

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

25

26

28

1. This is an action for temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, as well as damages, based upon the ongoing violations by the defendants of the rights secured to plaintiffs by the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. This Court has

jurisdiction over plaintiffs' claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 (in that this action poses a federal question, as it arises under the Constitution of the United States); §1343(a)(3) (in that it is brought to redress deprivations, under color of state law, of rights, privileges and immunities secured by the United States Constitution); and under § 1343(a)(4) (in that it seeks to secure equitable relief under an Act of Congress providing for the protection of civil rights, specifically under 42 U.S.C. § 1983); and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201(a) and 2202. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

2. Venue is proper in the Central District of California under 28 U.S.C. 1391(b). Defendants are located in the Central District, and all of the acts and/or omissions which give rise to the claims herein occurred, or will occur, in this District.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 3. This case arises from the actions by the Los Angeles Police Department ("LAPD") against street performers on the sidewalks of Hollywood Boulevard. The plaintiffs and the individuals in the Hollywood Characters unincorporated association perform in public as superhero characters and iconic movie stars. They embody these characters to the public, impersonating their voices, mannerisms, and dialogue. Plaintiffs, including the Hollywood Characters, interact with members of the public, many of whom seek to have their photographs taken with the Hollywood Characters. Over the course of the past two months, the Los Angeles Police Department has initiated a campaign to arrest Plaintiffs on false charges of violating Los Angeles Municipal Code § 41.18(a) for "obstructing" a sidewalk. Each of the individual named plaintiffs was arrested, taken into custody, handcuffed, and transported to a police station. Plaintiffs Balke, Harrell and Tomey were required to post bail and appear on criminal charges, which were dropped on or about early July 2010.
- 4. On June 4, 2010, at approximately 7:30 p.m., Plaintiffs Balke, Beithan and Harrell were arrested as they stood together on the curb of the public sidewalk outside the Fashion 21 store in the 6800 block of Hollywood Boulevard, at the

- Hollywood and Highland complex. At the time, BALKE was wearing in costume and performing as the character Wolverine from the movie "X-Men." Plaintiff HARRELL was performing as The Joker from the movie, "The Black Knight," and plaintiff BEITHAN was performing as Cat Woman. Approximately one week earlier, on or around May 28, 2010, several characters on the Hollywood Boulevard were arrested, including an individual who wears a Bumblebee "Transformer" costume.
- 5. On June 2, 2010, plaintiff TOMEY was arrested when he was performing as Batman on Hollywood Boulevard in front of Madame Tussaud's at approximately 2:30 p.m. Approximately 15 minutes after he started performing, a patrol car arrived and two officers, believed to be Officers JORDAN and RUTKOWSKI, exited the vehicle and approached TOMEY. The officers grabbed him by the arm and led him to the patrol car, where he was ordered to put his hands on his head, then handcuffed and placed in the police vehicle. TOMEY was transported to Wilcox station, questioned, held for a day at two different facilities, then released without any charges filed.
- 6. The area where plaintiffs Balke, Beithan and Harrell were standing on the sidewalk on the evening of June 4th is very wide. Plaintiffs observed that members of the public were freely able to walk up and down the sidewalk in front of them. There was light pedestrian traffic and at some points while plaintiffs were standing on the curb, there were no pedestrians in the area. Occasionally, a few people would stop and take photographs of the group of characters. Plaintiffs did not engage the members of the public who had stopped on the sidewalk to take photos of the characters except to tell them it was fine to take the pictures. They did not solicit any tip, donation or other form of monetary or non-monetary payment.
- 7. After approximately 10 minutes, BALKE, BEITHAN and HARRELL were approached by several individuals wearing Los Angeles Police Department uniforms, badges and insignias. The officers appeared to be completing an arrest of an individual they had brought out of the Hollywood and Highland complex. This

