1 2 3 4 5 6	MARTIN D. SINGER (BAR NO. 78166) MICHAEL D. HOLTZ (BAR NO. 149616 EVAN N. SPIEGEL (BAR NO. 198071) LAVELY & SINGER PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 2049 Century Park East, Suite 2400 Los Angeles, California 90067-2906 Ph: (310) 556-3501 Fax: (310) 556-3615 Attorneys for Plaintiff GABRIELA JOHANSSON Case	LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT MAY 1 9 2005 JOHN A. CLARKE, EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK BY J. SUNGA, DEPUTY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9		S ANGELES - CENTRAL DISTRICT
10		
11	GABRIELA JOHANSSON, an individual,) CASE NO. BC 333681
12	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR:
13	v.) (1) FRAUD - INTENTIONAL
14	TERRY RICHARDSON, an individual;	MISREPRESENTATION; (2) FRAUD - CONSTRUCTIVE FRAUD;
15	and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,) (3) FRAUD - FRAUDULENT) CONCEALMENT;) (4) RESCISSION;
16	Defendants.) (4) RESCISSION;) (5) MISAPPROPRIATION OF RIGHT OF PUBLICITY;
17		(6) INVASION OF PRIVACY; (7) FALSE LIGHT INVASION OF
18		PRIVACY; (8) BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT;
19		(9) BREACH OF IMPLIED CONTRACT; (10) BREACH OF COVENANT OF GOOD
20 21		FAITH AND FAIR DEALING; (11) INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF
22		EMOTIONAL DISTRESS; (12) DECLARATORY RELIEF; (13) INTINCTIVE DELLE
23	CIT/CASE: RECEIPT #: DATE PAID: PAYMENT: RECEIVED: CHE CAS: CHA	(13) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
24	20 Jb (0 M)	[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]
25	8C333681 E CH2801 05/19/05 \$299.50 \$EK; 29 H;	[CONT XIMIL DEMANDED]
26	1 LEA 80104 705 299,	
27	/DEF#: 031 12:33:43 PM 03:10	
28	8 5 5 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	

3696-2\PLE\COM 042505

COMPLAINT

THE NATURE OF THIS ACTION

1. This Complaint is brought by Plaintiff GABRIELA JOHANSSON ("Plaintiff" and/or "Johansson"), an established professional model, against Defendant TERRY RICHARDSON ("Defendant" and/or "Richardson"), a smut photographer who posing as a legitimate photographer fraudulently lures professional models into allowing him to photograph them for alleged professional casting auditions, and then exploits their photos as past of a sleazy and tortious scheme.

- 2. Richardson and his related entities and/or agents, under the guise of a "test shoot" session auditioning models for an alleged professional modeling job, conned Johansson and other models through blatant fraud, deceit, false promises, trickery and/or representations into posing for semi-nude and nude photographs. Unbeknownst to Johansson, not only did the alleged professional modeling job not exist, the model "sign-in" and age verification sheet that Richardson and his agents directed Johansson -- a non-native English speaking immigrant -- to sign was not a sign-in sheet but in actuality a purported model release. The purported model release allegedly granted Richardson, without any consideration whatsoever to Johansson or the other models, unlimited rights to use, exploit and disseminate the models' photographs and likenesses for any purpose. Richardson has and continues to wrongfully exploit and disseminate, throughout the world, photographs of Johansson for Richardson's personal use, gain and/or profit, to Johansson's detriment, without the approval or authorization of Johansson and despite her demands that Richardson cease and desist his tortious conduct.
- 3. Based on the substantial harm and damages she has incurred, and to prevent additional damages in the future as a result of Richardson's fraudulent scheme, Johansson claims: (1) Fraud Intentional Misrepresentation; (2) Fraud Constructive Fraud; (3) Fraud Fraudulent Concealment; (4) Rescission; (5) Misappropriation of Right of Publicity; (6) Invasion of Privacy; (7) False Light Invasion of Privacy; (8) Breach of Oral Contract; (9) Breach of Implied Contract; (10) Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing; (11) Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress; and seeks (12) Declaratory Relief; and (13) Injunctive Relief.

THE PARTIES

4. Plaintiff Gabriela Johansson is, and at all times relevant hereto has been, a resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Johansson is an accomplished professional model and at all times relevant hereto has been represented by a professional modeling agency by and through which all modeling castings, bookings and agreements are arranged and negotiated.

- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant Terry Richardson is, and at all times relevant hereto has been, an individual doing business as a professional photographer within the State of California, County of Los Angeles, having operated out of hotels and locales within the County of Los Angeles in furtherance of his fraudulent schemes whereby he preys upon unsuspecting California models and citizens to obtain nude and partially nude photographs which he commercially exploits and/or disseminates. Richardson is a photographer of arguable notoriety, whose works focus on what his press releases describe as "low-culture Americana," "unfettered sexuality" and an "obsessive exploration of myriad erotic themes," but often merely depict images of his own genitalia or that of nude and partially nude women and men engaged in sexual acts.
- 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of such fictitiously named Defendants when the same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged herein and that Plaintiff's damages have been, and will be, proximately caused by their conduct. For convenience, each allegation regarding Defendant Richardson shall apply to each of the Doe Defendants 1 through 50. Defendant Richardson and Doe Defendants 1 through 50 are sometimes hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants" and/or "Richardson," as the context so indicates.
- 7. Defendants designated as Doe Defendants 51 to 100 are Defendants that distribute and disseminate reproductions of photographs for either exhibition, sale to the public or to

8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, employees, partners, joint venturers, co-conspirators, owners, principals, and/or employers of the remaining Defendants, and each of them, and are, and at all times herein mentioned were, acting within the course and scope of that agency, employment, partnership, conspiracy, ownership or joint venture. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon that the acts and conduct alleged herein were known to, authorized and/or ratified by the officers, directors, and managing agents of Defendants, and each of them.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ALLEGATIONS

Casting "Test Shoot" Session

- 9. In or about August 2003, Johansson, a Romanian and non-native English speaking model, received information from Richardson, submitted and received through Johansson's professional modeling agency in Los Angeles, California, LA Models, requesting professional models to attend an alleged professional casting test shoot session in Los Angeles, California (the "Casting Session"). In response to the Casting Session notice, Johansson, along with other models represented by LA Models and other agencies, attended the purported Casting Session. Johansson, LA Models, and the other models represented by LA Models who attended the Casting Session, believed and operated under the express representation and information from Richardson that the Casting Session was only for test shoot purposes for a casting audition for a *potential* professional job involving topless poses. Johansson's attendance and consent to the photo shoot was based on the conditions represented and expressly agreed to prior to the Casting Session, namely, that the photographs of Johansson were test shoots for casting purpose use only and the photo session was not a booked job.
- 10. In or about August 2003, Johansson and Richardson entered into an oral agreement (hereinafter the "Agreement") whereby Johansson agreed to appear at a private Casting Session photo shoot in Los Angeles, California, where Richardson would take "test shoot" photographs of Johansson (hereinafter "Photographs") which were to be used solely for casting purpose

consideration for an alleged potential professional modeling job.

