

PERRY, JOHNSON, ANDERSON,
MILLER & MOSKOWITZ LLP

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Traci Carrillo, Bar No. 211596
Nicole M. Jaffee, Bar No. 255944
PERRY, JOHNSON, ANDERSON,
MILLER & MOSKOWITZ, LLP
438 1st Street, 4th Floor
Santa Rosa, California 95401
Telephone: (707) 525-8800
Facsimile: (707) 545-8242
E-mail: Carrillo@perrylaw.net
Jaffee@perrylaw.net

Attorneys for Plaintiffs JANE DOE #1,
JANE DOE #2, JANE DOE #3, JANE DOE
#4, JANE DOE #5, JANE DOE #6, JANE
DOE #7 and JANE ROES 8-100

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Sonoma
4/4/2022 1:26 PM

Arlene D. Junior, Clerk of the Court
By: Janie Dorman, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SONOMA

JANE DOE #1, JANE DOE #2, JANE
DOE #3, JANE DOE #4, JANE DOE #5,
JANE DOE #6, JANE DOE #7 and JANE
ROES 8-100, inclusive
Plaintiffs,

v.

DOMINIC FOPPOLI, TWO KINGS
WINE COMPANY, LLP dba
CHRISTOPHER CREEK WINERY,
SANTA ROSA ACTIVE 20-30 #50
FOUNDATION, ACTIVE 20-30 US &
CANADA and MOES 1-50, INCLUSIVE,
Defendants.

Case No. **SCV-270527**

[Unlimited Civil]

COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. Sexual Assault and Battery;**
- 2. Violation of Bane Civil Rights Act;**
- 3. Violation of Ralph Act;**
- 4. Unfair Competition;**
- 5. Negligence;**
- 6. Negligence;**
- 7. Gender Violence;**
- 8. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress;**
- 9. Domestic Violence;**
- 10. Defamation;**
- 11. Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage;**
- 12. Negligent Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage**

1 Plaintiffs Jane Doe #1, Jane Doe #2, Jane Doe #3, Jane Doe #4, Jane Doe #5, Jane Doe
2 #6 and Jane Doe #7 and Jane Roes #8-100 (hereinafter, collectively “Plaintiffs”), by and
3 through their undersigned counsel, complain as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. Defendant Domonic Foppoli is a politician and former mayor of Windsor,
6 California. He is, and at all relevant times was, an owner of the popular and well-known
7 Christopher Creek Winery. He is also a sexual predator who continuously used his power,
8 connections and alcohol to prey upon dozens of women in Sonoma County. Because of his
9 power, connections, and various other actions he or his agents took on his behalf, he was able
10 to keep the individual survivors silent. They were each scared that if they complained about
11 Defendant Foppoli, he would ruin their careers, their businesses, their families and their
12 reputations. Ultimately after survivors started to come forward, he and his agents did
13 everything in their power to try to do just that: ruin their careers, businesses, families, and their
14 reputations. In some cases, Defendant and his agents were successful.

15 **THE PARTIES**

16 2. Plaintiffs are victims of sexual assault committed by Defendant Dominic
17 Foppoli (hereafter “Defendant Foppoli”) or attempted to be committed by Defendant Foppoli
18 under the provisions of Penal Code sections 243.4 or 261, 264.1, 273.5, 286, 287 or 289.

19 3. These assaults or attempted assaults of Plaintiffs by Defendant Foppoli
20 occurred on or after Plaintiffs’ eighteenth birthdays. Plaintiffs have causes of action for
21 compensatory damages arising from the sexual assaults committed by Defendant Foppoli or
22 attempted to be committed by Defendant Foppoli as set forth in Code of Civil Procedure
23 section 340.16.

24 4. Defendant Foppoli is, and at all relevant times was, a resident of, and conducted
25 business in, Sonoma County, California.

26 5. Defendant Foppoli is, and at all relevant times was, an agent, employee and/or
27 an officer of Defendant Two Kings Wine Company, LLC dba Christopher Creek Winery
28 (“Defendant Winery”), and conducted business in the County of Sonoma, California.

1 transact business in the County of Sonoma and the injuries alleged herein occurred in said
2 county.

3 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 **Jane Doe #1**

5 13. Beginning in approximately 2001, plaintiff Jane Doe #1, then 19 years of age,
6 started a relationship with Defendant Foppoli. During that time, Defendant Foppoli raped her
7 dozens of times including forcing her to engage in oral copulation. On at least one occasion,
8 Defendant Foppoli handcuffed Jane Doe #1's hands and wrists to a bed without her consent
9 and then inserted grapes into her vagina as she struggled, cried and begged him to stop.
10 Afterwards, she bled from her ankles.

11 14. Defendant Foppoli told Jane Doe #1 that because they were in a relationship,
12 the forced intercourse, oral copulation, and insertions of foreign objects into her vagina was
13 simply sexual contact. Given her impressionable age, Jane Doe #1 believed him and did not
14 know it was rape.

15 15. Defendant Foppoli deliberately lied to Jane Doe #1 about raping her to conceal
16 his illegal activities, falsely stating that the rape was simply sexual contact. In this way,
17 Defendant Foppoli purposefully misled Jane Doe #1 so that she did not think that his actions
18 constituted rape. Because of Defendant Foppoli's misrepresentations to Jane Doe #1,
19 Defendant Foppoli induced Jane Doe #1 into believing that consent could be implied because
20 of their ongoing romantic relationship.

21 16. After reading an article of an investigation into Defendant Foppoli by the San
22 Francisco Chronicle in 2021, Jane Doe #1 came forward and reported the conduct to law
23 enforcement. It was not until her conversations with law enforcement in 2021 that Jane Doe
24 #1 learned and appreciated, for the first time, that regardless of relationship status, Defendant
25 Dominic Foppoli had raped her.

26 17. Because Defendant Foppoli told Jane Doe #1 that her consent was implied, Jane
27 Doe #1 had no reason to suspect that Defendant Foppoli had raped her. Jane Doe #1 did not
28 discover that Defendant Foppoli's actions were, in fact, rape until 2021.