- individual was in handcuffs and was being walked to the back of a patrol car. At about the same time, at least one additional patrol car arrived at the location.
- 8. The officers approached plaintiffs BALKE, BEITHAN and HARRELL. On information and belief, plaintiffs allege that Officer Chacon pointed his finger at Plaintiff Harrell and said words to the effect: "You are coming with us." Officer Chacon then pointed at BALKE and said "You need to leave." When Officer Chacon told BALKE to leave, BALKE asked what law he was breaking at the time. Officer Chacon did not respond to him verbally. Instead, he motioned with his hand and said "come on," which BALKE understood to mean, based on Chacon's words and his hand motion, as well, as his prior interaction with plaintiff HARRELL, that BALKE was being taken into custody by the officers and was no longer free to leave.
- 9. Immediately after arresting BALKE, Officer Chacon pointed to plaintiff BEITHAN and ordered her to leave. When BEITHAN refused to leave, she was arrested, as well. Officer Chacon grabbed plaintiff HARRELL, Officer Gonazalez grabbed BEITHAN by the arm, and a third officer grabbed BALKE by the arm and walked the trio west on Hollywood Boulevard to where two patrol cars were parked near the Grauman Theater box office.
- 10. When the three arrived at this location in front of the Grauman, each was handcuffed. Within about 5 minutes, a third patrol car arrived and BALKE, BEITHAN and HARRELL were each placed in a separate patrol car and transported to Wilcox police station. BALKE and HARRELL were handcuffed to a wooden bench until they were put through the booking process. After approximately 30 minutes, they were taken in to be photographed and fingerprinted. BALKE and HARRELL were held at the station for four hours and released around midnight after each posted cash bail of \$250.
- 11. Plaintiff BEITHAN was fingerprinted and held in a cell at Wilcox station, then transported to the women's jail at Van Nuys police station. At Van Nuys, she was fingerprinted again and held in a cell for approximately an hour, before

being released with two bus tokens to get home in the middle of the night.

- 12. Plaintiffs BALKE and HARRELL were required to retain a criminal defense lawyer to represent them. On July 2, 2010, criminal defense counsel for BALKE and HARRELL appeared at the Hollywood Criminal Court on a misdemeanor charge of violating Los Angeles Municipal Code §41.18(A), "blocking a sidewalk." All charges against them were rejected for filing.
- Boulevard for fear that they would be arrested again. They want to go back to this area because they want to perform as their characters. In addition, each of the plaintiffs has avoided walking in the area, even though they all live within a short distance of the Hollywood and Highland complex. They are concerned that if they are seen by police in the area, they will be arrested and charged with loitering or some other crime, even if they are not in costume and not performing. Their fear is based on the information and belief that one of the other Hollywood Characters was arrested for loitering shortly after they were arrested. At the time, this individual was not in costume. He was videotaping public events in the area when he was approached by the police, who told him they knew who he was even though he was not in costume.
- 14. Each of the acts complained of herein was taken, and each violation of plaintiffs' rights occurred, pursuant to the policies, practices, or customs of the LAPD.
- 15 In doing each of the constitutional violations complained of herein, defendants, their officials, agents, and employees were acting under color of law.
- 16. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and on such basis allege that at all times relevant to this action, each of the individual defendants, including DOES 1 through 10, were the agents, servants and/or employees of the defendant CITY, and were acting all times within the scope of their agency and employment and with the knowledge and consent of their principal and employer, the City of Los Angeles.
- 17. The acts of defendants were done with malice toward plaintiffs based on the fact that plaintiffs were engaged in exercising their First Amendment rights and

was done to deter or prevent plaintiffs from exercising such rights.

PARTIES

Plaintiffs:

- 18. HOLLYWOOD CHARACTERS is an unincorporated association of street performers and actors who engage in expressive activity on public sidewalks along Hollywood Boulevard. Members of the association embody the personas of fictional superheros and iconic movie stars. They perform on the sidewalk as they impersonate the characters, adopting their voices, appearances and speech.
- 19. Plaintiff MATTHIAS BALKE is a member of HOLLYWOOD CHARACTERS. He has performed on Hollywood Boulevard periodically as Wolverine for several years. He was detained, handcuffed and cited on June 4, 2010 for allegedly obstructing a public sidewalk. He was required to retain criminal defense counsel to represent him against the charges, which were rejected on July 2, 2010. He is concerned that he may be subjected to arrest again if he is present in the same area of Hollywood Boulevard, whether or not he is performing as Wolverine.
- 20. Plaintiff MELISSA BETHIAN is a member of HOLLYWOOD CHARACTERS. She has been performing on Hollywood Boulevard for less than a year. She was detained, handcuffed, transported and held at the Wilcox Station on June 4, 2010, then transported and held at the Van Nuys Station until finally being released in the middle of the night, with two bus tokens but without charges filed. The purported basis of her arrest was that she was obstructing a public sidewalk. She is concerned that she may be subjected to arrest again if she is present in the same area of Hollywood Boulevard, whether or not she is performing as Cat Woman.
- 21. Plaintiff PAUL HARRELL is a member of HOLLYWOOD CHARACTERS. He has been performed on Hollywood Boulevard as The Joker for several years. He was detained, handcuffed and cited on June 4, 2010 for allegedly obstructing a public sidewalk. He was required to retain criminal defense counsel to represent him against the charges, which were rejected on July 2, 2010. He is

