1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CUTTER LAW P.C. 401 Watt Avenue Sacramento, CA 95864 Telephone: (916) 290-9400 Facsimile: (916) 588-9330 Email: jroussas@cutterlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs, CHRISTOPHER CRABTREE; JENNY CRABTREE; CHRISTOPHER AND JENNY TRUST AGREEMENT DATED JULY 27, 2018; BRIAN FLAHERTY; DIANNA GARTNER; KYLE GARTNER; LANCE GILPIN; STEPHEN CLIFFORD; RUTH MAGIN; LARRY STEWART; RHONDA ROBERTS; and MARCELLA WILSON			
13	FOR THE COUNTY OF BUTTE			
14				
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	CHRISTOPHER CRABTREE; JENNY CRABTREE; CHRISTOPHER AND JENNY TRUST AGREEMENT DATED JULY 27, 2018; BRIAN FLAHERTY; DIANNA GARTNER; KYLE GARTNER; LANCE GILPIN; STEPHEN CLIFFORD; RUTH MAGIN; LARRY STEWART; RHONDA ROBERTS; and MARCELLA WILSON, Plaintiffs, vs. PG&E CORPORATION; PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES 1. NEGLIGENCE; 2. INVERSE CONDEMNATION; 3. TRESPASS; 4. PRIVATE NUISANCE; 5. CLAIM UNDER PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE §2106; AND 6. VIOLATION OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §13007 AND REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL		
28	///			
	-1-			
	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES			

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Plaintiffs complains of Defendants PG&E CORPORATION; PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and each of them, and alleges as follows:

1.0

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Beginning on or about November 8, 2018, residents and property owners in Butte County were devastated by severe wildfires known as the Camp Fire. The Camp Fire was started when electrical infrastructure owned, operated and maintained by PG&E CORPORATION and PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (hereinafter "PG&E") and/or sparks therefrom came into contact with vegetation inspected and maintained by PG&E. The fire began at the base of a nearly 100-year-old PG&E transposition tower when a steel hook holding a high voltage line failed, spreading rapidly. PG&E was well aware of the fragility of the tower at issue, having seen five other century-old towers collapse in a 2012 windstorm, yet neglected to take reasonable steps to inspect and maintain the equipment that ultimately failed on November 8th. The fire caused extensive damages within Butte County, in the State of California. The Camp Fire burned more than 153,000 acres and destroyed over 4,800 homes and other structures. As of the filing of this Complaint, the Camp Fire has been confirmed as the cause of deaths for at least 88 people making the fire the deadliest in California history, with over 150 people still unaccounted for. U.S. Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke estimates that costs associated with the Camp Fire will be in the billions of dollars. The risk modeling firm RMS estimates insured losses from the Camp Fire to reach between \$7.5 billion - \$10 billion. The Plaintiffs in this case are victims of the Camp Fire who individually seek just compensation and damages. Specifically, Plaintiffs in this action seek damages for, inter alia, personal injury; damage to and loss of use of real and personal property; pain and suffering; injury to livestock and pets; loss of income; consequential and incidental damages; and/or for emotional suffering, fear and anxiety, inconvenience, and other harm caused by the wrongful conduct of PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and Does 1 - 100, inclusive. ///