1 **Jane Doe #2**

2 18. In 2003, Jane Doe #2 met Defendant Foppoli one month after her eighteenth
3 birthday after she started working as his assistant on his political campaign. Eventually, they
4 became romantically involved.

5 19. Almost immediately, Defendant Foppoli ignored her boundaries. Despite
6 telling him at least two times she was waiting for marriage to have sex because of her Catholic
7 faith, Defendant Foppoli disregarded her wishes.

8 20. Between the end of November and mid December 2003, Defendant Foppoli
9 removed her clothes and touched her breasts and genitals, even as she told him to stop.

10 21. On one occasion in his bedroom, Defendant Foppoli digitally penetrated Jane
11 Doe #2 without her permission and after she told him to stop.

12 22. By the end of December 2003, Jane Doe #2 broke up with Defendant Foppoli
13 and he asked her to think more about it.

14 23. On December 31, 2003, Defendant Foppoli begged her to go on one last date
15 for New Years with him, and she agreed. On that occasion, Defendant Foppoli pressured Jane
16 Doe #2 to drink alcohol while she was under the legal drinking age. She had never had
17 alcohol before. Jane Doe #2 had almost no food in her system at the time and became
18 extremely intoxicated. This altered state rendered her unable to consent.

19 24. While she was in this altered state, Defendant Foppoli led her into a dark room
20 where he shut the door. He began removing her clothes as she begged him to stop. She
21 clutched her skirt as she struggled to keep her clothes on, while telling him no. However,
22 Defendant Foppoli did not stop. Instead, he raped her.

23 25. Immediately afterwards, she threw up over the side of the bed and then lost
24 consciousness.

25 26. When Jane Doe #2 regained consciousness, she felt pressure on her vagina and
26 pelvis. At that time, she realized Defendant Foppoli was in the process of raping her again.

27 27. She felt sick mentally, emotionally, physically and spiritually. She was
28 shocked, violated, and extremely confused. She also blamed herself for many years later, not

1 appreciating the depth of what he had done to her.

2 28. Since Jane Doe #2 was romantically involved with Defendant Foppoli, Jane
3 Doe #2, at an impressionable age, did not understand that she had been raped. When she
4 discussed the rape with him, Defendant Foppoli said it was not a big deal because they had
5 been drinking. It was not until much later in life that Jane Doe #2 realized that regardless of
6 relationship status or alcohol consumption, Defendant Foppoli had raped her.

7 29. Because Jane Doe #2 was in a relationship with Defendant Foppoli at the time
8 of the assaults and things he said to her, Jane Doe #2 did not initially believe that Defendant
9 Foppoli had raped her. Nor did she understand this was “domestic violence”. Jane Doe #2 did
10 not discover or fully appreciate that Defendant Foppoli’s actions were, in fact, rape until much
11 later in life.

12 **Jane Doe #3**

13 30. In or around 2006, Jane Doe #3 was 21 years old. She met Defendant Foppoli
14 at a dance class offered at the local Junior College. They became friends and spent time
15 together with other classmates on Sunday evenings at a salsa club in the East Bay.

16 31. One evening, Jane Doe #3 and Defendant Foppoli, along with their group of
17 friends went out dancing and drinking at a local club. At the end of the evening, they divided
18 into taxis. Jane Doe #3 ended up in the same taxi as Defendant Foppoli. She expected to be
19 dropped off first given the locations of their homes.

20 32. When the taxi stopped, she jumped out believing she was home. However,
21 Defendant Foppoli also got out of the taxi. Jane Doe #3 realized they were not at her house,
22 and Defendant Foppoli offered her to stay at his home and be driven home the next day. At
23 that point, Jane Doe #3 was very intoxicated.

24 33. Defendant Foppoli told Jane Doe #3 that she could sleep in his bed and he
25 would sleep on the couch. However, after she was in the bed, he did not go sleep on the couch
26 as he said he would. Instead, he climbed into the bed as well. She moved to the edge of the
27 bed, against a wall, to get away from him. However, Defendant Foppoli slid over and trapped
28 her between his body and the wall. He then thrust his groin against her buttocks and tried to

1 kiss her. She told him to stop. He did not stop. She pressed her ear to her shoulder to block
2 his mouth from kissing her further and told him, “NO”.

3 34. However, Defendant Foppoli did not stop assaulting her. Instead, he wrapped
4 his arm around her waist and slid his finger down the front of her pants and tried to remove
5 them. At that point, Jane Doe #3 had to wrestle away from him and then ran into the bathroom
6 where she locked herself in.

7 35. She remained locked in the bathroom out of fear and refused to open the door
8 despite Defendant Foppoli knocking on the door and apologizing.

9 36. Jane Doe #3 escaped a few hours later when she was able to reach a friend to
10 pick her up. She ran out of Defendant’s house without stopping and waited down the street for
11 her friend to pick her up.

12 37. Jane Doe #3 did not consent to Defendant Foppoli’s actions. Despite
13 repeatedly telling him no and to stop, Defendant Foppoli continued to sexually assault her.

14 38. Jane Doe #3 felt violated, scared and extremely disturbed by what had
15 happened. She was also very confused by Defendant Foppoli’s actions as she had considered
16 him a friend. She continued to feel anxiety and a range of emotions for many years after.

17 **Jane Doe #4**

18 39. Jane Doe #4 knew Defendant Foppoli through Active 20-30, where they were
19 both members. They became acquaintances through this organization and attended various
20 events related to this organization.

21 40. In June of 2012, they attended the Active 20-30’s national convention in Reno,
22 Nevada.

23 41. Defendant Foppoli approached Jane Doe #4 at the event and soon after they
24 started talking, Jane Doe #4 began feeling dizzy, could not focus, and was swaying. It was
25 clear that she was intoxicated. Jane Doe #4’s friend asked Defendant Foppoli to take Jane Doe
26 #4 back to her hotel room. When they arrived at the hotel room door, Jane Doe #4 realized
27 that he had taken her to the incorrect room. He then invited her in for a glass of wine from
28 “his winery”.

