1 2	CHRIS PURCELL, ESQ., SBN 145483 CHRISTINA D. BENNETT, ESQ., SBN 251842 PURCELL LAW 1539 E. 4 th Street Santa Ana, CA 92701 Phone: (714) 884-3006 Fax: (714) 884-3007			
3	1539 E. 4 th Street Santa Ana CA 02701 FILED			
4	Phone: (714) 884-3006 Eav: (714) 884-3006 Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles			
5	Attorneys for: Plaintiff, DAVID SOLOMON JAN 24 2014			
_	Sherri R: Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk			
FSC 7	07/10/2015 TRIAL: 07/24/2015 OSC: 01/24/2017 By Alyera Ethan Deputy Myrna Beltran			
8	D-92 EZIA WETNBACH SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA			
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
10	DAVID SOLOMON,) CASE NO.:			
11				
12	COMPLAINT			
13	SDINAL SOLUTIONS INC. BOCED			
13	SPINAL SOLUTIONS, INC; ROGER) WILLIAMS; MARY WILLIAMS;) CROWDER MACHINE AND TOOL SHOP:			
15	WILLIAM CROWDER, PHYSICIANS OF)			
16	MIDWAY, INC.; OLYMPIA MEDICAL) CENTER; AND DOES 1 to 30, inclusive,			
17	Defendant(s).			
18	Berendam(s).			
19	TO THE COURT:			
20	COMES NOW, Plaintiff, David Solomon, and for his Complaint in this matter, to allege as			
21	follows:			
22	1. Plaintiff is an individual who at all times relevant herein has resided in the State of California.			
23	2. Defendant, Spinal Solutions, Inc. ("Spinal Solutions"), is a corporation organized under the			
24	laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in Murrietan 使alifornia. "Defendants,"			
25	Roger Williams and Mary Williams, are owners, operators and/or management of Spinal Solutions. 召			
26	3. Defendant, Crowder Machine and Tool Shop, is a business entity of form unknown docate ලි			
27	in Temecula, California. Defendant, William Crowder, is an individual who, plaintiff is informed and			
28	believes and thereon alleges, has an ownership interest in and operates Crowder Machine and Tool Shop.			

1 COMPLAINT

F-9 []]

د.اً.

0 1 4

- 4. Defendant, Physicians of Midway, Inc. (hereinafter "Olympia") is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California that owns and operates the Olympia Medical Center, located in the City of Los Angeles.
- 5. The true names, identities and capacities, whether individual, associate, corporate or otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 30, inclusive, and each of them, are unknown to plaintiff at this time, who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names. When the true names, identities, capacities or participation of such fictitiously designated defendants are ascertained, plaintiff will ask leave of the Court to amend this complaint to insert said true names, identities and capacities.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of the defendants sued herein as a "Doe" is responsible in some manner for the events and happenings herein referred to, thereby proximately causing the injuries and damages to plaintiff as hereinafter set forth.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, each of the defendants sued herein was the agent, servant and/or employee of each other, and of his, her or its said co-defendants and was, as such, acting within the time, place, purpose and scope of the said agency, service and/or employment; that each of the defendants, as aforesaid, when acting as a principal, was negligent in the selection and hiring of each and every other defendant, as an agent, servant and/or employee.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 8. Plaintiff, David Solomon, was involved in an automobile accident and suffered serious injuries in 2007. These injuries included, inter alia, injuries to his back.
- 9. Plaintiff received treatments for his back injuries but his condition did not improve. After consulting Dr. John Regan, plaintiff decided to undergo lumbar fusion surgery. The initial surgery took place on December 18, 2011. As a part of the surgery, two pedicle screws were placed in plaintiff's back. The screws were manufactured by defendants Crowder Machine & Tool Shop and William Crowder and/or Does 1 to 10, inclusive, and were distributed by defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams and/or Does 11 to 20, inclusive.
- 10. The screws placed in plaintiff's back, as alleged in paragraph 10, above, were counterfeit screws that were not approved by the Federal Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") and were

defective. Plaintiff is informed and believe that defendants Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams and/or Does 1 to 20, inclusive, knowingly manufactured and distributed the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws as part of scheme to deceive medical professionals and the public by charging inflated prices for cheap, non FDA-approved, counterfeit and defective pedicle screws, as well as other medical devices and equipment, for the prices commanded by pedicle screws, or other medical devices and equipment, that were approved by the FDA.