27

28 ///

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2.1 The Plaintiffs are now and at all times relevant herein individuals, residents, domiciliaries and property owners who resided in Butte County. All of their claims arise from events or occurrences related to the Camp Fire within which resulted in the damages, losses, and injuries as hereinafter alleged.
- 2.2 At all times herein mentioned Defendants PG&E CORPORATION and PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, were corporations authorized to do business, and doing business, in the State of California, with their principal place of business in the County of San Francisco, State of California. Defendant PG&E CORPORATION is an energy-based holding company headquartered in San Francisco. It is the parent company of Defendant PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY. PG&E CORPORATION subsidiaries provide customers with public utility services, and services relating to the generation of energy, transmission of electricity and natural gas, generation of electricity, and the distribution of energy.
- 2.3 At all times mentioned herein, PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them, were suppliers of electricity to members of the public. As part of supplying electricity to members of the public, PG&E installed, constructed, built, maintained, and operated overhead power lines, together with supporting poles and appurtenances, for the purpose of conducting electricity for delivery to members of the general public. Furthermore, on information and belief, PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 through 100, are responsible for maintaining vegetation near, around, and in proximity to their electrical equipment in compliance with State and Federal Regulations, specifically including but not limited to Public Resource Code 4292, Public Resource Code 4293, General Order 95, and General Order 165.
- 2.4 Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the Defendants herein, and each of them, were agents and/or employees each of the other and in acting and/or failing to act as alleged herein, the Defendants, and each of them, were acting in the course and scope of said agency and/or employment relationship.

THE DEFENDANTS

- 4.1 PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMP ANY is both an "Electrical Corporation" and a "Public Utility" pursuant to, respectively, Sections 218(a) and 216(1) of the California Public Utilities Code. PG&E is in the business of providing electricity to the residents of at least two counties and 26 cities, including but not limited, to Butte County and, more particularly, to Plaintiffs' residences and/ or properties through a network of electrical transmission and distribution lines.
- 4.2 PG&E CORPORATION is a publicly traded company that owns and/or manages an "Electric Plant" as defined in Section 217 of the Public Utilities Code, and, like its subsidiary, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, is both an "Electric Corporation" and a "Public Utility" pursuant to, respectively, Sections 218(a) and 216(a) of the Public Utilities Code. It develops and operates energy infrastructure assets related to the production and distribution of energy such as power plants, electric lines, natural gas pipelines and liquefied natural gas receipt terminals.
- 4.3 Plaintiffs allege on information and belief that PG&E CORPORATION and PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY are jointly and severally liable for each other's negligence, conduct and wrongdoing as alleged herein, in that:
 - a. PG&E CORPORATION and PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY operate as a single business enterprise operating out of the same building located at 77 Beale St., San Francisco, California for the purpose of effectuating and carrying out PG&E CORPORATION's business and operations and/or for the benefit of PG&E CORPORATION;
 - b. Defendants do not operate as completely separate entities, but rather, integrate their resources to achieve a common business purpose;
 - c. PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY is so organized and controlled, and its decisions, affairs, and business so conducted as to make it a mere instrumentality, agent, conduit, or adjunct of PG&E CORPORATION;

- p. PG&E CORPORATION's officers, directors and other management make policies and decisions to be effectuated by PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMP ANY and/or otherwise play roles in providing directions and making decisions for PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY;
- q. PG&E CORPORATION's officers, directors, and other management direct certain financial decisions for PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY including the amount and nature of capital outlays;
- r. PG&E CORPORATION's written guidelines, policies, and procedures control PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, its employees, policies, and practices;
- s. PG&E CORPORATION files consolidated earnings statements factoring all revenue and losses from PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY as well as consolidated tax returns, including those seeking tax relief; and/or, without limitation;
- t. PG&E CORPORATION generally directs and controls PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY's relationship with, requests to, and responses to inquiries from, the California Public Utilities Commission and uses such direction and control for the benefit of Defendant PG&E CORPORATION.
- 4.4 The true names of DOES 1 through 100, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, are unknown to Plaintiffs who, under California Code of Civil Procedure Section 474, sue these Defendants under fictitious names. Each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the conduct alleged herein, including, without limitation, by way of conspiracy, aiding, abetting, furnishing the means and/or acting in capacities that create agency, respondeat superior, and/or predecessor-or successor-in-interest relationships with the Defendants. The DOE Defendants are private individuals, associations, partnerships, corporations, or otherwise that actively assisted and participated in the negligent and wrongful conduct alleged herein in ways that are currently unknown to Plaintiffs. Some or all of the DOE Defendants may be residents of the State of California. Plaintiffs may amend or seek to amend this Complaint to allege the true names, capacities, and responsibility of these DOE Defendants once they are ascertained, and to add additional facts and/or legal theories. Plaintiffs make all

