SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

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 THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

T (.) DI ADMINISTRO				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS		
Elizabeth Wells, individ situated	ually and on behalf of all others similar	ly Darden Restau ∎	rants, Inc.	
• • •	e of First Listed Plaintiff Bucks County, PA		of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	Orlando, FL
			D CONDEMNATION CASES, U INVOLVED.	JSE THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	e, Address, and Telephone Number)	Attorneys (If Known)		
	C 1051 County Line Road, Suite "A"			
Huntingdon Valley, PA II. BASIS OF JURISI		Ⅲ Ⅲ. CITIZENSHIP OF P	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	6(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
		(For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		TF DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated or F of Business In Th	
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2	Principal Place D 5 D 5 Another State
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	Foreign Country		
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury - 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice Liability 365 Personal Injury -	 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure 	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability	630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS 8 20 Copyrights	 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and
151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers' Injury Product	650 Airline Regs.	830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability Liability 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPERT	☐ 660 Occupational FY Safety/Health	840 Trademark	 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud	690 Other		810 Selective Service
153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability	□ 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Encuching 	□ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage Product Liability □ 385 Property Damage □ 360 Other Personal Product Liability	Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 	 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 An instant acts
□ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITION	& Disclosure Act	□ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	□ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
□ 210 Land Condemnation	□ 441 Voting □ 510 Motions to Vacate	5	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	893 Environmental Matters
 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 	442 Employment Sentence 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant) Ø 871 IRS—Third Party	 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations 🖸 530 General		26 USC 7609	Act
 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	□ 444 Welfare □ 535 Death Penalty □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - □ 540 Mandamus & Oth	er 462 Naturalization Application	1	900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access
	Employment	463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Determore		to Justice 950 Constitutionality of
	X 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - D 555 Prison Condition Other	Alien Detainee 465 Other Immigration		State Statutes
	□ 440 Other Civil Rights	Actions		
B			<u> </u>	
🕱 1 Original 🔲 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from 3 Remanded from tate Court Appellate Court		ferred from ☐ 6 Multidis er district Litigatio	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you ar 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of cause: Violation of the Americans With I	Disabilities Act		
VII. REQUESTED IN			CHECK YES only	y if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		JURY DEMAND	: 🗹 Yes 🗆 No
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF AT	FORNEY OF RECORD		
12/3/16		R1		· · ·
FØR OFFICE USE ONLY				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. J.	JDGE
	······			

