	ature of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES						
CONTRACT ☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJUR		ORFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 15							
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product		of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))							
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical		50 Other	□ 400 State Reapportionment PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 410 Antitrust							
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	Personal Injury			☐ 820 Copyrights	430 Banks and Banking						
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product	al		☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviate							
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product			New Drug Application ☐ 840 Trademark ☐ Corrupt Organizat								
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	RTY	LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer							
of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle		Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	Protection Act							
☐ 190 Other Contract☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	. 72	20 Labor/Management Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (40: ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/							
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -		40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions							
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO		Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUI	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 893 Environmental Matters						
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	★ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee		91 Employee Retirement	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plainti	iff 395 Freedom of Information						
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	te	Income Security Act	or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	Act ☐ 896 Arbitration							
240 Torts to Land245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations			26 USC 7609	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of							
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -		IMMIGRATION		Agency Decision							
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other		62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration		☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes						
	Other 448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Actions								
		☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of										
		Confinement										
		Remanded from Appellate Court		nstated or	erred from	ltidistrict						
- Troccamp				(specify) (Do not cite jurisdictional state	Trai	nsfer Direct File						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON 42 U.S.C § 1983 Brief description of ca	ause:										
THE PROVIDENCE IN	Violation of 4th A	mendment			CHECK VE	Sluif demanded in complaints						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTIO 23, F.R.Cv.P.	ON I	DEMAND \$	JURY DEM	S only if demanded in complaint: IAND: Yes □ No						
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	HIDGE			DOCUETATIANE	TD.						
DATE		JUDGESIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY	OF RECORD	DOCKET NUMBE	Λ						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						a winds						
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP)	JUDGE	MA	AG. JUDGE						

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u>.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
 - Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 - Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.

 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - Multidistrict Litigation Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
 - Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.
- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Class Action Alleges San Diego</u>, <u>Police Department's 'Tagging' of Legally Parked Vehicles Is Unconstitutional</u>