5.0

BACKGROUND

- 5.1 Prior to November 8, 2018 Defendants, and each of them, had a duty to properly maintain and repair the electric transmission lines, and other equipment associated with their duty to transmit electricity and to keep vegetation properly trimmed and maintained so as to prevent contact with power lines and other electrical equipment. In the construction, repair, maintenance, and operation of such equipment and power lines the Defendants, and each of them, had an obligation to comply with statutes, regulations, and standards, specifically including, but not limited to, Public Resource Code 4292, Public Resource Code 4293, General Order 95, and General Order 165. In addition, the Defendants, and each of them, were specifically aware that such standards and regulations were minimum standards and that Defendants, and each of them, had a duty to make their lines safe under all the exigencies created by the surrounding circumstances and conditions and that a failure to do so constituted negligence and would expose members of the general public to a serious risk of injury or death.
- 5.2 At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were aware that the State of California had been in a state of drought and the summer months exacerbated drought-like conditions. Defendants, and each of them, were aware that the drought conditions had existed and were aware that fire danger was at an extraordinarily high level. In fact, Defendants were aware that just months before the Camp Fire, less than 100 miles away, the Carr Fire, ignited by the mechanical failure of a vehicle, had ignited brush by the roadside and spread rapidly, burned over 220,000 acres of land. Defendants, and each of them, knew that if the power lines or other equipment came into contact with, or caused electricity to come into contact with, vegetation it was probable that a fire would result and that, given the drought conditions, a resulting fire would likely result in the loss of life, significant damage to real and personal property and damage to members of the general public, including these Plaintiffs.
- 5.3 Defendants, and each of them, were negligent in that they failed to properly maintain, repair, and inspect the subject lines, equipment and adjacent vegetation and negligently

failed to properly trim, prune, remove, and/or otherwise maintain vegetation near their electrical equipment so as to secure safety to the public in general, specifically including these Plaintiffs. As a direct, proximate, and legal result of the negligence of the Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs suffered the injuries and damages alleged herein.

5.4 On information and belief, beginning on or about November 8, 2018 as a direct and proximate result of the negligence of the Defendants, and each of them, power lines and/or other electrical equipment and/or sparks therefrom came in contact with vegetation and caused the Camp Fire, which burned in excess of 150,000 acres, including property owned or occupied by these Plaintiffs.

6.0

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 6.1 Defendants are, and were, aware of the danger from fires in Butte County during the summer months when environmental conditions are favorable for extensive conflagration and the high temperatures, absence of moisture, and the prevalence of wind renders the extinguishment of a burning fire difficult. As with previous years, the summer conditions continued into November of 2018.
- 6.2 Wires and other equipment carrying electricity are a dangerous instrumentality and a hazardous and dangerous activity requiring the exercise of increased care commensurate with and proportionate to that increased danger so as to make the transport of electricity through wires safe under all circumstances and exigencies offered by the surrounding environment, including the risk of fire.
- 6.3 Defendants failed in their duty to exercise care commensurate with and proportionate to the combined danger of an area susceptible to wildfire and the dangerous activity of wires carrying electricity, thereby being a substantial factor in the cause of the fires, as more fully set forth below.
- 6.4 The conditions and circumstances existing at the time of the ignition at the Camp Fire's origin area, including the extended drought, high temperature, low humidity, and tinder-like dryness of vegetation, were reasonably foreseeable, if not expected, by a reasonable and

and/or otherwise collaborated with the DOE Defendants and/or other parties to perform work along and maintain the network of distribution lines, infrastructure, and vegetation. The work for which the DOE Defendants were hired involved a risk of fire that was peculiar to the nature of the agency relationship. A reasonable property/easement owner and/or lessee in the position of the PG&E knew, or should have recognized, the necessity of taking special precautions to protect adjoining property owners against the risk of harm created by work performed, work to be performed, and/or work otherwise not performed.