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 2 of 13

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. □ FELA 2. □ Airplane Personal Injury 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. □ Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Patent 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury 7. □ Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability Assets 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Check Appropriate Category) 11. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby certify: 12. □ Artisl de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. DATE: 12/3/2016 Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to assignment to appropriate calendar.	be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose	of
Place of Acoident, Incident of Transaction: Eastern District of Pennsylvania (UM Revers Side for Additional Space) Date fits thit decis involve a sequence from an accounce with Pd R.Civ P. 7.1(a) Yeal No ^B RELATED CASE IF ANY. Case and other decision of the Discionare Suscement Form in accounce with Pd R.Civ P. 7.1(a) Yeal No ^B RELATED CASE IF ANY. Constrained and any patholy be and part or constrained with Pd R.Civ P. 7.1(a) Yeal No ^B RELATED CASE IF ANY. Constrained and property induced in any efficiency quastions: 1. Is this over closed to property induced in an entity analysis of pathon in this court? Yeal No ^B 2. Does this case involve the same biase of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior sub pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yeal No ^B 3. Does this case involve the same biase of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior sub pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yeal No ^B 4. Is this case involve the same biase of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior sub pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yeal No ^B 5. Do stitu is case involve the same biase of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior sub pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yeal No ^B 6. Inderminy Construct, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 7. Information Construct, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 8. Determiny Janifestion Construct, and All Other Contracts 9. Good Contract and Other Contracts 9. Good Contract Construct, Social Soc	Address of Plaintiff: c/o Kalikhman & Rayz, LLC 1051 County	Line Rd., Suite "A" Huntingdon Valley, PA	A
(Use Reverse Side For definitional Spaces) Dates this call action involve a nangovernmental coopenate party with any publicly bell corporation overlap [10% or more of its stock? (Valueh ver couples of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with FeLR.Cv.P. 7.1(a)) Yest No	Address of Defendant: 1000 Darden Center Drive Orlando, FL	32837	
(Atach two copies of the Disclonue Statement Roms in accordance with HeLR.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Yes No ^{II} Does this case involve multidistic lligation possibilities? Yes No ^{III} REM.TRD.CASE, IF ANY:	Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Eastern District of Pennsy (Use Reverse Side For	lvania Additional Space)	
Dues this case involve multidistrict linguing possibilities? Yes□ No ^{III} ZEATED CASE, IF ANY:	Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?	
BELATED CASE, IF ANY:	(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a	a)) Yes No	
Case Nomber	Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No⊠	
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No Yes		Date Terminated:	
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously transminated action in this court? Yeal No 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously transmitted action in this court? Yeal No 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yeal No A. Federal Question Case: B. Diversity Jorisdiction Cases: I. Informative Contract, and All Other Contracts I. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Detries Active Action Cases: 6. Other Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury 6. Detries Active Action Cases: 7. Products Liability 7. Detries Active Action Cases: 8. Products Liability 8. Diversity Jorisdiction Cases: 8. Other Personal Injury 9. Descurity Review Cases 9. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 9. Descurity Review Cases 9. All other Personal Injury (Please specify) 10. Social Security Review Cases 9. All other Personal Injury (Please specify) 11. Social Security Review Cases 9. All other Personal Injury (Please specify) <			
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously transminated action in this court? Yeal No 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously transmitted action in this court? Yeal No 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yeal No A. Federal Question Case: B. Diversity Jorisdiction Cases: I. Informative Contract, and All Other Contracts I. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Detries Active Action Cases: 6. Other Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury 6. Detries Active Action Cases: 7. Products Liability 7. Detries Active Action Cases: 8. Products Liability 8. Diversity Jorisdiction Cases: 8. Other Personal Injury 9. Descurity Review Cases 9. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 9. Descurity Review Cases 9. All other Personal Injury (Please specify) 10. Social Security Review Cases 9. All other Personal Injury (Please specify) 11. Social Security Review Cases 9. All other Personal Injury (Please specify) <	1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	vear previously terminated action in this court?	
action in this court? Yes No No No No No No No No No No No No N			
Yes No 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any carlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes No 7.00 CML: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Individual? No A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Individual? No 0 Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Othore Vertice Personal Injury 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability Asbastos 9. Descurity Review Cases (Please specify) Yes Yes 10. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) Xes Yes 11. Babeas Corpus 8.		suit pending or within one year previously terminated	
terminated action in this court? Yes□ No□ 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes□ No□ CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Juriadiction Cases: No□ CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Juriadiction Cases: No□ 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. □ FELA 2. □ Airplane Personal Injury 3. □ Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. □ Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antitrust 6. □ Other Personal Injury 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Other Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. □ Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ Cautify Review Cases (Please specify) 42 ∪ S. C. S 12101 et seq. ARBITRATION CERFIFICATION Cate Aphropriste Category) (Arkady "Bric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do herdy certips? NOTE: A trial de novo		Yes No	
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes□ No□ 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes□ No□ CIVIL: (Place ✔ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A Federal Question Case: 1. □ Indermity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. □ FELA 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Antitrust 5. □ Patent 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 7. □ Civil Rights 8. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability 9. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ Arkady "Bric" Rayz, Esq. (Cased Appropriate Category) 1. □ Arkady "Bric" Rayz, Esq. (Cased Appropriate Category) 1. □ Arkady "Bric" Rayz, Esq. (Note: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Vertify that, to my knowledge, the within lose is not related to and case is not related to any case anow pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court exeept as noted above. DATE: 12/	3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	numbered case pending or within one year previously	
Yes No CIVIL: (Place 4' in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1 Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts I Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2 FELA 2 Airplane Personal Injury 3 Jones Act-Personal Injury 3 Assault, Defamation 4 Antitrust 4 Marine Personal Injury 5 Patent 5 Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6 Other Personal Injury 6 Other Personal Injury 7 Civil Rights 7 Products Liability 8 Habeas Corpus 8 Products Liability 9 Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. & Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record to hereby certify: 12. Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record to hereby certify: 13. A Relif other than monetary damages is sought. Attomey-at-Law DATE: 12/3/2016 Attomey-at-Law Arter 12. Attomey-at-Law Attomey 1D.#	terminated action in this court?	Yes No	