- of her during the private photo session. Johansson was not paid any compensation by Richardson for the Photographs. Nor did Richardson pay Johansson for the right to sell, license, publish or otherwise exploit the Photographs. Johansson would not have consented to such use in any event. Johansson, an established professional model represented through a professional agency, would never have knowingly agreed to an unlimited model release, whether for monetary consideration or otherwise, especially in order to merely have photos of herself taken in audition for a potential job. There was no mutuality of consent nor meeting of the minds for any alleged model release.
- 12. The Agreement was solicited, entered into and partially performed in Los Angeles, California. Richardson's fraud and the harms to Johannson occurred in Los Angeles, California.
- 13. Upon Johansson's arrival at the Chateau Marmont Hotel, in Los Angeles, California, at approximately 11:00 a.m., for the purported Casting Session, Johansson (along with other models in attendance) was told to wait in the hallway because Richardson wasn't ready to begin the Casting Session. The call time for the Casting Session was between 11:00 a.m. and 11:30 a.m., however, Johansson, the second or third person in line, was left waiting in line in the hallway for about one hour before entering the room. At no point during the lengthy time that Johansson was made to wait prior to entering the room where the photos were taken was Johansson, or any of the other waiting models, given any documents to review, including any alleged model release.
- by a woman to wait for Richardson. The woman then directed Johansson to papers on a nearby table in the room and instructed Johansson simply to sign the "sign-in" papers and fill-in the necessary age verification information to verify that she was not a minor. Johansson understood the sign-in process as consistent with the typical sign-in process of a casting shoot, especially involving topless poses whereby a model must confirm that she is not a minor. Johansson was not given an opportunity to review the alleged model release and purported sign-in age verification sheet (the "Alleged Model Release"), but merely signed it <u>as directed</u> by Richardson's agents.

Johansson was given mere seconds to write her name, address, social security number and/or driver's license, and to sign the papers. Johansson did not have time to remove the papers from the table and was never presented with a duplicate copy of the papers. The Alleged Model Release, which was only momentarily presented to Johansson without the opportunity for her, a non-native English speaker, to review the document or seek advice of counsel or her agent, contained small point font with language that most native English speakers could not even begin to comprehend.

- 15. Almost immediately upon Johansson being directed to sign the sign-in age verification papers, Richardson joined Johansson in the room on the couch to review Johansson's professional modeling portfolio book.
- of Johansson. As soon as Richardson began taking the topeless Photographs of Johansson, Richardson requested Johansson to show more than merely a topless pose, and then ultimately pushed aggressively for her to pull down her bottoms and/or remove all of her clothes which was not the stated and represented purpose of the casting session. Johansson became very uncomfortable with Richardson's conduct and his requested poses as he continued to push aggressively for full nude versus only semi-nude/topless photographs. Although Johansson was initially pressured by Richardson under the false pretense and promise of a potential modeling job to participate in nude poses of which she was extremely uncomfortable, Richardson's conduct quickly resulted in Johansson's refusal to continue and her termination of the Casting Session. Johansson's participation in the Casting Session and any alleged agreement for the use of the Photographs by Richardson was thereby rescinded.
- 17. Johansson has <u>never</u> previously posed for nor allowed any full nude photographs to be taken of herself, nor would she ever agree or consent to the public dissemination or publication of any such photographs of herself, which are highly offensive to her, an invasion of her privacy and damaging to her career.

///

///

- 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Richardson had represented to and informed LA Models, who in-turn informed its models, that the photo shoot was a Casting Session for a potential job and that the photo shoot was not a booked job. It is the custom and practice in the modeling profession that professional models with representation generally do not sign releases at a casting session. LA Models and Johansson do not knowingly sign any releases at a casting session that have not been previously reviewed and negotiated. Any and all releases for represented professional models are to be submitted through the model's representatives and the proposed release would need to be reviewed and agreed upon by the agency and the model, and/or their attorney, for potential signature.
- 19. Johansson only agreed to the photo shoot and Casting Session based on express representations by Richardson and/or his agents and the understanding that the Photographs were only for test shoot casting purposes and could not be otherwise used, disseminated or exploited.
- 20. At no time did Richardson, nor any of his staff, ever discuss or state to Johansson that the "test shoot" photo shoot was allegedly a "booked job." Johansson was never asked to sign any purported model release. Johansson, an established professional model represented and contacted through a professional agency, would never have knowingly agreed to a full unlimited model release without consideration. Nor would she have knowingly permitted unlimited exploitation of test photos of herself. Any and all releases for Johansson must be submitted to and approved through her modeling agency prior to Johansson's review and potential signature, which did not occur in connection with Richardson's Casting Session.
- 21. Johansson did not knowingly sign a release nor any other written agreement or document evidencing consent to use of her name and likeness she merely signed what she believed and was informed and represented to be a sign-in sheet and verification of age. At no time did Johansson give any verbal consent to the commercial use of any Photographs of herself. Johansson's participation in the photo shoot and signing of the Alleged Model Release, which she believed to be a sign-in form, was fraudulently induced/obtained, lacked mutuality of consent or a meeting of the minds, and was not supported by consideration.