- 7.5 Defendants, and each of them, knew or should have known that the activities of the DOE Defendants, and/or other parties, involved a risk that was peculiar to the operation of Defendants' business that was foreseeable and arose from the nature and/or location of the work. Notwithstanding this, Defendants, and each of them, failed to take reasonable precautions to protect adjoining property owners against the foreseeable risk of harm created by their activities.
- 7.6 Defendants, and each of them, have special knowledge and expertise far above that of a layperson that they were required to apply to the design, engineering, construction, use, operation, inspection, repair, and maintenance of electrical lines, infrastructure, equipment, and vegetation in order to assure safety under all the local conditions in their service area, including but not limited to, those conditions identified herein.
 - 7.7 Defendants negligently breached their duties by, among other things:
 - a. Failing to conduct reasonably prompt, proper, and frequent inspections of the electrical transmission lines, wires, and associated equipment;
 - b. Failing to design, construct, monitor, and maintain high voltage transmission and distribution lines in a manner that avoids igniting fire during long, dry seasons by allowing those lines to withstand foreseeable conditions and avoid igniting fires;
 - Failing to design, construct, operate, and maintain high voltage transmission and distribution lines and equipment to withstand foreseeable conditions to avoid igniting fires;
 - d. Failing to maintain and monitor high voltage transmission and distribution lines in fire prone areas so as to avoid igniting and spreading fires;

- e. Failing to install the equipment necessary, and/or to inspect and repair the equipment installed, to prevent electrical transmission and distribution lines from improperly sagging, operating or making contact with other metal wires placed on its poles and igniting fires;
- f. Failing to keep equipment in a safe condition at all times to prevent fires;
- g. Failing to inspect vegetation within proximity to energized transmission and distribution lines;
- h. Failing to de-energize power lines during fire prone conditions;
- i. Failing to de-energize power lines after the fire's ignition;
- j. Failing to properly investigate, vet, hire, train, and supervise employees and agents responsible for maintenance and inspection of the distribution lines;
- k. Failing to implement and follow regulations and reasonably prudent practices to avoid fire ignition;
- Failing to properly investigate, monitor, and maintain vegetation sufficient to mitigate the risk of fire; and
- m. Failing to repair faulty equipment.
- 7.8 The fire alleged herein was a direct, legal, and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 to 100, and each of them. Defendants, and each of them, further breached their duties owed to Plaintiffs in that said Defendants (1) failed to comply with the applicable statutes, regulations and standards, (2) failed to timely and properly maintain and inspect the subject line and adjacent vegetation, (3) failed to properly cut, trim, prune, and/or otherwise keep vegetation from contact with its line, and (4) failed to make the overhead lines safe under all the exigencies created by the surrounding circumstances and conditions. Defendants, and each of them, negligently installed, constructed, maintained, operated, inspected, and/or repaired the line and as a direct, proximate, and legal result the line caused a fire and Plaintiffs' damages. As a direct, proximate, and legal result of said negligence these Plaintiffs suffered damages as alleged herein.
 - 7.9 At all times mentioned herein, Defendants PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC

GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 to 100, and each of them, failed to properly inspect and maintain the subject line and equipment which they knew, given the then existing drought conditions, posed a risk of serious injury, damage or death to others, including Plaintiffs. Defendants PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 to 100, and each of them, were aware that if the subject line and/or subject equipment came in contact with vegetation that a fire would likely result. Defendants, and each of them, also knew that, given the existing drought like conditions, said fire was likely to pose a risk of serious injury, danger, and/or death to the general public, including these Plaintiffs.