CIVIL: (Place V in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. □ FELA 2. □ Airplane Personal Injury 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. □ Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antirust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Patent 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury 7. □ Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 12. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby cerify: A Pursuan to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; A Relief other than monetary damages is sought. 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney ID.#	4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rig	hts case filed by the same individual?	
A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. □ FELA 2. □ Airplane Personal Injury 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Patent 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. □ Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. coursel of record do hereby certify: a Prisuan to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; a Relief other than monetary damages is sought. 879776 Attorney 1D.# DATE : 12/3/2016 879776 Attorney-at-Law 879776 Attorney 1D.# DATE : 12/3/2016 B Approximation on performance with F.R.C.P. 38.		Yes No	
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. □ FELA 2. □ Airplane Personal Injury 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. □ Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Patent 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury 7. □ Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Habeas Corpus 8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Check Appropriate Category) 11. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Check Appropriate Category) 12. □ Altorney.at. Law Attorney LD.# DATE: 12/3/2016 Attorney.at. Law Attorney.at. Law Attorney LD.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a frial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Terrify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 Attorney.at.Law Attorney ID.#	CIVIL: (Place 🗸 in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)		
 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Patent 6. □ Other Personal Injury 6. □ Other Personal Injury 7. □ Civil Rights 8. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. ☑ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 11. ☑ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 12. △ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Check Appropriate Category) (Check Appropriate Category) (Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Check Appropriate Category) (Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Check Appropriate Category) (Check Appropria			
 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Patent 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Other Personal Injury 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. □ Civil Rights 8. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Chease of the test of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; R Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: 12/3/2016 Attomey-at-Law DATE: 12/3/2016 Attomey-at-Law Attomey-at-Law Attomey-tabut Attomey-tabut Attomey-tabut Attomey 1D.# 	2. \Box FELA	2. 🗆 Airplane Personal Injury	
 5. □ Patent 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. □ Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ Social Security Review Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) 1. △ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby certify: Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby certify: A Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: 12/3/2016 Attomey.at.Law Attomey.at.Law Attomey.1D.# 	3. 🗆 Jones Act-Personal Injury		
6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. □ Civil Rights 8. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) 1. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq., counsel of record do hereby certify: □ Products Liability — Asbestos (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (Check Appropriate Category) 1. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq., counsel of record do hereby certify: □ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: <u>12/3/2016</u> Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: <u>12/3/2016</u> Attorney-at-Law Attorney-at-Law Attorney-at-Law Attorney-tLaw Attorney ID.#	4. □ Antitrust	4. 🗆 Marine Personal Injury	
specify) 7. □ Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Habeas Corpus 8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. ☑ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (Please specify) 11. ☑ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (Check Appropriate Category) (Check Appropriate Category) 1. ▲ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby certify: 🕸 Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; 🕸 Relief other than monetary damages is sought. 87976 Attorney-at-Law DATE: 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law Icertify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney-at-Law 87976 Attorney ID.#	5. 🗆 Patent	5. 🗆 Motor Vehicle Personal Injury	
7. □ Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Products Liability Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) 1 Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. coursel of record do hereby certify: R Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; M Relief other than monetary damages is sought. 87976 DATE: 12/3/2016 Kertify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 Attorney-at-Law 87976 Attorney-at-Law 87976 Attorney-at-Law 87976	6. 🗆 Labor-Management Relations	6. 🗆 Other Personal Injury (Please	;
 8. □ Habeas Corpus 8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. ☑ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) 1		specify)	
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (Check Appropriate Category) I Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Check Appropriate Category) I Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. (Check Appropriate Category) Kappropriate Category) (Check Appropriate Category) I Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby certify: Relief other than monetary damages is sought. 87976 DATE: _ 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: _ 12/3/2016	7. 🗆 Civil Rights	7. D Products Liability	
10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) I. □ Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby certify: □ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought. 87976 DATE: 12/3/2016 I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 Attorney-at-Law 87976 Attorney-at-Law 87976	8. 🗆 Habeas Corpus	8. 🗆 Products Liability — Asbestos	
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) I	9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. all other Diversity Cases	
(Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) I, Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. , counsel of record do hereby certify: Image: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Image: 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law 87976 Attorney-at-Law 87976	10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERFIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) (counsel of record do hereby certify:	11. All other Federal Question Cases		
I. Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby certify: Image: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Image: Parsuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Image: Parsuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Image: Parsuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Image: Parsuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Image: Parsuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Image: Parsuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive and the parsuant to the pa			
x	Arkady "Frid" Paus Egg (Check Appropriate (Category)	
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; ■ Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: 12/3/2016 Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 BATE: 12/3/2016 Attorney-at-Law Attorney-at-Law Attorney-at-Law BATE: 12/3/2016	i,, counsel of feedfu do hereby cert		f
Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#	\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;		
Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#			
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 Attorney-at-Law 87976 Attorney I.D.#			
except as noted above. DATE: 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#		· · · · ·	
DATE: 12/3/2016 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#	I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	r within one year previously terminated action in this court	
Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#	except as noted above.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
	DATE: 12/3/2016	87976	
	•	Attorney I.D.#	