3696-2\PLE\COM 042505

- 22. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Richardson has an ongoing scheme and practice of intentionally and fraudulently inducing or tricking vulnerable models, including those for whom English is a second language, into signing unlimited model releases without consideration and without their knowledge in order that Richardson may exploit their photographs for his own commercial gain.
- 23. Johansson has never consented to the commercial use of any of the Photographs, including the posting or displaying on Richardson's Website or allowing the display on other websites or in any public exhibitions. No has Johansson ever consented to Richardson's commercial use, dissemination, sale and/or exploitation of the Photographs. Johansson only agreed that the Photographs could be used for test shoot casting purposes for the specific potential job which was the purported subject of the Casting Session.

Johansson First Learns of Richardson's Fraudulent Scheme and Wrongful Use and Dissemination of the Photographs

- 24. Despite the above stated facts, Richardson has, without authorization, exploited and attempted to exploit the Johansson Photographs, having unlawfully published and disseminated them on his website at terryrichardson.com (the "Website"), commencing in or about early Fall 2004, and in a gallery exhibition traveling through-out the United States, all in violation of Johansson's rights.
- 25. In or about Fall 2004, soon after Richardson's creation and posting of his Website, Johansson first became aware that Richardson was publicly disseminating the Photographs and exploiting the Photographs in order to promote Defendant's Websites, services, merchandise and goods throughout the State of California, the United States and throughout the world. All such activity is and was without the knowledge, approval or authority of Johansson.
- 26. As a result, in or about September 2004 and October 2004, Johansson's representatives sent written cease and desist demands to Richardson, informing Richardson that he had no right to publish, disseminate, license or otherwise commercially exploit any of the Photographs. Johansson further informed Richardson of the damages she had incurred, the violations of her rights, and the fact that any further publication or dissemination of the

Photographs would be an intentional violation of her rights which would result in further and increased damages.

- 27. In response to Johansson's representatives informing Richardson that he had no right to license or otherwise disseminate or exploit any of the Photographs and that Johansson had not signed a model release, Richardson, by and through his representatives, for the first time ever, produced to Johansson a copy of the Alleged Model Release. This was Johansson's first knowledge of the existence of any alleged model release, first knowledge that unbeknownst to her at the time of the Casting Session the sign-in age verification form was a purported model release, and first knowledge of Richardson's fraudulent scheme and fraudulent misrepresentations.
- 28. Johansson thereafter placed Richardson on notice that the Alleged Model Release was null and valid, having been obtained by fraud and deceit, without Johansson's knowledge, without consideration and without any meeting of the minds, and that Richardson had no right to further publish, disseminate, license or otherwise commercially exploit any of the Photographs.
- 29. In further response to Johansson informing Richardson that he had no right to license or otherwise commercially exploit any of the Photographs and that Johansson had not knowingly signed a model release, that any alleged model release was obtained by means of fraud and was therefore void and rescinded, Richardson, by and through his representatives represented that he would remove the pictures of Johansson from his Website and that the Photographs would not be further published or disseminated. Johansson is informed and believes and alleges thereon that the promise and agreement, in response to Johansson's extreme outrage and objection to the publication of the Photographs and fraudulent scheme and tortious conduct, was an acknowledgment that Defendant Richardson had no right to sell, license, or publish the Photographs and that it represented an outrageous violation of Johansson's rights.

	_	_	-		
24	111				///
25					///
26	111				///
27	111				///
28	111				///

3696-2\PLE\COM 042505

Richardson's Continued Fraud and Misrepresentations and

Wrongful Use and Dissemination of the Photographs

- 30. Even after being placed on notice of the matters alleged hereinabove, and unbeknownst to Johansson until in or about February 2005, Richardson continued to exploit one or more of the Photographs in a traveling world-wide exhibition entitled "Beautiful Losers: Contemporary Art and Street Culture" (the "Beautiful Losers Exhibition"), among other exploitation. One or more of the Photographs has been displayed in the Beautiful Losers Exhibition throughout the State of California, the United States and throughout the world, in a traveling exhibitions. Additionally, Richardson is continuing to display the Photographs on the Internet. All such activity is and was without the approval or authority of Johansson.
- Richardson's Websites, books, exhibits or other exhibitions or merchandising of his works, or other websites displaying Richardson's works, they are likely to be confused into believing that Johansson authorizes, sponsors or somehow is affiliated with Defendants, with their Websites, and/or with the sale of the Photographs, and/or that Johansson agreed to allow nude photographs of herself to be publicly displayed and disseminated, which is not the case. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that unless enjoined by this Court, Defendants intend to continue their course of conduct and to wrongfully use, infringe upon, sell and otherwise profit from Johansson's name, photographs, and likeness as alleged above. As a direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendants alleged above, Johansson has already suffered irreparable damage and Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants have unjustly obtained benefits as a result of their unlawful activities. Johansson has no adequate remedy at law and will continue to suffer irreparable damage and injury until Defendants' actions alleged herein are enjoined by this Court.

21	and Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants have unjustly
22	obtained benefits as a result of their unlawful activities. Johansson has no adequate remedy at law
23	and will continue to suffer irreparable damage and injury until Defendants' actions alleged hereir
24	are enjoined by this Court.
25	111
26	111
27	///
	111
0340	10

- 32. Johansson is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant Richardson retained Does 51 through 100 to facilitate and assist Defendant Richardson in selling, distributing and/or disseminating the Photographs to third parties for publication and for other uses or exploitation.
- 33. Johansson did not authorize Richardson to use her name, image and/or likeness to advertise or promote the sale of his services. By placing one the Photographs in the Beautiful Losers Exhibition and on his Website, Richardson created the false impression that Johansson voluntarily agreed to pose nude for publicly disseminated photographs and/or be included in and associated with a collogue of sexually explicit works entitled *Beautiful Losers*.
- 34. Johansson never authorized or consented to Defendant Richardson's publishing the Photographs or to his selling, distributing or disseminating the Photographs to third parties, including any magazines or exhibitions, for publication or for any other use (other than for the one-time use as test images for consideration for one potential purported modeling job).
- 35. The claims and conduct and any agreements forming the basis of this action arose and/or occurred and/or were entered into within the jurisdiction of the above-entitled Court, in the County of Los Angeles.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Fraud – Intentional Misrepresentation of Fact (Against All Defendants)

