1	CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS Ray Ballister, Jr., Esq., SBN 111282		
2	Isabel Masanque, Esq., SBN 292673 Phyl Grace, Esq., SBN 171771		
3	Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082 <u>Mail</u> : PO Box 262490		
4	San Diego, CA 92196-2490		
5	<u>Delivery</u> : 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92131		
6	(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax phylg@potterhandy.com		
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8	-		
9			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	CENTRAL DISTRIC	Γ OF CALIFORNIA	
12	Luis Marquez;	Case No.	
13	Plaintiffs,	Complaint For Damages And	
14	V.	Complaint For Damages And Injunctive Relief For Violations Of: American's With Disabilities	
15		Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act	
16	Wolf Family Real Estate Partnership, a Corporation General		
17	Partnership; And Partne		
18	10,		
19	Defendants.		
20			
21	Plaintiff Luis Marquez complains of Defendants Wolf Family Rea		
22	Estate Partnership, a Corporation General Partnership; Bodega Latina		
23	Corporation, a Delaware Corporation; and Does 1-10 ("Defendants") and		
24	alleges as follows:		
25			
26	PARTIES:		
27	1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is a		
28	paraplegic who cannot walk and who uses a wheelchair for mobility.		

- 2. Defendant Wolf Family Real Estate Partnership owned the real property located at or about 14601 Lakewood Blvd., Paramount, California, in August 2017.
- 3. Defendant Wolf Family Real Estate Partnership owns the real property located at or about 14601 Lakewood Blvd., Paramount, California, currently.
- 4. Defendant Bodega Latina Corporation owned the El Super Market located at or about 14601 Lakewood Blvd., Paramount, California, in August 2017.
- 5. Defendant Bodega Latina Corporation owns the El Super Market ("Supermarket") located at or about 14601 Lakewood Blvd., Paramount, California, currently.
- 6. Plaintiffs do not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

JURISDICTION & VENUE:

- 7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.
- 8. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of

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

the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in this district and that Plaintiffs' cause of action arose in this district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

- 10. The Plaintiff went to the Supermarket in August 2017 to shop.
- 11. The Supermarket is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.
- 12. Ticket dispensers are one of the facilities, privileges, and advantages offered by Defendants to patrons of the Supermarket.
- 13. Unfortunately, there were ticket dispensers placed on the transaction counters in the meat and cheese departments for patrons to take a serving number that were too high.
- 14. The ticket dispensers were more than 48 inches above the finish floor and were not effectively used by wheelchair users. In fact, the ticket dispensers at the meat and cheese departments are 59 inches high.
- 15. Currently, there are ticket dispensers placed on the transaction counters of the meat and cheese departments for patrons to take a serving number.
- 16. Currently, the ticket dispensers are more than 48 inches above the finish floor and are not effectively used by wheelchair users.
- 17. Service counters are one of the facilities, privileges, and advantages offered by Defendants to patrons of the Supermarket.
- 18. The service counters were more than 36 inches in height. In fact, the meat and cheese counters are 55 inches high.
- 19. There were no lowered, 36-inch or lower portion of the service counters for a person with disabilities to use, to interact with store personnel, or to

receive his order.

- 20. Currently, the service counters are more than 36 inches in height.
- 21. Currently, there are no lowered, 36-inch or lower portion of the service counters for a person with disabilities to use, to interact with store personnel, or to receive his order.
 - 22. Plaintiffs personally encountered these barriers.
- 23. These inaccessible conditions denied the plaintiffs full and equal access and caused them difficulty and frustration.
- 24. Plaintiffs would like to return and patronize the Supermarket but will be deterred from visiting until the defendants cure the violations.
- 25. The violations identified above are easily removed without much difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact, are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of access if complete removal were not achievable.
- 26. A common barrier removal project is modifying service counters to make a portion of the counter accessible. This is a simple construction task, well within the capabilities of any general contractor. The task can be completed easily and for a modest price.
- 27. Ticket dispensers, meanwhile, could be lowered so that they are accessible to wheelchair users. This could be done at little cost.
- 28. Plaintiffs are and have been deterred from returning and patronizing the Supermarket because of his knowledge of the illegal barriers that exist. Plaintiffs will, nonetheless, return to the business to assess ongoing compliance with the ADA and will return to patronize the Supermarket as a customer once the barriers are removed.
 - 29. Given the obvious and blatant violation, the plaintiffs allege, on

information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiffs will amend the Complaint to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit once they conduct a site inspection. However, please be on notice that the plaintiffs seek to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See *Doran v. 7-11*, 506 F.3d 1191 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to her disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

30. Additionally, on information and belief, the plaintiff alleges that the failure to remove these barriers was intentional because: (1) these particular barriers are intuitive and obvious; (2) the defendants exercised control and dominion over the conditions at this location and, therefore, the lack of accessible facilities was not an "accident" because, had the defendants intended any other configuration, they had the means and ability to make the change.

I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of plaintiff and against all defendants (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

- 31. Plaintiffs replead and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 32. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:
 - a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,

- or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36, Appendix "D."
- c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).
- 33. In areas used for transactions that may not have a cash register but at which goods or services are sold or distributed, the business must provide either: (1) a portion of the main counter which is a minimum of 36 in inches length shall be provided with a maximum height of 36 inches; or (2) an auxiliary counter with a maximum height of 36 inches in close proximity to the main counter; or (3) some sort of qualifying equivalent facilitation. 1991 Standards § 7.2(2). Under the 2010 Standards, where the approach to the sales or service counter is a parallel approach, such as in this case, there must be a portion of the sales counter that is no higher than 36 inches above the floor and 36 inches in width and must extend the same depth as the rest of the sales or service counter top. 2010 Standards § 904.4 & 904.4.1.

,	_	
	•	

41. Because the defendants violated the plaintiffs' rights under the ADA,

they also violated the Unruh Civil Rights Act and are liable for damages. (Civ.

Code § 51(f), 52(a).)

26

27

1 42. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty, 2 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiffs, the defendants are also each 3 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-(c).) 4 5 6 PRAYER: 7 Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray that this court award damages and provide 8 relief as follows: 9 1. For injunctive relief, compelling defendants to comply with the 10 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the 11 Plaintiffs are not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all. 12 13 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act which damages provide for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000. 14 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, 15 16 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; Cal. Civ. Code § 52. 17 18 Dated: December 26, 2017 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS 19 By: ____label \$.1//~ 20 21 Isabel Masanque, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff 22 23 24 25 26 27 28