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CIVIL ACTION

	V	•	
DARDEN RESTAURANTS,	INC.		NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.	()
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.	()
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.	()
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special	
management cases.)	(x)
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.	()

12/3/16	100	Plaintiff
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for
(215) 364-5030	(215) 364-5029	_erayz@kalraylaw.com
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ELIZABETH WELLS, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No.
Plaintiff, v. DARDEN RESTAURANTS, INC., Defendant.	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Jury Trial Demanded

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Elizabeth Wells ("Plaintiff" or "Wells"), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff Wells is an "individual with a disability" as that term is understood pursuant to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (the "ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*, and its implementing regulations.

2. Plaintiff Wells has suffered from a long history of mobility-related impairments, which began with the removal of the cartilage in both knees that arose from a work-related injury in the 1980s. In 2001, she underwent double knee replacement. Despite this surgery, Plaintiff still has (i) limited mobility, (ii) trouble walking distances and up/down steep inclines, and (iii) trouble walking on uneven or unsecure surfaces (such as sand, gravel, soft dirt).

3. Plaintiff currently suffers from osteoarthritis and traumatic arthritis of the left ankle, which required surgery from which she is still recovering. To maintain her limited mobility, these problems require her to use a physician-prescribed walker or cane on a daily

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 5 of 13

basis, and have, at times, required her to need the assistance of a wheelchair.

4. Naturally, Plaintiff's vehicle is registered as a handicapped vehicle with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Transportation and consequently, bears a handicapped license plate.

5. Because of her condition, Plaintiff requires the use of handicap parking spaces in order to provide her with sufficient space for access to and from her motor vehicle.

6. Plaintiff has patronized Defendant's facilities in the past, and will do so in the future.

7. As set forth below, Plaintiff was denied full access to Defendant's facility due to its non-compliance with the ADA. As set forth below, Defendant has failed to comply with the ADA's regulations regarding handicap parking. As such, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the ADA and its implementing regulations.

8. Unless Defendant corrects the access barriers detailed herein, Plaintiff will be denied safe and full access to Defendant's facilities.

9. The ADA permits private individuals, such as Plaintiff, to bring suit in federal court so as to compel compliance with the ADA.

10. Accordingly, and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals, Plaintiff seeks: (i) a declaration that Defendant's facility violates federal law as described; and (ii) an injunction requiring Defendant to remove the identified access barriers so that Defendant's facility is fully accessible to, and independently usable by, physically-impaired individuals such as Plaintiff and the class she seeks to represent.

11. Plaintiff also requests that once Defendant is fully in compliance with the requirements of the ADA, the Court retain jurisdiction for a period of time to be determined to

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 6 of 13

ensure that Defendant has adopted and is following an institutional policy that will, in fact, cause Defendant to remain in compliance with the law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over the ADA claims asserted herein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.

13. Plaintiff's claims asserted herein arose in this judicial district and Defendant does substantial business in this judicial district.

14. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred.

PARTIES

15. Plaintiff Elizabeth Wells ("Plaintiff" or "Wells") is and, at all times relevant hereto, was a resident of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Plaintiff Wells is and, at all times relevant hereto, has been a legally handicapped individual, and is therefore a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2) and the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 *et seq*.