- 36. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 37. As a material inducement for Johansson to attend the Casting Session and enter into the Agreement or agreements referenced hereinabove and to pose for a photo session and allow semi-nude images of herself to be taken, Richardson represented and promised to Johansson, among other things specified herein, that:
- (i) Richardson was conducting a "test shoot" casting photo session, to include a topless semi-nude pose, for consideration for a professionally booked modeling job;
 - (ii) the "test shoot" Photographs would be used solely for casting purposes for

consideration for the one potential professionally booked modeling job;

- (iii) the Alleged Model Release was a "sign-in" and model age verification form, as required in photo shoots involving semi-nude or nude poses; and
- (iv) if, based upon the "test shoot" Photographs, Johansson was selected and offered the potential professionally booked job, she would be offered compensation to be negotiated through her professional modeling agency.
- 38. At the time the foregoing representations were made by Richardson, they were in fact false.
- 39. At the time the foregoing misrepresentations were made, Richardson knew them to be false, and made said misrepresentations with the intention and expectation that Johansson would act in reliance upon them and be induced provide her services and pose for said Photographs, enter into the aforementioned Agreement or agreements, sign the Alleged Model Release and otherwise act to her detriment.
- 40. At the time said representations were made by Defendants and at the time Johansson took the actions herein alleged, Johansson was ignorant of the true facts and ignorant of the falsity of Defendants' representations and believed them to be true, and justifiably relied on them. Had Johansson known the actual and true facts, she would not have, among other things, attended the Casting Session, signed the Alleged Model Release believed to be a sign-in age verification form, and/or posed for the Photographs.
- A1. Johansson's reliance on Defendants' representations were justified because Richardson had a reputation in the industry as a professional photographer of some notoriety. In addition, Richardson represented to LA Models, Johansson's professional modeling agency, that he was holding an open casting "test shoot" session for a potential professional modeling job. Further, Johansson was informed of and sent to the Casting Session by her professional modeling agency based upon Richardson's reputation and representations with regard to holding an open casting "test shoot" session. Johansson reasonably relied on said fraudulent misrepresentations and as a result thereof, was induced to enter into the agreements and/or perform under said agreements.

- 43. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fraudulent and intentional misrepresentations and Plaintiff's reliance thereon, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount not yet fully ascertainable but which is believed to be in excess of One Million (\$1,000,000) Dollars. When Plaintiff has ascertained the full amount of the damages, she will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint accordingly and/or provide proof of said damages at trial.
- 44. Plaintiff intends this action to serve as further notice to Defendants of her intention to rescind the Agreement and seeks to rescind the agreement and Alleged Model Release for fraud and seeks restitution of all assets or value provided, or in the alternative, for damages resulting from the fraud.
- 45. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the aforementioned acts of Defendants were done intentionally or with a conscious disregard of Johansson's rights, and with the intent to vex, injure or annoy Johansson, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice thus entitling Johansson to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them, and to deter such conduct in the future, which amount will be proved at trial.
- 46. Johansson is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the officers, directors and/or managing agents of Defendants authorized, directed, adopted and/or ratified the wrongful acts of Defendants and are consequently liable to Johansson.

23		///
24	111	111
25		///
26	111	///
27	111	///
28	111	///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Fraud - Constructive Fraud

(Against all Defendants)

- 47. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35 and 37 through 42, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 48. Defendants have engaged in constructive fraud by concealing their intention to fraudulently induce or trick or deceive Johansson into attending the Casting Session, and enter into the Agreement or agreements referenced hereinabove and sign the "sign-in" sheet and to pose for a photo session and allow semi-nude or nude images of herself to be taken as purported "test shoot" Photographs to be used solely for casting purposes for consideration for the one potential professional modeling job, whereby Richardson's true intentions were, among other things specified herein, to deceive Johansson into signing the Alleged Model Release and instead use the test-shoot Photographs for Richardson's his own benefits or self-interests and not for consideration for the potential professional modeling job.
- 49. At the time Defendants concealed their true intentions to deceive Johansson, and other models, into signing the Alleged Model Release and instead use the test-shoot Photographs for Richardson's his own benefits or self-interests and exploitation, Defendants knew that they were instructing unsuspecting models, including Johansson a non-native English speaking model, to unknowingly and without consideration sign complicated small-point font releases purporting to grant the unlimited right and interest in and to the models' most valuable professional assets. Defendants knowingly concealed the true facts that:
- (i) Richardson was not conducting a "test shoot" casting photo session for a topless semi-nude pose for consideration for a professional booked modeling job;
 - (ii) at no time did a potential professional booked modeling job exist;
- (iii) at no time prior to nor during the Casting Session did Richardson, nor his representatives, discuss with, explain to or disclose to Johansson, nor her representatives, the true contents or terms of the purported sign-in and age verification form, which known to Defendants

and unbeknownst to Johansson, was actually an alleged full model release;

- (iv) during the time that Richardson requested and accepted or received the value of Johansson's services (i.e., posing as a professional model in a casting session), under the representation that Richardson was holding a casting "test shoot" session for a potential professional booked job, Richardson had no intention of considering Johansson for a paid booked professional modeling job;
- (v) Richardson did not intend to use the "test shoot" Photographs solely for casting purposes for consideration for the one purported potential professional booked modeling job; and
- (vi) Richardson intended to disseminate and/or exploit for personal profit, gain or otherwise, all without compensation to the models, nor their knowledge or approval, the Photographs taken at the Casting Session.
- 50. Defendants' acts and omissions set forth hereinabove were performed with the purpose and intent to deceive, defraud, harm and damage Johansson in the manner heretofore alleged and with the knowledge and expectation that Johansson would act in reliance upon such fraudulent concealments in the manner heretofore alleged and thereby pose for said Photographs and enter into the aforementioned Agreement or agreements and sign the Alleged Model Release represented to be a sign-in and age verification form and otherwise act and provide services and pose for photographs accordingly. Defendants' acts and omissions set forth hereinabove were further performed with the purpose and intent to prevent Johansson from realizing the full benefits and monetary consideration pursuant to the terms and conditions of Richardson's and Johansson's Agreement or agreements, whereby Johansson agreed to provide her valuable time and image and posed for photographs for consideration for a potential booked professional modeling job and Richardson agreed to take the test shoot photographs solely as a test shoot and consider Johansson for the potential job.