- 11. Subsequent to the surgery of December 18, 2011, plaintiff developed additional pains and problems in his back. Plaintiff learned in late 2012 that the screws that had been placed in his back were defective. One of the one-inch screws, installed at S-1, broke, requiring plaintiff to undergo replacement surgery. The replacement surgery was performed by Dr. Regan on February 27, 2013.
- 12. Plaintiff continues to suffer pain, loss of movement, emotional distress and other ill effects from the implantation of the defective and counterfeit screws manufactured and distributed by defendants Crowder Machine & Tool Shp and William Crowder, Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams and/or Does 1 to 20, inclusive, and each of them.
- 13. Plaintiff has been informed by physicians that he can expect to continue to suffer pain, loss of movement, emotional distress and other ill effects from the implantation of the defective and counterfeit screws manufactured and distributed by defendants Crowder Machine & Tool Shp and William Crowder, Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams and/or Does 1 to 20, inclusive, into the indefinite future.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Products Liability, Against Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive)

- 14. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 13, above, as if restated in full.
- 15. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive, and each of them, knowingly and intentionally manufactured and distributed counterfeit and defective pedicle screws for use in surgery and implantation in human beings such as plaintiff. The scheme of defendants was elaborate, involving not only the manufacture of the counterfeit and defective screws but also the creation of false

(E)

15

2

3

5

6

10

11

documentation and packaging materials to make it appear that the screws had been manufactured by FDA-approved manufacturers. The scheme of defendants also involved overcharging insurance companies and other payors for the counterfeit and defective screws through the creation and submission of false, fraudulent and/or grossly inflated invoices. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the counterfeit and defective screws manufactured and distributed by defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive, were implanted in thousands of persons throughout the United States.

- 16. The counterfeit and defective screws manufactured and distributed by defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive, and each of them, were not reasonably fit for the purpose for which they were to be used, i.e., implantation in human beings in spinal fusion and other surgeries.
- 17. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive, and each of them, knew that said counterfeit and defective pedicle screws were not reasonably fit to be implanted into human beings, but deliberately and callously manufactured and distributed them knowing that they would be used for such purpose. Said defendants further knew that said pedicle screws would not be inspected prior to their use in human beings, and further said defendants actively attempted to prevent said screws from being inspected. through the artifice of creating false documentation and packaging for said screws in order to make it appear that they had been manufactured by an FDA-approved manufacturer. Said defendants either knew that the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws they were manufacturing and distributing would break and cause injury and damages to persons such as plaintiff, or they knew there was a substantial certainty that said counterfeit and defective pedicle screws would break and cause injury and damages to persons such as plaintiff, but recklessly disregarded such substantial certainty. The acts of defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive, in manufacturing and distributing the counterfeit and defective screws for implantation into persons were despicable, fraudulent and undertaken in deliberate violation of the rights of plaintiff and persons similarly situated.
 - 18. The counterfeit and defective screws manufactured and distributed by defendants Spinal

Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive, were implanted into plaintiff in the surgery of December 18, 2011, subsequently failed. The failure of said screws was not apparent to plaintiff and was not discovered by plaintiff until, at the earliest, November 2012. Such failure was a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer physical injury and emotional distress as alleged hereinabove, and in requiring plaintiff to undergo further surgery and treatments.