1 42. Inside his hotel room, Defendant Foppoli provided her with something to drink
2 from an unmarked bottle. Jane Doe #4 is informed and believes that Defendant Foppoli put a
3 “drugging” substance in her drink. Upon drinking the alcohol, she immediately felt symptoms
4 consistent with being “drugged” such as an altered state not consistent with simply drinking
5 alcohol. This altered state rendered her unable to consent.

6 43. Jane Doe #4 was incapacitated and woozy. She suddenly came aware that she
7 was topless and on her knees in the bathroom of the hotel room. She did not know how she
8 got there. In that position, Defendant Foppoli was standing over her forcing her to perform
9 oral copulation on him.

10 44. Jane Doe #4 did not consent and was unable to give Defendant Foppoli consent
11 due to being incapacitated and intoxicated.

12 45. Jane Doe #4 lodged various complaints about Defendant Foppoli’s actions to
13 various leaders within Defendants 20-30 Club. Although she did not appreciate that
14 Defendant Foppoli’s conduct was legally rape, she knew it was unwanted contact and reported
15 it to Defendants 20-30 Club. She believed Defendants 20-30 Club had fully investigated her
16 complaints. It was not until 2021 that she learned Defendants 20-30 Club had failed to
17 investigate her complaints.

18 46. It was also not until 2021, when Jane Doe #4 spoke with newspaper reporters,
19 that she learned, for the first time, that oral copulation without consent was rape.

20 47. Defendant Foppoli’s rape of Jane Doe #4 caused her to feel extremely violated,
21 distressed and confused.

22 48. Jane Doe #4 never gave consent for Defendant Foppoli’s actions and Jane Doe
23 #4 was unable to give her consent because she was intoxicated and unconscious.

24 49. Jane Doe #4 relied on 20-30 officials to fully investigate and take action against
25 Defendant Foppoli. She not only learned 20-30 officials had not investigated or taken action
26 against Defendant Foppoli, she learned other women were sexually assaulted by Foppoli as
27 well.
28

1 **Jane Doe #5**

2 50. In or around the summer of 2016, Defendant Foppoli invited Jane Doe #5 and
3 her friend to a party at the Winery, where active 20-30 members were also present. Defendant
4 Foppoli invited the women into the wine cellar for a wine tasting. He then continued to
5 provide Jane Doe #5 additional alcohol while inviting her and her friend into the hot tub with
6 him and another 20-30 member. He continued to fill her and her friend's glasses with alcohol.
7 He ensured they were drinking alcohol to the point of intoxication. As they continued to sip
8 wine, Defendant Foppoli suddenly reached over, ripped off her bikini top and threw it over the
9 edge of the hot tub. He then grabbed her by her waist and tried to pull her onto his lap. Jane
10 Doe #5 was stunned and scared by Defendant's sudden aggression and moved across the hot
11 tub to escape his unwanted advances.

12 51. Jane Doe #5 never gave consent for Defendant Foppoli's actions and Jane Doe
13 #5 was unable to give her consent because she was intoxicated.

14 52. Jane Doe #5 was distraught following this incident and felt very violated by his
15 aggression and unwanted sexual advance. As a result of this incident, she decided to not join
16 Active 20-30 or continue to socialize with its members.

17 **Jane Doe #6**

18 53. In or around 2019, Jane Doe #6 met Defendant Foppoli through professional
19 acquaintances in the wine industry. She was invited to Christopher Creek Winery during the
20 harvest season where she was introduced to Defendant Foppoli as "the Mayor" (of Windsor).

21 54. Throughout the evening, Jane Doe #6 was drinking wine. At one point during
22 the evening, Defendant Foppoli stood up and told all the girls to "go to the barrel room."

23 55. When Jane Doe #6 joined the others in the barrel room, Defendant Foppoli
24 provided wine from barrels and then from a different room. Jane Doe #6 was given a glass of
25 wine that came from a different room and it tasted different from the wine she had been
26 drinking.

27 56. Shortly thereafter, Jane Doe #6 is informed and believes that Defendant Foppoli
28 placed some kind of "drugging" substance into her drink. After drinking what she was given,

1 she immediately felt symptoms consistent with being “drugged” such as an altered state not
2 consistent with simply drinking alcohol. This altered state rendered her unable to consent.

3 57. Jane Doe #6 walked outside of the winery and Defendant Foppoli followed her
4 outside. He then showed her his Tesla and offered her a “tour.”

5 58. Defendant Foppoli then took Jane Doe #6 for a ride in the Tesla, at which point
6 Jane Doe #6 was in a very altered state mentally as her consciousness faded in and out.

7 59. Jane Doe #6’s next memory was being in an unknown house with Defendant
8 Foppoli. Defendant Foppoli then sexually assaulted her, without her consent. He grabbed her
9 around her waist, forcibly kissed her and groped her buttocks while pinning her body against
10 his own. She told him “no”, pushed him back, however his grip tightened and he continued to
11 sexually assault her despite her telling him no and trying to push him away. She continued to
12 fade in and out of consciousness.

13 60. Defendant Foppoli returned Jane Doe #6 to the Christopher Creek Winery
14 where she immediately took a shower and then left with her colleagues. The next day she was
15 extremely sick and felt as though she had been drugged.

16 61. Jane Doe #6 never gave consent for Defendant Foppoli’s actions, and Jane Doe
17 #6 was unable to give her consent because she was intoxicated and/or unconscious by an
18 unknown substance given to her by Defendant Foppoli.

19 62. Jane Doe #6 perceived Defendant Foppoli to be a powerful man in the town of
20 which he was Mayor. He was introduced to her as Mayor of the City.

21 63. Jane Doe #6 felt violated and traumatized by Defendant Foppoli’s assault of
22 her. She remained very fearful of the power Defendant Foppoli held. She suffered near daily
23 panic attacks for many weeks following the assault, and she became very reactive when she
24 saw a car the same color as Defendant Foppoli’s.

25 **Jane Doe #7**

26 64. Jane Doe #7 and Defendant Foppoli were colleagues.

27 65. In or around February 2020, Defendant Foppoli and Jane Doe #7 were at a
28 community event.