26 ||

28 || /

///

II

- 51. At the time of Defendants' concealments, acts and omissions and at the time Johansson took the actions herein alleged, Johansson was ignorant of the true facts and ignorant of Defendants' concealments, acts and omissions. Had Johansson known the actual and true facts, she would not have, among other things, attended the Casting Session, signed the Alleged Model Release believed to be a sign-in age verification form, and/or posed for the Photographs.
- 52. As set forth above, Plaintiff did not discover or have knowledge or any reason whatsoever to know or suspect Defendants' fraud and misrepresentations and/or concealments until approximately August 2005, within one year of the commencement of the litigation herein.
- 53. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fraudulent concealments, acts and omissions, and Plaintiff's reliance thereon, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount not yet fully ascertainable but which is in excess of One Million (\$1,000,000) Dollars. When Plaintiff has ascertained the full amount of the damages, she will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint accordingly and/or provide proof of said damages at trial.
- 54. Plaintiff intends this action to serve as further notice to Defendants of her intention to rescind the Agreement and seeks to rescind the agreement and Alleged Model Release for fraud and seeks restitution of all assets or value provided, or in the alternative, for damages resulting from the fraud.
- 55. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the aforementioned acts of Defendants were done intentionally or with a conscious disregard of Johansson's rights, and with the intent to vex, injure or annoy Johansson, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice thus entitling Johansson to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them, and to deter such conduct in the future, which amount will be proved at trial.
- 56. Johansson is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the officers, directors and/or managing agents of Defendants authorized, directed, adopted and/or ratified the wrongful acts of Defendants and are consequently liable to Johansson.

///

28 II / /

//

J

28 || / / /

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Fraud - Fraudulent Concealment

(Against All Defendants)

- 57. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42 and 48 through 52, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 58. Defendants concealed the above listed material facts with the intention of inducing or causing Johansson to act in reliance in the manner herein alleged, or with the expectation that Johansson would so act.
- 59. Based on Defendants' concealed of the above material facts, Johansson was induced to act to her detriment, including, as set forth herein, attending the Casting Session, signing the Alleged Model Release believed to be a sign-in and age verification form but unbeknownst to Johansson was actually a model release, posing for semi-nude and nude photographs, and otherwise providing services and acting accordingly.
- 60. As set forth above, Johansson did not discover or have knowledge or any reason whatsoever to know or suspect Defendants' fraudulent concealment of material facts until approximately in or about August 2004, within one year of the commencement of the litigation herein, when Richardson first alleged to have a model release.
- 61. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fraudulent concealments and Plaintiff's reliance thereon, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount not yet fully ascertainable but which is believed to be in excess of One Million (\$1,000,000) Dollars. When Plaintiff has ascertained the full amount of the damages, she will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint accordingly and/or provide proof of said damages at trial.
- 62. Plaintiff intends this action to serve as further notice to Defendants of her intention to rescind the Agreement and seeks to rescind the agreement and Alleged Model Release for fraud and seeks restitution of all assets or value provided, or in the alternative, for damages resulting from the fraud.

- 63. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the aforementioned acts of Defendants were done intentionally or with a conscious disregard of Johansson's rights, and with the intent to vex, injure or annoy Johansson, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice thus entitling Johansson to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them, and to deter such conduct in the future, which amount will be proved at trial.
- 64. Johansson is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the officers, directors and/or managing agents of Defendants authorized, directed, adopted and/or ratified the wrongful acts of Defendants and are consequently liable to Johansson.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Rescission

(Against Defendant Richardson)

- 65. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 62 through 64, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- As set forth herein, the Alleged Model Release was obtained without knowledge or agreement by Johansson, a non-native English speaker, and without any consideration, without a meeting of the minds, and through fraud.
- 67. Based on Defendants' outrageous, malicious, and unconscionable fraudulent conduct and intentional misrepresentations and concealments, and complete failure to provide any consideration for the Alleged Model Release which was obtained through fraud and trickery and without the knowledge of Johansson, Johansson seeks to rescind the Alleged Model Release and any other alleged agreement(s) that Richardson relies on as a justification for licensing or permitting the public dissemination, publication, exploitation and/or other use or other exploitation of any of the Photographs, seeks restitution of all assets or value provided, and seeks disgorgement

by Defendants of the full amount of any unjust enrichment.

68. Although notice of rescission was previously provided to Richardson, in or about September 2004, Johansson hereby intends service of this Complaint in this action to serve as further notice of rescission of the Alleged Model Release and any other alleged agreement(s) and hereby demands that Defendants restore to Johansson all consideration previously conveyed and disgorge the full amount of any unjust enrichment. Johansson also seeks restitution for Defendants' wrongful misappropriation of Johansson's likeness and photograph as herein alleged. Finally, Johansson seek an order from this Court that the Alleged Model Release and any other alleged agreement(s) are rescinded and void.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Common Law Misappropriation of Right of Publicity, including Damages, Profits and Unjust Enrichment (Against All Defendants)

- 69. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52 and 58 through 60, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 70. Johansson has been a professional model for a number of years and has spent considerable time, energy and money developing her career. Through years hard work and use of her talents in the modeling field, Johansson has developed sufficient skill, reputation and virtues to create considerable commercial value in her image and identity, which have become vested with substantial good will in the eyes of the public and employers. The marketable product of that labor is the ability of Johansson's name or likeness to attract the attention and evoke a desired response in a particular consumer audience. The commercial value in her identity permits Johansson to receive an economic return through some medium of commercial promotion.
- 71. The commercial value of Johansson's identity can be diminished by an unauthorized use of her image and persona in association with products or services perceived unfavorably by the public or by the negative portrayal of Johansson in connection with the promotion of a product or otherwise.