concerned that he may be subjected to arrest again if he is present in the same area of Hollywood Boulevard, whether or not he is performing in his persona as Wolverine.

22. Plaintiff TERRELL "TONY" TOMEY is a member of HOLLYWOOD CHARACTERS. He has been performed on Hollywood Boulevard periodically as Wolverine for several years. He was detained, handcuffed and arrested on June 2, 2010 for allegedly obstructing a public sidewalk. He was held in custody for more than a day before being released without charges filed. He is concerned that he may be subjected to arrest again if he is present in the same area of Hollywood Boulevard, whether or not he is performing in his persona as Wolverine.

Defendants:

- 23. Defendant CITY OF LOS ANGELES (hereinafter "CITY") is a municipal entity, organized as a Charter City under the laws of the State of California, with the capacity to sue and be sued. The CITY is the legal and political governmental entity responsible for the actions of the Los Angeles Police Department, its officials, agents, and employees. The CITY is sued in its own right, and on the basis of the acts of its officials, agents, and employees.
- 24. Officer CHACON (Badge # 36929) is an employee of the Defendant CITY and the LAPD. He was one of the officers responsible for the arrest of the plaintiffs. He is sued in his official and individual capacity.
- 25. Officer MACHADO (Badge # 37048) is an employee of the Defendant CITY and the LAPD. He was one of the officers responsible for the arrest of the plaintiffs. He is sued in his official and individual capacity.
- 26. Officer GONZALES (Badge # 37578) is an employee of the Defendant CITY and the LAPD. He was one of the officers responsible for the arrest of the plaintiffs. He is sued in his official and individual capacity.
- 27. Officer JORDAN (Badge # 32285) is an employee of the Defendant CITY and the LAPD. He was one of the officers responsible for the arrest of the plaintiffs. He is sued in his official and individual capacity.

5 6

8 9

7

11 12

10

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

- Officer RUTKOWSKI (Badge # 40290) is an employee of the Defendant 28. CITY and the LAPD. He was one of the officers responsible for the arrest of the plaintiffs. He is sued in his official and individual capacity...
- Defendants DOE 1-10 are officers with the LAPD, who were involved in the detention and/or arrest of plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sue these defendants by such fictitious names. DOES 1-10 are sued on the basis that one or more of the DOE defendants directed, participated in and/or failed to prevent the detention and arrest of plaintiffs while plaintiffs were engaged in lawful First Amendment activity, and that one or more of the DOE defendants used force to detain, handcuff and arrest the plaintiffs without probable cause. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of each of the DOE defendants as such information is ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that defendants DOES 1-10 are responsible in some manner for the damages and injuries the plaintiffs suffered.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Violation of the Right of Free Speech

- Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations 30. contained previously and subsequently in this Complaint.
- The conduct of the defendants violates, and was taken in retaliation for, 31. plaintiffs exercise of their First Amendment rights to be present and perform on public sidewalks and other public fora. Defendants have no time, place or manner regulations restricting Defendants' expressive activities in this area or, for that matter, on any public sidewalk in the City. The arrest of plaintiffs, including members of the HOLLYWOOD CHARACTERS, violates the First Amendment rights of the plaintiffs.
 - As a direct result of defendants' unlawful conduct, plaintiffs have 32.

suffered violations of their First Amendment rights. Plaintiffs have fear and apprehension that they will continue to be subject to defendants' unlawful efforts to intimidate plaintiffs from engaging in First Amendment protected activity in the public fora which are the sidewalks along Hollywood Boulevard.