1 66. Jane Doe #7 is informed and believes that Defendant Foppoli placed some kind
2 of “drugging” substance into her drink. After drinking what Defendant Foppoli gave her, she
3 immediately felt symptoms consistent with being “drugged” such as an altered state not
4 consistent with simply drinking alcohol. This altered state rendered her unable to consent.

5 67. Defendant Foppoli and another man drove Jane Doe #7 to her residence, but
6 only Defendant Foppoli walked her inside her home. During this time, Jane Doe #7 remained
7 in an altered state and became unconscious. During this altered state of unconsciousness,
8 Defendant Foppoli raped her. When she regained consciousness, she was naked, in pain and
9 was bleeding from her rectum.

10 68. In or around August 2020, Jane Doe #7 and Defendant Foppoli were at an event
11 at Christopher Creek Winery where there were large amounts of alcohol provided to guests,
12 including Jane Doe #7. Jane Doe #7 is informed and believes that Defendant Foppoli placed
13 some kind of “drugging” substance to her drink. After drinking, she immediately felt
14 symptoms consistent with being “drugged” such as an altered state not consistent with simply
15 drinking alcohol. This altered state rendered her unable to consent.

16 69. While at Christopher Creek Winery, Defendant Foppoli’s associate led Jane
17 Doe #7 to another location of the winery, while she remained in the altered mental state and
18 unable to consent. Jane Doe #7 regained consciousness and found herself engaged in an act of
19 oral copulation upon Defendant Foppoli’s associate.

20 70. The following day, Defendant Foppoli told Jane Doe #7 that he had a video of
21 her engaging in a sexual act and told her she was lucky he had control of the video.

22 71. Jane Doe #7 is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendant
23 Foppoli secretly slipped a drugging agent into her drink to render her compliant and altered
24 such that she could not consent, turned her over to an associate for a sex act she could not
25 consent to, which was a “set up” to obtain a video to extort her with later as a political
26 advantage. He was also trying to keep Jane Doe #7 quiet about the fact that Defendant Foppoli
27 raped her in February 2020.

28 72. Jane Doe #7 became scared that Defendant Foppoli would retaliate against her

1 if she reported that he had drugged and raped her. When she learned that Defendant Foppoli
2 had raped the other Plaintiffs, she spoke out against him publicly.

3 73. Her public pronouncement resulted in Defendant Foppoli threatening to release
4 the video he had of her and implied that he would release it if she did not recant her statement
5 against him.

6 74. After this effort to extort her, Jane Doe #7 reported all of the conduct to law
7 enforcement.

8 75. Jane Doe #7 is informed and believes that Defendant Foppoli learned of her
9 report to law enforcement given law enforcement interviews she knew were being conducted.
10 Defendant Foppoli's reaction was swift and punishing. He personally and through agents
11 immediately made high-profile defamatory statements about Jane Doe #7 that were knowingly
12 false, inflammatory, and made with an intent to tarnish her reputation and political aspirations.

13 **Further Allegations Pertaining to All Plaintiffs**

14 76. All Defendants profited financially from Defendant Foppoli luring Plaintiffs to
15 events held at or on behalf of Defendants 20-30 Club and Defendant Winery. Plaintiffs are
16 informed and believe and thereupon allege that Defendants 20-30 Club was paid membership
17 fees and for the events that they put on during which Defendant Foppoli assaulted Plaintiffs.

18 77. Moreover, Defendant Foppoli, as an employee and/or officer of Defendant
19 Winery at the time Plaintiffs were sexually abused, assaulted, raped, and harassed by
20 Defendant Foppoli, acted as an agent of Defendant Winery. Plaintiffs are informed and
21 believe and thereupon allege that Defendant Winery was paid for putting on the events during
22 which Defendant Foppoli assaulted Plaintiffs.

23 78. All Defendants were well aware that Defendant Foppoli was abusing, harassing
24 and assaulting women including Plaintiffs and that he had a long history of doing so.

25 79. Despite such knowledge, Defendants took no action against Defendant Foppoli.
26 Instead, Defendants ratified Defendant Foppoli's actions by enabling and encouraging him,
27 providing him with access to women, covering up his actions and forcing women, including
28 Plaintiffs, to continue to have to be exposed to him despite his despicable behavior.

1 85. Defendant Foppoli committed acts of sexual assault and battery against all
2 Plaintiffs as described above.

3 86. Defendant Foppoli's actions against Plaintiffs were intentional and performed
4 to cause an offensive and unwanted touching and contact of an intimate and sexual nature
5 against Plaintiffs.

6 87. Defendant Foppoli's acts occurred at a time when Plaintiffs were all over the
7 age of 18.

8 88. Defendant Foppoli affirmatively misrepresented to Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe
9 #2 that the rape was consensual intercourse because they were in a relationship.

10 89. Defendant Foppoli actively provided alcohol and/or other substances to Jane
11 Doe #2, #3, #4, #5, #6 and #7 in an effort to alter their mental states and render them unable to
12 legally consent to or ward off his sexual abuse.

13 90. Moreover, Defendant Foppoli's acts of providing alcohol and/or other
14 substances to which Defendant Foppoli administered to Plaintiffs without their knowledge or
15 consent, were malicious, fraudulent, deceitful and oppressive, and performed to make them
16 more pliable and cooperative in his unwanted sexual advances, while rendering them legally
17 incapable of consent.

18 91. Defendants 20-30 Club and Defendant Winery ratified Defendant Foppoli's
19 unlawful conduct as described herein by allowing Defendant Foppoli to continue to work at
20 Christopher Creek Winery and be a member of Defendants 20-30 Club despite knowing that
21 Defendant Foppoli was assaulting, abusing and harassing women, including Plaintiffs.

22 92. None of the Plaintiffs consented to Defendant Foppoli's acts as he caused them
23 all to be in altered states, whether by intoxication or drugging, to render them unable to
24 consent.

25 93. As a proximate result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiffs suffered and continue to
26 suffer injury, including medical bills, significant emotional pain and suffering, mental anguish,
27 humiliation, loss of enjoyment of life, embarrassment, and damage to their reputation.