16. Defendant DARDEN RESTAURANTS, INC., ("Darden" or "Defendant") is a restaurant owner headquartered in Orlando, Florida. Defendant owns and operates several restaurant chains throughout the United States, including LongHorn Steakhouse.

17. Defendant is a public accommodation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(F).

TITLE III OF THE ADA

18. On July 26, 1990, President George H.W. Bush signed into law the ADA, a comprehensive civil rights law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability.

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 7 of 13

19. The ADA broadly protects the rights of individuals with disabilities with respect to employment, access to State and local government services, places of public accommodation, transportation, and other important areas of American life.

20. Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination in the activities of places of public accommodation and requires places of public accommodation to comply with ADA standards and to be readily accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12181-89.

21. On July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice ("DOJ") issued rules implementing Title III of the ADA, which are codified at 28 CFR Part 36.¹

22. Appendix A of the 1991 Title III regulations (republished as Appendix D to 28 CFR part 36) contains the ADA standards for Accessible Design ("1991 Standards"), which were based upon the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines ("1991 ADAAG") published by the Access Board on the same date.²

23. The ADA requires removal of existing architectural barriers in facilities existing before January 26, 1992 where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181(9), 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 28 CFR 36.304(a).

24. Facilities newly built or altered after January 26, 1993 must be readily accessible

¹ The DOJ is the administrative agency charged by Congress with implementing the requirements of the ADA.

² The Access Board was established by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 29 U.S.C. § 792. The passage of the ADA expanded the Access Board's responsibilities. The ADA requires the Access Board to "issue minimum guidelines . . . to ensure that buildings, facilities, rail passenger cars, and vehicles are accessible, in terms of architecture and design, transportation, and communication, to individuals with disabilities." 42 U.S.C. § 12204. The ADA requires the DOJ to issue regulations that include enforceable accessibility standards applicable to facilities subject to Title III that are consistent with the "minimum guidelines" issued by the Access Board, 42 U.S.C. § 12134(c), 12186(c).

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 8 of 13

and usable by disabled individuals, including individuals who use wheelchairs. 28 CFR 36.401 and 28 CFR 36.402.

25. The DOJ revised the 1991 ADAAG when it issued The 2010 Standards for Accessible Design ("2010 Standards"), which were published on September 15, 2010.

26. Notably, many of the requirements with respect to parking remained the same in the 2010 Standards.

27. As set forth below, Defendant has failed to comply with those requirements.

VIOLATIONS AT ISSUE

28. Defendant owns, operates, and/or leases a place of public accommodation.

29. Defendant's facilities are not fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities.

30. In November 2016, Plaintiff Wells visited the Defendant's LongHorn Steakhouse located at 100 Rock Hill Drive, Bensalem, Pennsylvania.

31. The Defendant's facility is within Plaintiff's regular area of travel. She has patronized this location in the past and intends to do so again in the future.

32. During her November 2016 visit, Plaintiff, who was using a physician-prescribed cane at the time, experienced difficulty and unnecessary risk due to the existence of architectural barriers that impeded her access to, and ability to use, Defendant's facility.

33. Specifically, the purportedly handicap accessible parking spaces were not located on the shortest accessible route to the restaurant's accessible entrance.

34. Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 Standards requires that accessible parking spaces shall be located on the shortest accessible route from parking to an entrance.

35. Additionally, the curb ramp located at the end of the handicapped access aisle

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 9 of 13

adjacent to the restaurant's purportedly accessible parking spaces extends into the access aisle in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 Standards.

36. Finally, as evidenced in the image below, the signs identifying the parking spots as "van accessible" are mounted lower than the 60 inches required by the Section 502.6 of the 2010 Standards.



37. Upon information and belief, Defendant has centralized policies regarding the management and operation of its facility, and those policies are inadequate to ensure compliance with the ADA, as is demonstrated by the fact that Defendant's facility remains non-compliant.

38. Plaintiff will continue to attempt to access Defendant's facility in the future. However, so long as Defendant's facility continues to violate the ADA, Plaintiff will be unable

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 10 of 13

to access it independently and will be, thereby, denied full access to Defendant's facility.