33. As a direct and proximate consequence of defendants' unlawful actions, plaintiffs have suffered damages, including loss of their constitutional rights, pain and suffering, humiliation and embarrassment. Plaintiffs are entitled to compensatory damages and punitive damages against the individual defendants as permitted by law.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOURTH AMENDMENT AND 42 U.S.C. § 1983; CALIF. CONSTITUTION, ART. I, sec. 13 Violation of the Right to Be Free from Unreasonable Seizure

- 34. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained previously and subsequently in this Complaint.
- 35. The acts by defendants described above constitute violations of plaintiffs' right to be free from an unreasonable seizure as guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Defendants seized and handcuffed the individual plaintiffs for purported violations of LAMC § 41.18(a), despite the fact that plaintiffs were not blocking the sidewalk and that, in fact, if anyone was blocking the sidewalks, it was the tourists who gathered to take plaintiffs' photographs.
- 36. As a direct result of defendants' unlawful conduct, plaintiffs have suffered violations of their Fourth Amendment rights. Plaintiffs have fear and apprehension that they will continue to be subject to violations of their Fourth Amendment rights as a result of defendants' unlawful efforts to deter and prevent plaintiffs from engaging in First Amendment protected activity by performing on Hollywood Boulevard. Plaintiffs are entitled to compensatory damages and punitive damages against the individual defendants, as permitted by law.
- 37. As a direct and proximate consequence of defendants' unlawful actions, plaintiffs have suffered damages, including loss of their constitutional rights, pain and

suffering, humiliation and embarrassment.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION INJUNCTIVE RELIEF (By All Plaintiffs Against Defendant City)

- 38. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained previously and subsequently in this Complaint.
- 39. Defendants have engaged in a course of unlawful conduct aimed at deterring and preventing plaintiffs from exercising their First Amendment rights as street performers on Hollywood Boulevard. As part of that unlawful course of conduct, defendants have ordered plaintiffs to leave the area, threatened them with arrest, and arrested plaintiffs when they have asserted their protected First Amendment rights.
- 40. Plaintiffs want to continue performing on Hollywood Boulevard in the immediate future, but are fearful they will suffer repeated violations of their rights due to defendants' policies, practices or customs when they are in the area. Plaintiffs also live in this area and they are forced to change the places where they shop and socialize in order to avoid the area of their arrests and avoid possible future arrests.
- 41. Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable harm and, absent extraordinary relief from this Court, will continue to suffer irreparable harm by being subjected to unwarranted and unlawful violations of their First and Fourth Amendment rights. Damages will not be an adequate remedy at law because damages cannot adequately compensate plaintiffs for the loss of their fundamental constitutional rights. An actual controversy has now arisen and exists between plaintiffs and defendants regarding the challenged policies, practices or customs implemented and engaged in by defendants with respect to plaintiffs' expressive activity as street performers on Hollywood Boulevard. Plaintiffs contend that defendants are engaging in unconstitutional conduct in violation of the First and Fourth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, in an apparent effort to harass and intimidate them and drive them away from the public fora of Hollywood Boulevard.

- 42. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege that defendants dispute these contentions and contend otherwise.
- 43. Plaintiffs desire and request a judicial determination of their constitutional rights and the constitutional limitations of conduct by defendants, and specifically that plaintiffs' contentions regarding the First Amended protected nature of their activity, as set forth above, are correct.
- 44. This declaration is necessary and appropriate at the present time in order to set at rest the constitutional rights and obligations of the parties.

FOURTH CASE OF ACTION THREATS, INTIMIDATION OR COERCION (California Civil Code Section 52.1)

- 45. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained previously and subsequently in this Complaint.
- 46. The Defendants by their conduct interfered by threats, intimidation, or coercion, or attempted to interfere by threats, intimidation, or coercion, with the exercise or enjoyment of Plaintiffs rights as secured by the First and Fourth and Amendments to the United States Constitution and of the rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the state of California, including but not limited to California Constitution Art. I, sec. 2 and 13 and California Civil Code §51.7.
- 47. There was no lawful justification for defendants to threaten, intimidate or coerce any of the plaintiffs, or to attempt to use threats, intimidation or coercion to interfere with Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights. Defendants' actions were taken with malice and oppression to deter and/or prevent plaintiffs' from exercising their protected First Amendment rights and in retaliation for the exercise of those rights.
- 48. As a direct and proximate consequence of defendants' actions, plaintiffs suffered, and continue to suffer pain and suffering, humiliation and embarrassment and are entitled to injunctive relief and compensatory damages for injury to their person, and punitive damages against the individual defendants as permitted by law.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION FREEDOM FROM VIOLENCE OR INTIMIDATION (California Civil Code Section 51.7)