28 94. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants' acts against Plaintiffs were

1 carried out with a malicious intent and conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights, thereby
2 constituting oppression, fraud, or malice pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 3294. As
3 such, Plaintiffs are entitled to punitive damages to make an example and to punish Defendant
4 Foppoli and to deter similar conduct in the future.

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
6 **Violation of the Bane Civil Rights Act**
7 *(Plaintiffs against all Defendants)*

8 95. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every
9 allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 94, inclusive, as though set forth in
10 full.

11 96. Defendants 20-30 Club created a culture of drinking and sexual assaults. The
12 organization attracted sexual predators, encouraged a rape culture, and failed to stop predators
13 like Defendant Foppoli from assaulting women.

14 97. Defendants 20-30 Club encouraged binge drinking and sexual violence against
15 members and guests at Club events, both sanctioned and non-sanctioned.

16 98. Defendants 20-30 Club knew or should have known the risk it created could
17 have been reduced by investigating reports of abuse, implementing policies and protections for
18 female members, and educating its members on preventing sexual abuse.

19 99. Defendants 20-20 Club violated Civil Code section 52.1 in that they created a
20 vehicle to allow Plaintiffs to be injured.

21 100. Defendant Foppoli assaulted, harassed and/or raped all Plaintiffs.

22 101. Defendant Christopher Creek Winery failed to protect female visitors at the
23 winery when it knew one of its owners was a sexual predator. Defendant Foppoli regularly
24 used the Winery to host events both as a politician and Winery owner, and he regularly invited
25 himself to private events when female had rented the guesthouse.

26 102. Defendant Christopher Creek Winery knew about Defendant Foppoli well
27 before he sexually assaulted the various Plaintiffs at the Winery.

28 103. In 2013, female friends had rented the guest house at Christopher Creek Winery

1 for a private party. Defendant Foppoli “crashed” their party and followed the women to the
2 hot tub, turning off the lights. He filled their wine glasses with wine, after they had already
3 had alcohol, and then told everyone to look up at the stars. He then sexually assaulted one of
4 the women by trying to remove their bathing suits more than once.

5 104. Following the sexual assaults at the Winery, one of the women sent an email to
6 a manager of Christopher Creek Winery and threatened legal action and gave a description of
7 Defendant Foppoli’s sexual misconduct.

8 105. Defendant Christopher Creek Winery violated Civil Code Section 52.1 in that
9 they created a vehicle that allowed Defendant Foppoli to continue his predatory behavior,
10 allowing future Plaintiffs to be harmed.

11 106. In addition, Defendant Foppoli, on his behalf and on behalf of Defendant
12 Winery, violated Civil Code section 52.1 in that he interfered and/or attempted to interfere
13 with Plaintiffs’ exercise and enjoyment of civil rights secured by Civil Code section 43,
14 specifically the right of protection from bodily harm, personal insult and injury to their
15 personal relations. Defendant Foppoli, on his behalf and on behalf of Defendant Winery,
16 interfered and/or attempted to interfere with Plaintiffs’ rights by threats and intimidation,
17 specifically by threatening to distribute photographs and/or video recordings of Plaintiffs that
18 could cause embarrassment and to disparage Plaintiffs’ names in the community.

19 107. Defendant Foppoli, on his behalf and on behalf of Defendant Winery, enlisted
20 an agent, Robert Stryk, to make dramatic allegations to the San Francisco Chronicle and other
21 media outlets that the women were not credible, their accounts were not solid, and that he had
22 “killed” an earlier investigation into Defendant Foppoli by The Press Democrat in 2019.

23 108. Defendant Foppoli, on his behalf and on behalf of Defendant Winery, further
24 enlisted this agent to publicly claim to these media outlets that images existed that would be
25 released, which would discredit women who have come forward.

26 109. Defendant Foppoli, on his behalf and on behalf of Defendant Winery, further
27 enlisted this agent to publicly claim that they hired a right-wing figure known for conducting
28 hidden camera stings of liberals and journalists to interview and discredit the accusers,

1 claiming, "Everything I have, I'm going to release it slowly...we're going to drip it out."

2 110. As a proximate result of the actions of Defendants, Plaintiffs suffered and
3 continue to suffer injury, including, medical bills, emotional pain and suffering, mental
4 anguish, humiliation, loss of enjoyment of life, embarrassment, and damage to their
5 reputations.

6 111. In doing the acts alleged herein, Defendants knew or should have known that
7 the actions were likely to injure Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants
8 intentionally caused injury to Plaintiffs and acted with willful and conscious disregard of
9 Plaintiffs' rights as secured by Civil Code section 52.1. Therefore, Plaintiffs are entitled to
10 recover exemplary damages pursuant to Civil Code sections 52.1 and 52.

11 112. Unless Defendants are restrained by a preliminary and permanent injunction,
12 Plaintiffs will suffer great and irreparable injury in that Defendants and/or other agents acting
13 on their behalf may release information, images, photographs and/or recordings of Plaintiffs
14 that may cause Plaintiffs embarrassment. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law as
15 pecuniary damages would not afford adequate relief because once the information and or
16 recordings are released, the damage to Plaintiffs is already done.

17 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Violation of Ralph Act**

19 *(Plaintiffs against all Defendants)*

20 113. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every
21 allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 112, inclusive, as though set forth
22 in full.

23 114. Defendants 20-30 Club and Defendant Winery created a common plan, scheme
24 and vehicle by which Plaintiffs were able to be injured by Defendant Foppoli.

25 115. Defendant Foppoli assaulted, harassed and/or raped Plaintiffs.

26 116. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege that the incidents
27 described herein were motivated by Defendants' hatred and prejudice of women.

28 117. Defendants, by their use of violence or threats of violence against Plaintiffs

1 because of their gender, violated Plaintiffs’ right to be free from violence or intimidation by
2 threats of violence as guaranteed by Civil Code section 51.7.

3 118. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ conduct, Plaintiffs have
4 suffered and continue to suffer injury, including, medical bills, emotional pain and suffering,
5 mental anguish, humiliation, loss of enjoyment of life, embarrassment, and damage to their
6 reputations.