- 19. The failure of the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws manufactured and distributed by defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive, and each of them, was a substantial factor in causing severe injury and damages to plaintiff as alleged hereinabove, in an amount according to proof but substantially in excess of the minimum needed to invoke the Unlimited Civil jurisdiction of the Court.
- 20. The actions of defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, inclusive, and each of them, as alleged above were despicable and constitute malice, fraud and oppression, as defined by Civil Code § 3294, and further entitle plaintiff to an award of exemplary damages, in an amount determined by the Court to be just, to punish defendants and deter them from any such actions in the future. Punitive damages.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Medical Battery; Against Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20)

- 21. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 20, above, as if restated in full, except those inconsistent with the claim for Medical Battery.
- 22. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, knew and intended that the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws they manufactured and distributed would be implanted in human beings in medical procedures such as the fusion that plaintiff underwent. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, actively concealed the counterfeit and defective nature of said pedicle screws because, in part, they knew that persons such as plaintiff would not consent to the implantation of said

screws if they knew their true nature and because they knew that health care providers would not use said pedicle screws if they knew their true nature.

- 23. The active concealment by defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, of the true nature of the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws prevented plaintiff from giving informed consent to the implantation of such screws in his body. Said defendants, and each of them, intended that said counterfeit and defective pedicle screws would be implanted into persons such as plaintiff without their consent, and by their manufacture, distribution and sale of such counterfeit and defective pedicle screws defendants caused them to be implanted into plaintiff, and into other persons situated similarly to plaintiff.
- 24. The active concealment by defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, of the true nature of the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws prevented the health care providers who treated plaintiff from discovering that said screws were counterfeit and defective and prevented said providers from obtaining the informed consent of plaintiff to the implantation of such screws in his body.
- 25. The active concealment by defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, of the true nature of the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws caused a medical procedure, to which plaintiff did not give his informed consent, to be performed on plaintiff. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, knew and intended that such procedures would be performed on persons such as plaintiff, without their informed consent and without even the possibility of their informed consent, when they manufactured and distributed said counterfeit and defective pedicle screws. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, are liable to plaintiff for all injuries and damage caused by the performing of said medical procedure, to which plaintiff had not given his informed consent.
- 26. The implantation of the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws in plaintiff caused severe injury and damage to plaintiff, in an amount according to proof but substantially in excess of the

minimum needed to invoke the Unlimited Civil jurisdiction of the Court. The actions of defendants, and each of them, as alleged above were despicable and constitute malice, fraud and oppression, as defined by Civil Code § 3294, and further entitle plaintiff to an award of exemplary damages, in an amount determined by the Court to be just, to punish defendants and deter them from any such actions in the future.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Fraud, Against Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20)

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 26, above, as if restated in full, except those inconsistent with the claim for Fraud.
- 28. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, deliberately manufactured and distributed counterfeit and defective pedicle screws for implantation into persons such as plaintiff during surgical procedures.
- 29. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, deliberately, intentionally, and actively concealed the facts that said pedicle screws were counterfeit and defective through, inter alia, the creation of deceptive and false documentation and packaging that was intended to make it appear that said screws had been manufactured by FDA-approved manufacturers. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, placed said counterfeit and defective pedicle screws into the stream of commerce with such deceptive and false documentation and packaging.
- 30. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, knew and intended that health care providers would rely on the false documentation and packaging that accompanied the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws and would then use such screws in medical procedures.
- 31. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, knew and intended that persons such as plaintiff would rely

either on the false documentation and packaging that accompanied the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws, or on their health care providers to select FDA-approved pedicle screws for implantation in them, and thereby consent to the implantation of such counterfeit and defective pedicle screws in them during surgical procedures.

- 32. Plaintiff in fact did rely on the false documentation and packaging that accompanied the counterfeit and defective pedicle screws, and/or on his health care providers to select FDA-approved pedicle screws for implantation in him. Plaintiff would not have consented to the implantation of said counterfeit and defective screws in his body if he had known their true nature.
- 33. The implantation of said counterfeit and defective screws in the body of plaintiff was a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer severe injury and damages. Plaintiff's damages are in an amount according to proof but substantially in excess of the minimum needed to invoke the Unlimited Civil jurisdiction of the Court. The actions of defendants, and each of them, as alleged above were despicable and constitute malice, fraud and oppression, as defined by Civil Code § 3294, and further entitle plaintiff to an award of exemplary damages, in an amount determined by the Court to be just, to punish defendants and deter them from any such actions in the future.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligence, Against Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20)