7.10 Over the past approximately 10 years Defendants, PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 to 100, and each of them, have been subject to numerous fines and penalties as a result of PG&E's ongoing failure to abide by safety rules and regulations. On or around April 9, 2015, the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") imposed a record \$1.6 billion fine/penalty on PG&E for safety violations that resulted in eight deaths, numerous injuries, and the destruction of 38 homes related to the San Bruno Fire, the largest imposed on any American public utility. One of the stated purposes of the CPUC in rendering such a record fine against PG&E was to "ensure that nothing like this happens again." PG&E was also subjected to significant fines and penalties for its role in causing the Butte Fire. In addition, PG&E's disregard for safety has resulted in federal criminal charges. The United States of America has charged PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY with various crimes based on PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY's knowing and willful violation of various minimum safety standards. Despite these penalties and fines, these Defendants have failed and refused to modify their behavior and they have continued to conduct their business with a conscious disregard for the safety of the public. As a result of the continued actions by these Defendants, in conscious disregard for the safety of others, the CPUC ordered an investigation into the culture of ignoring safety at PG&E. The CPUC President recognized that these Defendants have failed and refused to modify their conduct. Despite penalties and fines, in July of 2015, the President of the CPUC, specifically stated:

///

24

25

26

27

28

26

27

28

Despite major public attention, ongoing CPUC investigations (OIIs) and rulemakings (OIRs) into PG&E's actions and operations, including the investigations we voted on today, federal grand jury, and California Department of Justice investigation, continued safety lapses at PG&E continue to occur.

7.11 Nonetheless, Defendants continue to consciously disregard the safety of the public, including these Plaintiffs. Since December 2008, Defendants PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMP ANY and DOES 1 to 100, and each of them, have been responsible for the deaths of at least fourteen people and burns and injuries suffered by at least 40 other people. These figures do not include the Tubbs Fire, which has been attributed to Defendants and caused the deaths of at least 22 people. Defendants have admitted to putting profits over safety and to having violated safety regulations. Prior to the Camp Fire, the PG&E Defendants, acting with conscious disregard for the safety of others, caused the deaths of eight people and destroyed an entire neighborhood in San Bruno, California. Defendants conduct continued with its role in causing the Butte Fire. The deaths, injuries, and damage occasioned by the Camp Fire are the result of the ongoing custom and practice of the Defendants, and each of them, of consciously disregarding the safety of the public and not following statues, regulations, standards and rules regarding their business operations. Despite having caused the death and injury to numerous people, these Defendants have continued to act in conscious disregard for the safety of others, and have ratified the conduct of their employees. Upon information and belief, no employee has been disciplined or discharged as a result of failing and/or refusing to comply with the regulations and/or as a result of the deaths of members of the public. These Defendants, in order to cut costs, failed to properly inspect and maintain the subject line and/or the subject equipment with full knowledge that any incident was likely to result in a fire that would burn and/or kill people, damage property, and/or cause harm to the general public, including these Plaintiffs. The actions of these Defendants, and each of them, did in fact result in damages to these Plaintiffs. The Defendants, and each of them, failed to make the proper inspections, remove vegetation, and failed to safely operate their line, in order to save money, while at the same time spending millions of dollars on a television advertising campaign falsely representing to the public that the

1	

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Trespass

(Against PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 through 100)

- 9.1 Plaintiffs incorporate and re-allege each of the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein at length.
- 9.2 At all times relevant herein, Plaintiffs were the owners and lawful occupiers of property damaged by the Camp Fire.
- 9.3 Defendants negligently allowed the Camp Fire to ignite and/or spread out of control, causing injury to Plaintiffs. The spread of a negligently caused fire to the land of another constitutes a trespass.
- 9.4 Plaintiffs did not grant permission for Defendants to cause the Camp Fire to enter their properties.
- 9.5 As a direct, proximate, and substantial cause of the trespass, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer damages, including but not limited to damage to property, discomfort, annoyance, and emotional distress in an amount to be proved at the time of trial.
- 9.6 As a further direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs, have hired and retained counsel to recover compensation for loss and damage and are entitled to recover all attorney's fees, expert fees, consultant fees, and litigation costs and expense, as allowed under California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 1021.9.
- 9.7 As a further direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs seek treble or double damages for wrongful injuries to timber, trees, or underwood on their property, as allowed under California Civil Code, Section 3346.
- 9.8 Defendants' conduct was willful and wanton, and with a conscious contempt and disdain for the disastrous consequences that Defendants knew could occur as a result of their dangerous conduct. Accordingly, Defendants acted with malice towards Plaintiffs, which is an appropriate predicate fact for an award of exemplary/punitive damages in a sum according to