7 119. Defendants’ violation of Plaintiffs’ rights as guaranteed by Civil Code section
8 51.7 entitled Plaintiffs to compensatory and punitive damages, a \$25,000 civil penalty,
9 attorneys’ fees and injunctive relief, all of which were provided for in Civil Code section 52.

10 120. In doing the acts alleged herein, Defendants knew or should have known that
11 they actions were likely to injure Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that
12 basis allege that Defendants intended to cause Plaintiffs injury and acted with a willful and
13 conscious disregard of Plaintiffs’ rights as secured by Civil Code section 51.7, entitling
14 Plaintiffs to recover punitive damages under Civil Code section 52(b)(1).

15 121. Unless Defendants are restrained by a preliminary and permanent injunction,
16 Plaintiffs will suffer great and irreparable injury in that Defendants and/or other agents acting
17 on their behalf may release information, images, photographs and/or recordings of Plaintiffs
18 that may cause Plaintiffs embarrassment. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law as
19 pecuniary damages would not afford adequate relief because once the information and or
20 recordings are released, the damage to Plaintiffs is already done.

21 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Unfair Competition (Cal. Bus & Prof. §17200 et seq.)**

23 *(Plaintiffs Jane Doe #5, Jane Doe #6 and Jane Doe #7 against Defendants Winery, 20-30
Santa Rosa Club and 20-30 National Club)*

24 122. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every
25 allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 121, inclusive, as though set forth
26 in full.

27 123. Plaintiffs are private individuals within the meaning of Business and
28 Professions Code Section 17204 as defined by Business and Professions Code section 17201.

1 Plaintiffs have standing to sue for any violation of Business and Professions Code section
2 17200 et seq. on behalf of themselves and on behalf of the People of the State of California
3 pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17204.

4 124. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereupon allege that Defendant Winery
5 have engaged in unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practices, including allowing
6 Defendant Foppoli to engage in repeated harassment and abuse of women, including Plaintiffs,
7 and failing to take all reasonable steps to prevent harassment and abuse from occurring.

8 125. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereupon allege that Defendants 20-30
9 Club engaged in unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practices, including allowing
10 Defendant Foppoli to engage in repeated harassment and abuse of women, including Plaintiffs,
11 failing to take all reasonable steps to prevent harassment and abuse from occurring, failing to
12 adequately investigate Defendant Foppoli, concealing Defendant Foppoli's harassment and
13 abuse of women, and refusing to design, implement or oversee policies on harassment, abuse
14 and sexual assaults of its members and invitees.

15 126. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereupon allege that Defendants
16 engaged in a common scheme and plan to conceal allegations against Defendant Foppoli to try
17 to maintain a positive public opinion of Defendants 20-30 Club and Defendant Winery and to
18 continue to profit from members, invitees and other funding sources.

19 127. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereupon allege that Defendants have
20 committed the same or similar breaches of the UCL with respect to many or all of their
21 members and invitees in their businesses.

22 128. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that unless Defendants
23 are restrained from such violations, Defendants will continue to engage in said unlawful and
24 unfair business practices to the detriment of Plaintiffs and all similarly situated Californians.

25 129. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege that Defendants, as
26 indicated by their conduct alleged throughout this Complaint, and based upon Plaintiffs'
27 information and belief of how Defendants conducts themselves in the business of social clubs
28 and winery business, was and is part of a plan or scheme by Defendants to defraud Plaintiffs

1 and the public and trick them into believing that Defendants engage in lawful conduct. Each
2 act alleged herein was performed and executed to conform to Defendants' plan or scheme.

3 130. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege that Defendants, as
4 indicated by their conduct previously alleged, and based upon Plaintiffs' information and
5 belief of how Defendants have wrongfully conducted business in violation of federal, state,
6 and/or local laws, have collected moneys and have profited through means of unfair
7 competition.

8 131. Defendants' violations of the statutory and common law rights of Plaintiffs
9 serve as an unlawful predicate act and/or an unfair business practice for purposes of Business
10 and Professions Code section 17200, and remedies are provided therein under Business and
11 Professions Code section 17203.

12 132. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts by Defendants,
13 Plaintiffs have suffered a monetary loss in an amount to be proven at trial.

14 133. Business and Professions Code section 17203 provides that the Court may
15 restore to any person in interest any money or property which may have been acquired by
16 means of unfair competition.

17 134. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiffs are entitled
18 to a preliminary and permanent injunction, enjoining Defendants from continuing the unlawful
19 and unfair business practices described herein.

20 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **Negligence**

22 *(Plaintiffs Jane Doe #4, Jane Doe #5, Jane Doe #6 and Jane Doe #7 against Defendants 20-30
23 Santa Rosa Club and 20-30 National Club)*

24 135. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every
25 allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 134, inclusive, as though set forth
26 in full.

27 136. Defendants 20-30 Club created a culture of drinking and sexual assaults. The
28 organization attracted sexual predators, encouraged a rape culture, and failed to stop predators
like Defendant Foppoli from assaulting women.

1 137. Defendants 20-30 Club encouraged binge drinking and sexual violence against
2 members and guests at Club events, both sanctioned and non-sanctioned.

3 138. Defendants 20-30 Club knew the risk it created could have been reduced by
4 investigating reports of abuse, implementing policies and protections for female members, and
5 educating its members on preventing sexual abuse.

6 139. In or around October 2010, Defendants 20-30 Santa Rosa Club and 20-30
7 National Club, both officers at the local and national level, received a complaint by a female
8 member of the local club that Defendant Foppoli had sexually assaulted her against her will.

9 140. In or around June 2012, Jane Doe #4 told two officers of the local and national
10 20-30 Club that she had been sexually assaulted by Defendant Foppoli. One or both of those
11 officers spoke directly to the officer that received the sexual assault complaint by a survivor in
12 2010 about Defendant Foppoli. Despite that prior knowledge, Defendants 20-30 Club ignored
13 the accusation and continued to allow Defendant Foppoli to remain as an active member. As
14 an active member, Defendant Foppoli was not restrained in any way from attending social
15 events with female members. This enabled him to continue preying upon women by providing
16 alcohol and committing additional sexual assaults. Defendants 20-30 Club failed to
17 investigate further or protect their members from Defendant Foppoli's continued predatory
18 behavior.