39. Plaintiff requests periodic monitoring to confirm that the public accommodation is brought into compliance and remains in compliance.

40. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff will continue to be unable to independently use Defendant's facility.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

41. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Rules 23(a) and 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of herself and all individuals with disabilities who have attempted to access, or will attempt to access Defendant's facilities (the "Class").

42. Upon information and belief, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all individual members in one action would be impracticable. The disposition of the individual claims of the respective Class members through this class action will benefit both the parties and this Court.

43. <u>Typicality:</u> Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class. The claims of the Plaintiff and members of the Class are based on the same legal theories and arise from the same unlawful conduct.

44. <u>Common Questions of Fact and Law:</u> There is a well-defined community of interest and common questions of fact and law affecting members of the Class in that they all have been and/or are being denied their civil rights to full and equal access to, and use and enjoyment of, Defendant's facilities and/or services due to Defendant's failure to make its facilities fully accessible and independently usable as above described.

45. The questions of fact and law common to the class include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Whether Defendant is a "public accommodation" under the ADA;
- b. Whether Defendant's conduct in failing to make its facility fully accessible and independently usable as described above violated the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*; and
- c. Whether Plaintiff and members of the class are entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief.

46. <u>Adequacy of Representation</u>: Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class because her interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly, adequately, and vigorously represent and protect the interests of the members of the class and have no interests antagonistic to the members of the class. Plaintiff has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in the prosecution of class action litigation.

47. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, making appropriate both declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Plaintiff and the Class as a whole.

<u>COUNT I</u> <u>VIOLATION OF THE ADA</u>

48. The allegations contained in the previous paragraphs are incorporated by reference.

49. Defendant's facility was required to be altered, designed, or constructed so that it is readily accessible and usable by disabled individuals. 42 U.S.C.§12183(a)(1).

50. The architectural barriers described above demonstrate that Defendant's facility was not altered, designed, or constructed in a manner that causes it to be readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including Plaintiff and the class she seeks to represent.

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 12 of 13

51. The architectural barriers described above demonstrate that Defendant has failed to remove barriers, as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

52. Defendant's facility is required to comply with the Department of Justice's 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, or in some cases the 1991 Standards 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 36.406; 28 C.F.R., pt. 36, app. A.

53. Defendant is required to provide individuals with disabilities full and equal enjoyment of its facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

54. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and the Class in that it has failed to make its facility fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities in violation of the ADA, as described above.

55. Defendant's conduct is ongoing, and, given that Defendant has not complied with the ADA's requirements that public accommodations be fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities, Plaintiff invokes her statutory right to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

56. Without the requested injunctive relief, specifically including the request that the Court retain jurisdiction of this matter for a period to be determined after the Defendant certifies that it is fully in compliance with the mandatory requirements of the ADA that are discussed above, Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA's requirements that its facility be accessible to, and independently usable, by individuals with disabilities is likely to recur.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the members of the Class, pray for:

A. A Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA described above;

Case 2:16-cv-06295-GJP Document 1 Filed 12/05/16 Page 13 of 13

B. A permanent injunction which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its facility into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the ADA, and its implementing regulations, and which further directs that the Court shall retain jurisdiction for a period to be determined after Defendant certifies that its facility is fully in compliance with the relevant requirements of the ADA to ensure that Defendant has adopted and is following an institutional policy that will in fact cause Defendant to remain in compliance with the law;

C. An Order certifying the Class proposed by Plaintiff, and naming Plaintiff as the class representative and appointing her counsel as class counsel;

D. Payment of costs of suit;

E. Payment of reasonable attorneys' fees; and,

F. The provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and appropriate.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff Wells hereby requests a jury on all issues so triable.

Date: December 3, 2016

Respectfully submitted, KALIKHMAN & RAYZ, LLC

Arkady "Eric" Rayz Demetri A. Braynin 1051 County Line Road, Suite "A" Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006 Telephone: (215) 364-5030 Facsimile: (215) 364-5029 E-mail: erayz@kalraylaw.com E-mail: dbraynin@kalraylaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Pennsylvania Law Firm Files Two Class Actions Over ADA Compliance</u>