- 72. Johansson and her representatives carefully limit and restrict the use and publication of authorized photographs of Johansson to particular types of poses, products and associations to maximize the commercial value in her identity, to limit the potential harmful consequences to that commercial value caused by improper and inappropriate use of her image and to ensure that the product, medium and mode of promotion are consistent and compatible with her persona.
- 73. Accordingly, at the time of the exploitation, distribution, publication and/or dissemination of the Photographs alleged hereinabove, Johansson had valuable publicity and property rights with substantial commercial value.
- 74. Johansson did not authorize Defendants to commercially exploit by means of selling, distributing, disseminating or publishing the Photographs of her, or to disseminate nor publish any of the Photographs of her, in any magazine, publications, exhibitions, websites or otherwise. Nor did Johansson authorize Defendants to commercially exploit the Photographs or to advertise or promote Defendants' products or services by using Johansson's name or the Photographs. Defendant was solely to make use of the Photographs for casting test images for one particular purported potential professional modeling job.
- 75. By allowing the nude Photographs to be published and disseminated, Defendants' made unauthorized use of the Photographs in order to further their own pecuniary interests by preying on and wrongfully exploiting Johansson's image and persona, and that of other unsuspecting models. Defendants' conduct manifests an outright disregard of Johansson's rights under the Agreement, as well as Johansson's common law and statutory right to prohibit and prevent the commercial use of her name and likeness without her express and knowing consent.
- 76. Defendants' unauthorized sale, exploitation, distribution, dissemination and publication of the Photographs constitutes a violation and misappropriation of Johansson's right of publicity, in that Defendants misappropriated Johansson's likeness by using the Photographs for the purpose of commercial gain by publishing, exhibiting, licensing or selling the Photographs or merchandise containing one or more of the Photographs and/or by promoting and advertising Defendants' business and services including, but not limited to, the services of Defendant Richardson as a professional photographer and the services of Doe Photo Agency, and other Doe

1 Defendants, through the exhibition and publication of the Photographs on Richardson's Website 2 and over the Internet, through the exhibition and publication of one or more of the Photographs 3 in Richardson's Beautiful Losers exhibition, through the exhibition and publication of one or more of the Photographs on various websites advertising or otherwise for the promotion of Richardson's 4 5 Beautiful Losers exhibition, and other dissemination of certain of the Photographs for profit or other gain, all without Johansson's consent and over her strong objection. Defendants' 7 unauthorized commercial exploitation and/or solicitation of the Photographs, constitute violations 8 and misappropriations of Plaintiff's common law right of publicity, in that Defendants 9 misappropriated Plaintiff's name and/or likeness for commercial gain, all of which occurred 10 without Plaintiff's consent. The appropriation was for Defendants' advantage, in that Plaintiff's name, photograph and/or likeness were used for Defendants' own pecuniary gain and profit.

- 77. The appropriation was for Defendants' advantage, in that Johansson's name, photograph and/or likeness were used and intended to create and enhance Defendants' pecuniary gain and profit resulting from the sale, distribution, dissemination or publication of the Photographs and the attribution of credit given to Defendants upon publication or other exhibition of the Photographs.
- 78. Defendants have threatened to continue utilizing Johansson's name and/or likeness by continuing to exhibit, sell, distribute, disseminate, publish and/or permit publication of the Photographs. Unless and until enjoined and restrained by Order of this Court, Defendants' continued acts will cause Johansson severe and irreparable injury, which cannot adequately be compensated by money damages. By reason of the foregoing, Johansson is entitled to temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, enjoining the distribution and use of the Photographs and mandating the return to Johansson or escrow (and upon final determination of this matter, the destruction) of all negatives, reproductions and copies of the Photographs.

```
25
    111
                                                                                               111
26
                                                                                               ///
27
```

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

13 14

12

16

15

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

79. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts by Defendants, and each of them, Johansson has been damaged in an amount not yet fully ascertainable but which is believed to be in excess of One Million (\$1,000,000) Dollars, including damage to the value of Johansson's name, likeness and goodwill, the loss of the monetary consideration that would customarily be paid by said Defendants to Johansson to license the Photographs for publication or exploitation, and damage to Johansson's reputation as a result of the manner or context in which one or more of the Photographs have been published or exploited. Johansson has also incurred emotional distress as a result of said Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged in this cause of action, which however, is not disabling severe emotional distress. When Johansson has ascertained the full amount of said damages, she will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint accordingly.

- 80. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts by Defendants, and each of them, Defendants have earned profits from the sale, exploitation, distribution, dissemination and/or publication of the Photographs and from any attribution of credit coinciding with the publication of the Photographs in an amount which has yet to be ascertained, and have thereby been unjustly enriched. Johansson is entitled to recover all said unjust enrichments, including all profits earned by Defendants as a result of Defendants' unauthorized use of Johansson's name, photograph and/or likeness for commercial purposes.
- 81. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the aforementioned acts of Defendants were done intentionally or with a conscious disregard of Johansson's rights, and with the intent to vex, injure or annoy Johansson, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice thus entitling Johansson to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them, and to deter such conduct in the future, which amount will be proved at trial.
- 82. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the officers, directors and/or managing agents of Defendants authorized, directed and/or ratified the wrongful acts of Defendants and are consequently liable to Johansson.

///

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Invasion of Privacy

(Against All Defendants)

- 83. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 70 through 78, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 84. Defendants, without Johansson's consent, invaded Johansson's protected right to privacy as recognized and preserved in the United States Constitution, the California Constitution and at Common Law, by disclosing to third parties and then exploiting, publishing, disseminating and/or distributing intimate Photographs of Johansson which were taken in a private setting and which were not to be published. Johansson had a reasonable expectation of privacy regarding the agreed limited use of the Photographs (i.e., for private test shoot use only, not public dissemination).
- 85. The unauthorized sale, distribution, dissemination and/or publication of the Photographs is offensive and objectionable to Johansson, as it would be to a reasonable person of ordinary sensibilities, in that the Photographs were agreed to be taken solely for private test shoot use for casting for a particular potential professional job and not for publication or dissemination, and in that Johansson did not authorize the Photographs to be disclosed in nationally and/or internationally published websites, exhibitions, merchandise, books or otherwise published. Johansson has never before allowed full nude photographs to be taken of herself and has never and would never allow any such photographs to be publicly disclosed. The disclosure is highly offensive to Johansson, and has thereby violated Johansson's right of privacy.
- 86. The disclosure by Defendants was a public disclosure to a large number of people in that Defendants, and each of them, disseminated certain of the Photographs on both published Internet websites and in exhibitions, which have national and/or international circulation.
- 87. Defendant Richardson and certain Does Defendants, disseminated the Photographs in order to realize the profits from the sale, distribution, dissemination and/or publication of the Photographs and/or from any attribution of credit coinciding with the publication of the