19 141. In or around 2013, at least one of the officers of Defendants 20-30 Club who
20 received the sexual assault complaint against Defendant Foppoli was also a business partner of
21 Defendant Foppoli as a part owner of Defendant Christopher Creek Winery.

22 142. In or around August of 2016, Jane Doe #5 attended a party at Christopher Creek
23 Winery where many of the Active 20-30 officers were also socializing. Defendant Foppoli
24 was one of the Active 20-30 members present. At that party, Defendant Foppoli sexually
25 assaulted Jane Doe #5. Despite prior complaints to Defendants 20-30 Club officers against
26 Defendant Foppoli, they allowed him to remain an active club member, and joined him at
27 Christopher Creek Winery for Active 20-30 events, leading to Jane Doe #5 also becoming a
28 victim of Defendant Foppoli's predatory behavior.

1 143. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereupon allege that survivors
2 complained about Defendant Foppoli specifically to officers of Defendants 20-30 Club as early
3 as 2010, long before Jane Doe #4 and Jane Doe #5 were sexually assaulted at either an Active
4 20-30 event or with Active 20-30 officers present. Defendants 20-30 Santa Rosa Club and 20-
5 30 National Club had direct knowledge that Defendant Foppoli was a sexual predator since he
6 became a member of the organization and failed to properly investigate or protect its members,
7 active or prospective.

8 144. In addition, Defendants 20-30 Club officers were present and witnessed
9 Defendant Foppoli pressure female members and other invitees present at Defendants 20-30
10 Club events to drink alcohol to the point of intoxication and, at times, unconsciousness, and
11 then sexually abuse women and otherwise act inappropriately towards women.

12 145. It was not until April 2021, when The San Francisco Chronicle published the
13 accusation, that Defendants 20-30 Club started an investigation into Defendant Foppoli and
14 finally expelled him from the organization. In the years between the organizations' officers
15 learning that Defendant Foppoli was a sexual predator and expelling him, dozens of women
16 were raped, sexually assaulted, and sexually harassed by Defendant Foppoli, including
17 Plaintiffs.

18 146. Defendants 20-30 Club failed to exercise reasonable due care to protect
19 Plaintiffs from the known risks of sexual abuse that the organization knowingly created and
20 fostered.

21 147. Defendants 20-30 Club, by virtue of its pre-existing relationship with Plaintiffs
22 as invitees to Club events, owed Plaintiffs a duty to warn Plaintiffs that Defendant Foppoli was
23 a sexual predator, and to put in place safeguards to protect against sexual violence.

24 148. Defendants 20-30 Club breached their duty by failing to protect Plaintiffs from
25 the risk the Club created through its culture of binge drinking and normalizing sexual abuse.

26 149. As a proximate result of Defendants 20-30 Club's failures to exercise due care,
27 Plaintiffs were injured.

28 150. Defendants 20-30 Club's actions caused Plaintiffs to suffer and to continue to

1 suffer injury, including, medical bills, significant emotional pain and suffering, mental
2 anguish, humiliation, loss of enjoyment of life, and embarrassment.

3 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Negligence**

5 *(Plaintiffs Jane Doe #6 and Jane Doe #7 against Defendant Winery)*

6 151. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every
7 allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 150, inclusive, as though set forth
8 in full.

9 152. Defendant Winery allowed Defendant Foppoli to use its premises as a sexual
10 playground, hosting events where he plied his victims with alcohol and/or other substances to
11 further alter their minds and render them unable to consent to sexual activity or to ward off
12 unwanted sexual advances.

13 153. Defendant Winery was aware of prior sexual assaults committed by Defendant
14 Foppoli prior to the sexual assaults alleged herein.

15 154. Specifically, a group of wine club members rented the guest house at
16 Christopher Creek Winery. During their time there, Defendant Foppoli inserted himself into
17 their private party, joined them in the hot tub, and plied them with alcohol. He exposed his
18 penis and grabbed one of the female guest's hands, forcing her to touch his penis. He then
19 tried to remove another female guest's bathing suit top multiple times, and also tried to remove
20 her bathing suit bottom as she tried to exit the hot tub. These were all sexual assaults.

21 155. Furthermore, a female wine club members specifically complained to the
22 manager of the wine club at Christopher Creek Winery about Defendant Foppoli. She
23 threatened legal action and provided a description of Defendant Foppoli's sexual misconduct.

24 156. Despite this clear warning and complaint about Defendant Foppoli's sexual
25 misconduct at the winery, the other officers/owners of the winery failed to investigate or
26 further protect its female patrons from Defendant Foppoli.

27 157. Defendant Winery failed to exercise reasonable due care to protect Plaintiffs
28 from the known risks of sexual abuse that the facility knowingly hosted.

1 in full.

2 165. Defendant Foppoli committed acts of sexual assault and abuse against
3 Plaintiffs, of which actions the other Defendants named herein had knowledge and were
4 involved in a common scheme, plan and design to create the vehicle by which Defendant
5 Foppoli could assault and abuse Plaintiffs. Defendants failed to protect Plaintiffs from the
6 known risks of sexual abuse by intentionally choosing not to investigate complaints of sexual
7 abuse and misconduct committed by Defendant Foppoli and to actively conceal his
8 misconduct. This conduct was outrageous.

9 166. Defendants intended to cause Plaintiffs emotional distress.

10 167. Each of the other Defendants named herein acted with reckless disregard of the
11 probability that Plaintiffs would suffer emotional distress, knowing that Plaintiffs were present
12 when the conduct occurred.

13 168. Plaintiffs suffered serious emotional distress following the sexual assaults and
14 abuses they experienced, including suffering, anguish, fright, horror, nervousness, grief,
15 anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, and shame. An ordinary, reasonable person would be
16 unable to cope with such serious emotional distress.

17 169. Defendants' actions were a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs' serious
18 emotional distress.

19 170. Defendants' conduct was done with conscious disregard for the rights and
20 safety of Plaintiffs. Therefore, Plaintiffs are entitled to punitive damages.