- 34. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 33, above, as if restated in full, except those inconsistent with the claim for Negligence.
- 35. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, as manufacturers and distributors of pedicle screws intended for implantation in human beings, had a duty of care to plaintiff, and persons situated similarly to plaintiff, to manufacture and distribute pedicle screws that were reasonably safe and effective for implantation into human beings and which complied with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations.
- 36. Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, breached their duty of care to

plaintiff, and to persons situated similarly to plaintiff, by manufacturing and distributing pedicle screws that were not reasonably safe and effective for implantation into human beings and/or which did not comply with one or more applicable federal and state laws and regulations.

37. The breach of duty by defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, and Does 1 through 20, and each of them, was a substantial factor in causing severe injury and damage to plaintiff, in an amount according to proof but substantially in excess of the minimum needed to invoke the Unlimited Civil jurisdiction of the Court.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligence, Against Olympia Medical Center, and Does 21 through 30)

- 38. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 37, above, as if restated in full, except those inconsistent with the claim for Negligence.
- 39. Defendant Physicians of Midway, Inc. (hereinafter "Olympia") and Olympia Medical Center, and Does 21 through 30, and each of them, had a duty of care to plaintiff, and to persons situated similarly to plaintiff, to use pedicle screws that were reasonably safe and effective for implantation into human beings and which complied with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations, in medical procedures such as the spinal fusion surgery performed on plaintiff.
- 40. Defendant Physicians of Midway, Inc. (hereinafter "Olympia") and Olympia Medical Center, and Does 21 through 30, and each of them, breached their duty of care to plaintiff by using and implanting into plaintiff pedicle screws that were not reasonably safe and effective for implantation into human beings and/or which did not comply with one or more applicable federal and state laws and regulations. Plaintiff has complied with the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure § 364 and has given notice to defendants of his intent to bring this action.
- 41. Said breach of duty by defendant Defendant Physicians of Midway, Inc. (hereinafter "Olympia") and Olympia Medical Center, and Does 21 through 30, and each of them, was a substantial factor in causing severe injury and damage to plaintiff, in an amount according to proof but substantially in excess of the minimum needed to invoke the Unlimited Civil jurisdiction of the Court.

//// ////

٤إ.

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(RICO, Against Defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, Olympia, Olympia Medical Center and Does 1 through 30)

- 42. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 41 above, as if restated in full, except those inconsistent with the claim for RICO.
- 43. Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, Olympia, and Does 1 through 30, inclusive, and each of them, formed and participated in an enterprise (the "Enterprise") to defraud insurance companies and other payors of health care costs through the manufacture and distribution of counterfeit and defective pedicle screws, and other counterfeit and defective medical equipment and devices, including, inter alia, rods to be implanted into human beings in surgery.
- 44. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the purpose of said Enterprise to generate profits for its participants through the manufacture and distribution of said counterfeit and defective pedicle screws and medical equipment and devices. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the participants in the scheme realized profits through the lower costs incurred in manufacturing counterfeit and defective items instead of purchasing said items from FDA-approved manufacturers, and also by substantial and unconscionable inflating of charges for said counterfeit and defective items. Plaintiff is informed and believes that thereon alleges that said Enterprise constituted an "enterprise" as that term is defined by the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act ("RICO") found at 18 U.S.C. § 1961, et seq. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that said Enterprise used the instrumentalities of interstate commerce in furtherance of its racketeering activities, including but not limited to the use of interstate transport and distribution of counterfeit and defective medical devices and equipment, and the use of the United States Mail, telephonic and electronic forms of communication. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that the predicate acts committed in furtherance of the activities of the Enterprise violated, inter alia, the federal mail fraud and wire fraud statutes, including but not limited to 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and 1343, as well as regulations promulgated by the FDA governing the manufacture, distribution, sale and use of medical equipment and devices.

(1)

J.

45. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that the participants in the Enterprise – defendants Spinal Solutions, Roger Williams, Mary Williams, Crowder Machine & Tool Shop, William Crowder, Olympia, Olympia Medical Center and Does 1 through 30, and each of them -- knew and intended its violations of statutes and regulations as alleged above, and intended to profit, and did profit, therefrom.

46. The actions of the Enterprise were a substantial factor in causing substantial injury and damage to plaintiff, in an amount according to proof but substantially in excess of the minimum needed to invoke the Unlimited Civil jurisdiction of the Court. The actions of said Enterprise have also required plaintiff to obtain attorneys and to incur attorneys' fees in order to vindicate his rights which were violated by the Enterprise.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for relief, as follows:

- 1. On all causes of action, for all compensatory economic and noneconomic damages allowable by law;
- 2. On the First, Second, and Third Causes of Action, for exemplary damages in an amount determined to be just;
- 3. On the Sixth Cause of Action, for a trebling of all permissible damages as allowed by the RICO statute, 18 U.S.C. § 1961, et seq;
 - 4. For costs of suit herein; and
 - 5. For all other relief that the Court determines is just and proper.

DATED: January 22, 2014

PURCELL LAW

Chris Purcell, Esq.

Christina D. Bennett, Esq.

Attorney for Plaintiff, DAVID SOLOMON

		CM-010		
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State-Lar I	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY		
Chris Purcell, SBN 145483 / Christina B	ennett, SBN 251842			
PURCELL LAW				
1539 E. 4th Street		eu er		
Santa Ana, CA 92701		FILED		
7.1.00.1.00.		Superior Court of California		
TELEPHONE NO.: 714-884-3006	FAX NO.: 714-884-3007	County of Los Angeles		
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): David Solomon		1441 0 4 2041		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS	Angeles	JAN 24 2014		
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street	-			
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street		\$herri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk		
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90012		By Myree Office Deputy		
BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk Courthous		Myrna Beltran		
CASE NAME: Solomon v. Spinal Solution	ns, Inc., et al.			
CIVIL CASE COVER CHEET	Compley Cose Designation	CASE NI IMPER		
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER: 534074		
X Unlimited Limited (Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder			
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defenda	ant JUDGE:		
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT:		
Items 1-6 be	low must be completed (see instructions	s on page 2).		
1. Check one box below for the case type that	best describes this case:			
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation		
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)		
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)		
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	= ` '	Construction defect (10)		
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)			
Achastas (O4)	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)		
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)		
X Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)		
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the		
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case		
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)		
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment		
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer			
		Enforcement of judgment (20)		
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint		
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)		
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)		
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Miscellaneous Civil Petition		
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)		
Employment				
Wrongful termination (36)	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)		
	Writ of mandate (02)			
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)			
2. This case is X is not comp	ex under rule 3.400 of the California Ru	les of Court. If the case is complex, mark the		
factors requiring exceptional judicial manage	ement:	•		
a. Large number of separately repres		of witnesses		
b. Extensive motion practice raising of	difficult or novet e. L Coordination v	vith related actions pending in one or more courts		
issues that will be time-consuming	to resolve in other counti	ies, states, or countries, or in a federal court		
c. Substantial amount of documentar	y evidence f. Substantial po	estjudgment judicial supervision		
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.	X monetary b. nonmonetary; c	declaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive		
4. Number of causes of action (specify): Six				
; — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —				
	ss action suit.			
If there are any known related cases, file ar	nd serve a notice of related case. (You re	may use form CM-015)		
Date: January 22, 2014				
Chris Purcell, SBN 145483 / Christina Bennett				
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		GNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)		
*·.	NOTICE			
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the fi	rst paper filed in the action or proceedin	g (except small claims cases or cases filed		
under the Probate Code, Family Code, or W	elfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rule	s of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result		
in sanctions.	a almost as as due of the state			
 File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule. If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all 				
other parties to the action or proceeding.				
 Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only. 				
		Page 1 of 2		

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]

BC534n74

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case: CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 14

Item II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps - If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):

Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.

Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case.

Step 3: In Column C, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0.

Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)

- Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage). Location where cause of action arose.
- Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred. Location where performance required or defendant resides.
- 6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.
- Location where petitioner resides. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
- Location where one or more of the parties reside.
 Location of Labor Commissioner Office

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

Auto Tort Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort ندو

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto (22)	□ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Asbestos (04)	□ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage □ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
Product Liability (24)	☑ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
Medical Malpractice (45)	□ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons □ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	 □ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) □ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) □ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress □ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death 	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

4

Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

Employment

Contract

Unlawful Detainer 🛴 🔑 TReal Property

1,5

Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
Civil Rights (08)	Rights (08) A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	
Defamation (13)	☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	1 (16)	
Professional Negligence (25)	☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3.
Other (35)	☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	□ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (13)	☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	10.
	☐ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)	2., 5.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06)	☐ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence)	2., 5.
(not insurance)	☐ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud)	1., 2., 5.
	☐ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	□ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff	2., 5., 6.
Conections (09)	□ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5.
Insurance Coverage (18)	□ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	☐ A6009 Contractual Fraud	1., 2., 3., 5.
Other Contract (37)	☐ A6031 Tortious Interference	1., 2., 3., 5.
	☐ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 8.
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	□ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
	□ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure	2., 6.
Other Real Property (26)	☐ A6032 Quiet Title	2., 6.
	☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	I I A6020 Unlawful Detainer Recidential (not drugg or unemetal existing)	
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	□ A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

Solomon v. Spinal Solutions, Inc., et al.

CASE NUMBER

В C Civil Case Cover Sheet Type of Action Applicable Reasons -Category No. See Step 3 Above (Check only one) ☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case Asset Forfeiture (05) 2., 6. **Judicial Review** Petition re Arbitration (11) ☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration 2., 5. A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus 2., 8. Writ of Mandate (02) ☐ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter 2. 2. A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review Other Judicial Review (39) □ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review 2., 8. Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03) A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation 1., 2., 8. Provisionally Complex Litigation Construction Defect (10) ☐ A6007 Construction Defect 1., 2., 3. Claims Involving Mass Tort A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort 1., 2., 8. (40)Securities Litigation (28) ☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case 1., 2., 8. Toxic Tort ☐ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental 1., 2., 3., 8. Environmental (30) Insurance Coverage Claims ☐ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only) 1., 2., 5., 8. from Complex Case (41) ☐ A6141 Sister State Judgment 2., 9. ☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment Inforcement of Judgment 2., 6. □ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) Enforcement 2., 9. of Judgment (20) A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) 2., 8. A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax 2., 8. ☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case 2., 8., 9. **RICO (27)** ☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case 1., 2., 8. Civil Complaints Miscellaneous ☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only 1., 2., 8. □ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) 2., 8. Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42) A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) 1., 2., 8. ☐ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex) 1., 2., 8. Partnership Corporation □ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case 2., 8. Governance (21) 1---A6121 Civil Harassment 2., 3., 9. Miscellaneous Civil Petitions ☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment 2., 3., 9. ☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case 2., 3., 9. Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) A6190 Election Contest 2. (43)A6110 Petition for Change of Name 2., 7. A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law 2., 3., 4., 8. (3) ☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition 2., 9. į.,,2 4

SHORT TITLE: Solomon v. Spinal Solutions, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER

Item III. Statement of Location: Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other circumstance indicated in Item II., **Step 3** on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.

REASON: Check the appr under Column C for the ty this case.	opriate boxes for the nu pe of action that you hav	mbers shown e selected for	ADDRESS: 5900 W. Olympic Boulevard
□1. □2. □3. ☑4.	□5. □6. □7. □8. □	□ 9. □10.	
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:	
Los Angeles	CA	90036	
and correct and that the	above-entitled matter	is properly file	erjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true for assignment to the Stanley Mosk courthouse in the rnia, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) a	nd (d)].		
Dated: January 22, 201	4		TSIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.

ارموروا الموجوا

, 1.

h. Ja

ئة: إ. "ني

N O

ند. ، إ

Į.