||///

Photographs. Richardson and certain Doe Defendants facilitated and permitted the publication of the Photographs to a large number of people, including, but not limited to, on published Internet websites and in gallery exhibitions, all without Johansson's consent and over Johansson's objection. One of the exhibitions to which said Defendants licensed and/or published the Photographs is the Beautiful Losers exhibition, which has been exhibited in various cities and locals around the United States and/or the world. By publishing one or more of the Photographs in the Beautiful Losers exhibition and over the Internet, Defendants disclosed said Photograph(s) to potentially hundred of thousands, or even millions, of people without the consent of Johansson, and over Johansson's strong objection, which had been communicated to Richardson prior to Defendants' publication and dissemination of the Photograph(s) in the on-going city to city traveling Beautiful Losers exhibition and on websites throughout the United Sates and world.

- 88. Johansson is informed and believes and, based upon such information and belief, alleges that Defendants, and each of them, acted with actual malice, or acted in reckless disregard of Johansson's right to privacy.
- 89. As a direct and proximate result of said wrongful conduct by Defendants, and each of them. Johansson has suffered shame, mortification, hurt feelings, emotional distress, embarrassment, humiliation, and injury to her privacy and peace of mind, all to Johansson's general damage in an amount which has yet to be ascertained but in excess of the jurisdictional limit of this Court. When Johansson ascertains the exact amount of said damages, she will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to set forth said amount.
- 90. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the aforementioned acts of Defendants were done intentionally or with a conscious disregard of Johansson's rights, and with the intent to vex, injure or annoy Johansson, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice thus entitling Johansson to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them, and to deter such conduct in the future, which amount will be proved at trial.

, ,

- 91. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the officers, directors and/or managing agents of Defendants authorized, directed and/or ratified the wrongful acts of Defendants and are consequently liable to Johansson.
- 92. Defendants have violated Johansson's privacy by publishing, distributing, publicly disseminating and then, after objections and demands with regard to the unauthorized publication, knowingly allowing the further publication and exploitation of the Photographs. Unless permanently enjoined and restrained by this court, Defendants will continue to publish and disseminate the Photographs, causing Johansson further severe and irreparable injury that cannot be adequately compensated by monetary damages. By reason of the foregoing, Johansson is entitled to permanent injunctive relief, enjoining the further publication, public dissemination and/or display of the Photographs, and mandating the return of all negatives, reproductions and copies of the Photographs to Plaintiff, or destruction thereof.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

False Light Invasion of Privacy

(Against All Defendants)

- 93. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 70 through 78 and 84 through 88, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 94. By selling, distributing, publishing and otherwise disseminating the Photographs, Defendants have placed Johansson before the public in a false and outrageous light, which is highly offensive to Johansson, and have thereby violated Johansson's right of privacy.
- 95. The false light in which Defendants, and each of them, have placed Johansson, by virtue of the sale, distribution, publication and/or dissemination of the Photographs, would be highly offensive to a reasonable person. By selling, distributing, publishing and/or disseminating the Photographs for publication on websites and in exhibitions published or displayed nationwide or worldwide, and by publishing the Photographs in the manner and context in which they have been published, including in Richardson's sexually explicit Beautiful Losers exhibition and on his sexually explicit Website, Defendants have falsely represented and implied that Johansson

consented to the sale, dissemination and/or publication of the Photographs, endorsed Defendants'
products and services, consented to nationwide or worldwide publication and distribution of the
Photographs, and in the case of the Beautiful Losers exhibition, falsely represented and implied
that Johansson had voluntarily posed for and consented to the publication or display of the
Photographs in the Beautiful Losers exhibition, or otherwise.

- 96. These representations, implications and associations are all false and depict Johansson in a false light, since Johansson did not consent to the sale, dissemination or publication of any of the Photographs, did not cooperate in the publishing of the Photographs, and does not endorse or promote in any way Defendants' products or services, nor did Johansson voluntarily pose for Photographs to be published on Defendant's sexually explicit Website or in Defendant's sexually explicit Beautiful Losers exhibition.
- 97. Johansson was embarrassed and distressed that family, friends, fans, business associates, people in the entertainment and modeling industry, and the general public saw these Photographs in the manner and context in which the Photographs were published with the false representations and inferences, some of which are alleged herein.
- 98. Johansson is informed and believes and, based upon such information and belief, alleges that Defendants, and each of them, acted with actual malice, that they had knowledge of, or acted in reckless disregard of the rights of Johansson, and the false light in which Johansson would be placed by the sale, distribution, publication and/or dissemination of the Photographs.
- 99. As a direct and proximate result of said wrongful conduct by Defendants, and each of them, Johansson suffered shame, mortification, hurt feelings, emotional distress, embarrassment, humiliation, and injury to her peace of mind, (although not severe, disabling emotional distress), all to Johansson's general damage in an amount which is in excess of the jurisdictional limit of this Court. When Johansson ascertains the exact amount of said damages, she will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to set forth said amount.

///

27 || / /

III

/ / /

//

100. As a further direct and proximate result of said wrongful conduct by Defendants, and each of them, Johansson has suffered general and special damages including, but not limited to, damage to her business, profession, reputation, character and property, which will most likely result in loss of employment, loss or reduction in earnings and profits in an amount which has yet to be ascertained, and will result in Johansson not been given certain modeling jobs and modeling spokesperson jobs. When Johansson ascertains the exact amount of said damages, she will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to set forth said amount.

101. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the aforementioned acts of Defendants were done intentionally or with a conscious disregard of Johansson's rights, and with the intent to vex, injure or annoy Johansson, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice thus entitling Johansson to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them, and to deter such conduct in the future, which amount will be proved at trial.

102. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the officers, directors and/or managing agents of Defendants authorized, directed and/or ratified the wrongful acts of Defendants and are consequently liable to Johansson.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Oral Contract

(Against All Defendants)

103. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 70 through 78, 84 through 88 and 94 through 98, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.