- 49. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained previously and subsequently in this Complaint.
- 50. Plaintiffs have a right to be free from violence or intimidation in the exercise of their protected rights. Defendants' actions violated plaintiffs' rights to be free from violence, or intimidation by threat of violence, committed against their person because of their exercise of their First Amendment rights to perform in public fora and their association with others who do so.
- 51. Defendants' unlawful actions were done willfully, maliciously, and with the specific intent to touch Plaintiffs without consent and cause them harm.
- 52. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' actions, plaintiffs suffered, and continue to suffer, pain and suffering, humiliation and embarrassment and are entitled to compensatory damages for injury to their person, as well as exemplary damages against the individual defendants as permitted by law.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION FALSE IMPRISONMENT/FALSE ARREST

- 53. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained previously and subsequently in this Complaint.
- 54. Defendants arrested the individual Plaintiffs without probable cause or lawful justification. Plaintiffs were confined by defendants against their will.
- 55. As a direct and proximate consequence of defendants' actions, plaintiffs suffered, and/or continue to suffer, pain and suffering, humiliation and embarrassment and, therefore, are entitled to compensatory damages for injury to their person, as well as punitive damages against the individual defendants as permitted by law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows:

1. A temporary restraining order, enjoining defendants their officers, agents

1	and employees from interfering with plaintiffs' constitutionally protected rights under
2	the First and Fourth Amendments;
3	2. A preliminary and permanent injunction, enjoining defendants, their
4	officers, agents and employees from interfering with plaintiffs' constitutionally
5	protected rights under the First and Fourth Amendments;
6	3. For a declaration that defendants' past, present and threatened future
7	actions violate Plaintiffs' rights to speech, assembly and association under the First
8	Amendment and to be free from unreasonable seizure under the Fourth Amendment.
9	4. For costs of suit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920. 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and
10	California Civil Code §§ 52.1(h) and 1021.5;
11	5. For attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988, California Civil Code
12	§§ 1021.5 and 52.1(h); and
13	6. For other such relief as this Court deems just and proper.
14	
15	DATED: August 6, 2010 Respectfully submitted,
16	LAW OFFICE OF CAROL A. SOBEL LAW OFFICE OF REBECCA F. THORNTON
17	Carol a Sobel
18	By: CAROL A SOBEL Attorneys for Plaintiffs
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	\cdot

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial in this matter. Respectfully submitted, LAW OFFICE OF CAROL A. SOBEL LAW OFFICE OF REBECCA F. THORNTON August 6, 2010 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

	DP-CW Document 1	Filed 08/06/10 Pag	e 15 of 18 Pa	ge ID #:15
Name & Address: Carol A. Sobel SBN 84483	,			
Law Office of Carol A. Sob				
429 Santa Monica Boulevar	d, Ste. 550			
Santa Monica, CA 90401	2.50			
t. 310 393-3055 f. 310 393	-3605			
-	UNITED STATES I CENTRAL DISTRIC		\	
OLLYWOOD CHARACTERS, a sociation, MATTHIAS BALKE, EITHAN, PAUL HARRELL, TE	MELISSA	CASE NUMBER		
OMEY,	PLAINTIFF(S)	CV10	5848	DDP (CV
V. TY OF LOS ANGELES, a munic	ipal entity, OFFICER			
EACON (Bodon #36026) OFFICE	P GONZALES (Radge			
7578), OFFICER MACHADO (F FICER JORDAN (Badge # 3228 adge # 40290) and DOES 1- 10, a	5), OFFICER RUTKOWSKI		SUMMONS	
adge # 40290) and DOES 1- 10, a	ll in 10, all in their official		SOMMONS	•
l individual capacities,	DEFENDANT(S).			
	• ,			
TO: DEFENDANT(S): C	ITY OF LOS ANGELES at	d LAPD OFFICERS	CHACON, GON	IZALES,
MACHADO, JORD	AN, RUTKOWSKI			
A lawsuit has been fil	led against you			* ,
11 lawsait has been in	iod against you.			
Within 21 days a	after service of this summon	s on you (not counting	g the day you rec	eived it), you
must serve on the plaintiff an	answer to the attached 🗹 c	omplaint 🗆	amended	complaint
☐ counterclaim ☐ cross-claim		· ·		
or motion must be served on	the plaintiff's attorney, <u>CA</u>	ROL A. SOBEL		whose address is
429 SANTA MONICA BLV judgment by default will be e	ntered against tray for the	oliof domanded in the	. II	you fall to do so,
your answer or motion with t		ener demanded in the	compianit, 10u	also must me
your answer or mount with t	no vouit.			
		Clerk, U.S. Distric	et Court	
		CHE	RISTOPHER POW	FD¢
Dated: AUGUST 6, 2010)	Ву:		LII.O
		Dep	uty Clerk	
		(Seal c	of the Court SFA	
		(Duas C	of the Court) SEA	
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	United States or a United States	agency, or is an officer or	employee of the Un	ited States. Allowed
CV-01A (12/07)	SUMM	ONS		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