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Domestic Violence**

23 *(Plaintiffs Jane Doe #1, Jane Doe #2 against Defendant Foppoli)*

24 171. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every
25 allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 170, inclusive, as through set forth
26 in full.

27 172. Defendant Foppoli inflicted injury on Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2, resulting
28 from abuse as defined in Penal Code section 13700(a). Defendant intentionally or recklessly
caused bodily injury to Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2.

1 182. Defendant Foppoli immediately retaliated against her by enlisting a reporter
2 from the local paper to contact her and advise her that he had a “sex tape” of her and to ask
3 whether she would recant her statement in light of that fact.

4 183. Based on this extortion attempt, Jane Doe #7 reported Defendant Foppoli’s
5 conduct, as well as the sexual assaults she had also personally suffered at his hands, to local
6 law enforcement.

7 184. After providing law enforcement with full statements against Defendant
8 Foppoli, Jane Doe #7 is informed and believes that law enforcement interviewed witnesses
9 who had close relationships with Defendant Foppoli. It is understood that Defendant Foppoli
10 would have learned that Jane Doe #7 was cooperating with police.

11 185. Once again, Defendant immediately retaliated and published a false statement
12 claiming that *he* was a victim of Jane Doe #7 and that *she* had assaulted *him*. In the face of
13 this public defamation, Jane Doe #7 was forced to respond to these allegations by providing
14 public responses and publicly sharing the intimate details of her own victimization at his
15 hands.

16 186. Defendant Foppoli then enlisted an agent, Robert Stryk, to publicly and
17 aggressively defame Jane Doe #7 in the print and radio media, calling her abusive and false
18 names such as a “drunk, philanderer, fabricator and danger to children.” He attempted to
19 negotiate with various news sources the release of a “sex tape” that he claimed was captured
20 by a surveillance camera at Christopher Creek Winery.

21 187. Defendant Foppoli caused to be published false and unprivileged statements
22 tending directly to injure Plaintiff Jane Doe #7.

23 188. Defendant Foppoli’s defamatory statements were designed and intended to
24 diminish Plaintiff Jane Doe #7’s reputation and injure her good name and career.

25 189. Members of the public read and heard the defamatory statements made by
26 Defendant Foppoli and they understood that the statements were regarding Plaintiff Jane Doe
27 #7 because the statements named her expressly.

28 190. As a proximate result of Defendant Foppoli’s defamatory statements, Jane Doe

1 #7 has suffered injury to her personal, business and professional reputation and has suffered,
2 and will continue to suffer, upset, embarrassment, humiliation, anguish and loss of business,
3 all to her damage in an amount according to proof.

4 191. Defendant Foppoli committed the acts alleged herein maliciously and with the
5 wrongful intention of injuring Jane Doe #7 and acted with an improper and evil motive
6 amounting to malice in conscious disregard of her rights. Because the acts taken towards Jane
7 Doe #7 were carried out in a deliberate and intentional manner to injure and damage her, Jane
8 Doe #7 is entitled to recover punitive and exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to
9 punish Defendant Foppoli and deter him from such conduct in the future.

10 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage**
(Plaintiff Jane Doe #7 against Defendant Foppoli)

12 192. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every
13 allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 191, inclusive, as though set forth
14 in full.

15 193. Plaintiff Jane Doe #7 had a reasonable probability of future business
16 opportunities and economic benefits in connection with her role in politics and in law.

17 194. Defendant Foppoli knew of such opportunities and intentionally interfered with
18 such opportunities with his untrue and derogatory statements about Plaintiff Jane Doe #7.

19 195. Defendant Foppoli committed these tortious acts with deliberate and actual
20 malice, ill-will and oppression in conscious disregard of Plaintiff Jane Doe #7's legal rights.

21 196. Defendant Foppoli's actions have disrupted Plaintiff Jane Doe #7's
22 relationships and business opportunities in politics and law, resulting in lost revenue in an
23 amount to be determined at trial.

24 197. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Foppoli's conduct, Plaintiff Jane
25 Doe #7 has been injured in an amount to be proven at trial.

26 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
27 **Negligent Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage**
(Plaintiff Jane Doe #7 against Defendant Foppoli)

28 198. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every

1 allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 197, inclusive, as though set forth
2 in full.

3 199. Jane Doe #7 had a reasonable probability of future business opportunities and
4 economic benefits in connection with her role in politics and in law.

5 200. Defendant Foppoli knew of such opportunities and knew or should have known
6 that if he did not act with due care, his actions would interfere with such opportunities and
7 cause Plaintiff Jane Doe #7 to lose the economic benefit of such relationships.

8 201. Defendant Foppoli has acted negligently and have disrupted Plaintiff Jane Doe
9 #7's relationships and business opportunities.

10 202. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Foppoli's conduct, Plaintiff Jane
11 Doe #7 has been injured in an amount to be proven at trial.

12 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants as follows:

13 1. General damages;

14 2. Special damages;

15 3. During the pendency of this action, a preliminary injunction ordering Defendant
16 Foppoli and his agents not to release any information, images, photographs, videos, and/or any
17 recordings of Plaintiffs to anyone, and to stay 100 yards away from Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs'
18 homes and worksites;

19 4. On a final hearing, a permanent injunction ordering Defendant Foppoli and his
20 agents not to release any information, images, photographs, videos, and/or any recordings of
21 Plaintiffs to anyone and to stay 100 yards away from Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' homes and
22 worksites;

23 5. Punitive and exemplary damages;

24 6. Attorneys' fees pursuant to Civil Code sections 52.1(h), 52(b)(3), 52.4, and
25 1708.6;


26 7. A statutory civil penalty of \$25,000 pursuant to Civil Code section 52(b)(2);
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 8. Plaintiffs' costs of suit; and
- 9. Such other relief as may be just and proper.

**PERRY, JOHNSON, ANDERSON,
MILLER & MOSKOWITZ, LLP**

DATED: April 4, 2022

By: 

TRACI CARRILLO
NICOLE M. JAFFEE
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

PERRY, JOHNSON, ANDERSON,
MILLER & MOSKOWITZ LLP