1	proof.		
2	10.0		
3	FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION		
4	Private Nuisance		
5	(Against PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES		
6	1 through 100)		
7	10.1 Plaintiffs incorporate and re-allege each of the paragraphs above as though fully		
8	set forth herein at length.		
9	10.2 Defendants' actions, conduct, omissions, negligence, trespass and failure to act		
10	resulted in a fire hazard and a foreseeable obstruction to the free use of Plaintiffs property,		
11	invaded the right to use the Plaintiffs' property, and interfered with the enjoyment of Plaintiffs'		
12	property, causing the Plaintiffs unreasonable harm and substantial actual damages constituting a		
13	nuisance, pursuant to California Civil Code Section 3479.		
14	10.3 As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs sustained		
15	loss and damage, including but not limited to damage to property, discomfort, annoyance, and		
16	emotional distress, the amount of which will be proven at trial.		
17	10.4 Defendants' conduct was willful and wanton, and with a conscious contempt and		
18	disdain for the disastrous consequences that Defendants knew could occur as a result of their		
19	dangerous conduct. Accordingly, Defendants acted with malice towards Plaintiffs, which is an		
20	appropriate predicate fact for an award of exemplary/punitive damages in a sum according to		
21	proof.		
22	11.0		
23	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION		
24	Claim Under Public Utilities Code 2106		
25	(Against PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1 through 100)		
26	Plaintiffs incorporate and re-allege each of the paragraphs above as though fully		
27	set forth herein at length.		
28	11.2 As Public Utilities, Defendants are legally required to comply with the rules and		
	-18-		

1	4.	4. Past and future medical expenses and incidental expenses according to proof at		
2		trial;		
3	5.	5. Attorney's fees, expert fees, consultant fees, and litigation costs and expense, as		
4		allowed under California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 1021.9;		
5	6.	Treble or double damages for wrongful injuries to timber, trees, or underwood on		
6		their property, as allowed under California Civil Code, Section 3346;		
7	7.	Punitive/exemplary damages;		
8	8.	8. All costs of suit;		
9	9.	Prejudgment interest, according to proof;		
10	10	. General damages for fear, worry, annoyance, disturbance, inconvenience, mental		
11		anguish, emotional distress, loss of quiet enjoyment of property, personal injury;		
12		and		
13	11	. For such other and further relief as the Court shall deem proper, all according to		
14		proof.		
15	For Invers	se Condemnation:		
16	1.	Repair, depreciation, and/or replacement of damaged, destroyed, and/or lost		
17		personal and/or real property;		
18	2.	Loss of the use, benefit, goodwill, and enjoyment of Plaintiffs' real and/or personal		
19		property;		
20	3.	Loss of wages, earning capacity, and/or business profits or proceeds, and/or any		
21		related displacement expenses;		
22	4.	All costs of suit, including attorneys' fees where appropriate, appraisal fees,		
23		engineering fees, and related costs;		
24	5.	Prejudgment interest according to proof; and		
25	6.	For such other and further relief as the Court shall deem proper, all according to		
26		proof.		
27	///			
28	///			
		-21-		
	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES			

1	Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial on all causes of action for which a jury is available		
2	under the law.		
3	Dated: December 7, 2018	CUTTER LAW P.C.	
4			
5		By:	
6		John G. Roussas Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
7		Auomeys for Plaintiffs	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		-22-	