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 Dean D. Pregerson and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Carla Woehrle.

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

CV10- 5848 DDP (CWx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central

	vistrict of California, the Mag notions.	gistra	te Judge has been designated	to he	ar discovery related
A	Il discovery related motions	shou	ald be noticed on the calendar	of the	e Magistrate Judge
	= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =		NOTICE TO COUNSEL		
	py of this notice must be served v a copy of this notice must be ser		e summons and complaint on all det n all plaintiffs).	endar	its (if a removal action is
Subs	sequent documents must be filed	at the	following location:		
[X]	Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012		Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516		Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501
Failu	re to file at the proper location will resu	ult in yo	our documents being returned to you.		

Case 2:10-cv-05848-DDP-CW Document 1 Filed 08/06/10 Page 17 of 18 Page ID #:17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

Oh Automeys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing yournelf, provide Sense.) Law Office of Carol A. Sobel STN 54483 T. 310 393-3055 Law Office of Carol A. Sobel 579 Sensit Ministers Birds, Res. 509, Sura Monies, CA 50-601 Los Angeles City Hall East Los Angeles, CA 50012 Little Basis Control Personal Perso	I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are Hollywood Characters, Matthias Ba "Tony" Tomey	1 ~	DEFENDANTS City of Los Angeles, Officer Jordan, Office		n, Officer Gonzales	, Officer Machad	o,	
Characteristic Char	yourself, provide same.) Carol A. Sobel SBN 84483 T. 3 Law Office of Carol A. Sobel 429 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 550, S.		Carmen J. Trutanich Los Angeles City Atto City Hall East Los Angeles, CA 900	12	or Diversity Cases (Only		
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 1 3 F	(Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.) PTF DEF Citizen of This State DI 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State			incipal Place { State]4 □4		
Total Proceeding Proceeding Removed from Appellate Court A Reinstated or Appellate Court	o	of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Subjec	at of a Foreign Country	□3 □3]6 ∐6
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) Sec. 1983:First and Fourth Amendment for arrests of street performers on Hollywood Boulevard VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.) GIFFERSONAL INJURY GOSTIFIC STATUTES GONTRACE 10 In Insurance 110 Insurance 1110 Insurance 1110 Insurance 1120 Marine 1131 Miller Act 1130 Miller Act 1131 Marine 1131 Marine 1132 Airplance 1132 Airplance 1135 Marine Product 1135 Marine 1135 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) 1130 Marine 1130 Miller Act 1130 Miller Act 1130 Miller Act 1131 Miller Act 1131 Miller Act 1131 Miller Act 1132 Miller Act 1134 Marine 1135 Miller Act 1134 Marine 1135 Miller Act 1136 Miller Act 1131 Miller Act 1131 Miller Act 1132 Miller Act 1134 Miller Act 1135 Miller Act 1135 Miller Act 1135 Miller Act 1136 Miller Act 1137 Miller Act 1137 Miller Act 1138 Miller Act 1136 Miller Act 1137 Mi	Original 2 Removed from 3 Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from another district (specify): 6 Multi-District Under from Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify): 6 Multi-District Under from							
Sec. 1983:First and Fourth Amendment for arrests of street performers on Hollywood Boulevard VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)	CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23:	Yes I No	M M	IONEY DEMANDED	IN COMPLA	INT: \$ TBD		
OTHER STATUTES	Sec. 1983:First and Fourth Amendme	ent for arrests of street perform			use. Do not ci	te jurisdictional sta	tutes unless diver	sity.)
400 State Reapportionment	VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in	one box only.)				- Barrier Control Control Control Control	Switch Company of the	iza sa manna sumu
1430 Banks and Banking	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 110 In	nsurance PE	RSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL		PETITIONS	□ 710 Fair Lab	(1996年)1997年(1995年)
	Rates/etc.	Recovery of Determinent & Groternayment & Groternayment & Groternayment & Groternayment & Groternayment of Ceterna's Benefits Rockholders' Suits Other Contract Contract Product Grand Condemnation Orectosure & Ejectment Grots to Land Groternayment of Ceterna's Contract Product Grand Condemnation Orectosure & Ejectment Grotes to Land Groternayment of Ceternayment Grotes & Ejectment Grotes to Land Groternayment Grotes & Ejectment	Assault, Libel & Slander Fed, Employers' Liability Marine Marine Product Liability Motor Vehicle Motor Vehicle Motor Vehicle Product Liability Other Personal Injury Med Malpractice Personal Injury-Product Liability Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability MMIGRATION Naturalization Application Habeas Corpus- Alien Detainee	□ 380 Other Perso Property Da Product Lia BANKRUPTC □ 422 Appeal 28 I 158 □ 423 Withdrawal USC 157 □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employmer □ 443 Housing/Ad mmodation □ 444 Welfare □ 445 American v Disabilities Employmer □ 446 American v Disabilities Other ■ 440 Other Civil Rights	nal	General Death Penalty Mandamus/ Other Civil Rights Prison Condition DEFETURE/ PENALTY Agriculture Other Food & Drug Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck Airline Regs Occupational Safety /Health	□ 730 Labor/M Reportin Disclosu □ 740 Railway □ 790 Other La Litigatio □ 791 Empl. Re Security □ ROPPERTY □ 820 Copyrig □ 830 Patent □ 840 Tradema SOCIAL SE □ 861 HIA (13 □ 862 Black Le □ 863 DIWC/I (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Ti □ 865 RSI (40 □ 867 Taxes (1) □ 870 Taxes (1) □ 871 IRS-Thi	gmt. g & re Act Labor Act bor n et. Inc. Act RIGHTS hts rk CURITY 95ff) nng (923) DIWW ttle XVI 5(g)) AXSUITS J.S. Plaint hadant) rd Party 2
and colo					9254 S ²⁰ 5			

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

Case 2:10-cy-05848-DDP-CW Document 1 Filed 08/06/10 Page 18 of 18 Page ID #:18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Page ID #:18 CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has If yes, list case number(s):	s this action been pr	reviously filed in this court ar	and dismissed, remanded or closed? No Yes			
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s):	e any cases been pre	eviously filed in this court that	at are related to the present case? MNo □ Yes			
□B. □c.:	Arise from the sam Call for determinati For other reasons w	e or closely related transactio ion of the same or substantial rould entail substantial duplic	ons, happenings, or events; or all yellow and fact; or cation of labor if heard by different judges; or t, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.			
IX. VENUE: (When completing the (a) List the County in this District;			if necessary.) if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides.			
	s agencies or emplo	oyees is a named plaintiff. If	f this box is checked, go to item (b). California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
County in this District.* Los Angeles	······································	·	Camorina County outside of this bisuict, State, it outer than Camorina, or 1 oregan Country			
			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).			
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Los Angeles						
(c) List the County in this District; Note: In land condemnation ca			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.			
County in this District:*		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Los Angeles						
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us			San Luis Obispo Counties			
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER):	Carol a.	Sobel Date August 6, 2010			
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The or other papers as required by law	e CV-71 (JS-44) C v. This form, appro	ivil Cover Sheet and the infor ved by the Judicial Conference	ormation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings are of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed atting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)			
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	cial Security Cases	:				
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement o	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	All claims for supplement Act, as amended.	ntal security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security			
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))				

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2