104. Johansson and Richardson entered into the oral Agreement, as alleged hereinabove, in or about August 2003, whereby Johansson agreed, either directly and/or through her professional agent, to appear at a private Casting Session photo shoot where Richardson would take "test shoot" topless modeling photographs of Johansson which were to be used solely for casting purpose consideration for an alleged potential professional modeling job, and if Johansson

was thereafter offered the job, compensation and terms of a model release and use agreement would thereafter be negotiated for among the parties through Johansson's authorized agent. Under the express terms of the Agreement, the Photographs were to be used only for private "test shoot" casting purposes for an alleged potential booked professional modeling job. Richardson offered these terms and conditions as an inducement for Johansson, a professional model, to appear at the Casting Session and allow that test shoot Photographs to be taken of herself, and Johansson accepted and agreed to said terms.

- 105. Johansson has performed all conditions, covenants, promises, duties and obligations on her part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the oral agreement, except to the extent such performance was waived, excused, or prevented by reason of the acts and omissions of Richardson and/or other Defendants.
- 106. Richardson materially breached the oral Agreement(s) by, among other things and conduct, selling, publicly displaying, posting, disseminating and/or distributing the Photographs on the worldwide internet and in public exhibitions, permitting third parties to publish the Photographs, and soliciting third parties to purchase and/or publish or display or disseminate the Photographs and thereafter permitting third parties to publish or publicly display or disseminate the Photographs, all without Johansson's consent.
- 107. Johansson further alleges that Richardson repudiated the promise and materially breached the oral agreement by, among other things, publicly posting and displaying the Photographs on his Website and licensing (or otherwise allowing use of) the Photographs for publication and public display in the Beautiful Losers exhibition, and possibly other uses, display, and dissemination.
- 108. Johansson has made demands on Richardson, in or about September 2004 and October 2004, informing Richardson that he is in breach of their oral agreement whereby Johansson allowed the Photographs to be taken solely for casting test purposes, and that Richardson had no right to publish, publicly disseminate, license or otherwise commercially exploit any of the Photographs and that at no time did Johansson gave any verbal consent and/or knowingly sign consent to or agree to the commercial use of any of Photographs of herself.

Richardson has failed and refuses and continues to fail and refuse to comply with the terms of their 1 2 oral agreement, whereby Richardson continues to publish, publicly disseminate, distribute, license or otherwise commercially exploit the Photographs, all in violation of the terms of the oral 3 4 agreement. As set forth above, Johansson did not discover or have knowledge or any reason 5 109. whatsoever to know or suspect that Defendants breached the oral agreement until within two years 6 7 of the commencement of the litigation herein. 8 As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions and material breaches of the 110. oral agreement or agreements, Johansson has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, 9 10 which include, but are not limited to compensatory, consequential and incidental damages. 11 Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon allege, that such damages are within the jurisdictional limits of this court, and when Johansson has ascertained the full amount of those 12 13 damages, she will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint accordingly and/or provide 14 proof of said damages at trial. 15 Defendants have misappropriated Johansson's likeness by exploiting, selling, 111. distributing, disseminating and/or publishing the Photographs and then personally and/or 16 knowingly allowing the further publication and exploitation of the Photographs. 17 permanently enjoined and restrained by this court, Defendants will continue to exploit the 18 Photographs, causing Johansson severe and irreparable injury that cannot be adequately 19 compensated by monetary damages. By reason of the foregoing, Johansson is entitled to 20 permanent injunctive relief, enjoining the further sale and commercial usage of the Photographs 21 and the further display, publication or dissemination of the Photographs, and mandating the return 22 to Johansson and/or destruction of all negatives, reproductions and copies of the Photographs. 23 24 111 /// 25 111

26

27

///

111

///

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Implied Contract

(Against All Defendants)

- 112. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 70 through 78, 84 through 88 and 94 through 98, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- his employees and representatives, contacted Johansson's professional modeling agency, informed said agency of an upcoming Casting Session and requested professional models attend the Casting Session photo shoot where Richardson would take "test shoot" topless modeling photographs of models which were to be used solely and only for casting purpose consideration for an alleged potential booked professional modeling job, and if a model who attended the Casting Session was thereafter selected and offered the job, compensation and terms of a model release and use agreement would thereafter be negotiated for among the parties through their authorized agents. Richardson, directly and/or through his employees and representatives, represented to and informed Johansson that the Alleged Model Release was a sign-in age verification form, required prior to Richardson taking any test shoot Photographs. Richardson offered these terms and conditions as an inducement for Johansson, a professional model, to appear at the Casting Session and allow that test shoot Photographs to be taken.
- hereinabove, Johansson agreed to provide her valuable time and services and appear at the private Casting Session photo shoot to allow Richardson to take "test shoot" topless modeling photographs of herself to be used solely for casting purpose consideration for an alleged potential booked professional modeling job, upon the expectation that if Johansson was thereafter selected and offered the job and/or her services or images were desired, compensation and terms of a model release and use agreement would thereafter be negotiated for among the parties through Johansson's authorized agent.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

October 2004, informing Richardson that he is in breach of his representations and their agreement based thereon, whereby Johansson attended the casting Session and allowed the Photographs to be taken for casting test purposes only. Johansson further made demands that Richardson comply with his representations and their agreement based thereon, whereby Richardson had no right to publish, publicly disseminate, license or otherwise commercially exploit any of the Photographs and that at no time did Johansson gave any verbal consent and/or knowingly sign consent to or agree to the commercial use of any of Photographs of herself. Richardson has failed and refuses and continues to fail and refuse to comply with the terms of his representations and their agreement based thereon, whereby Richardson continues to publish, publicly disseminate, distribute, license or otherwise commercially exploit the Photographs, all in violation of the terms of the implied agreement.

- 119. As set forth above, Johansson did not discover or have knowledge or any reason whatsoever to know or suspect that Defendants breached the agreement until within two years of the commencement of the litigation herein.
- 120. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions and material breaches of the agreement or agreements, Johansson has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, which include, but are not limited to compensatory, consequential and incidental damages. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon allege, that such damages are within the jurisdictional limits of this court, and when Johansson has ascertained the full amount of those damages, she will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint accordingly and/or provide proof of said damages at trial. Unless permanently enjoined and restrained by this court, Defendants will continue to exploit the Photographs, causing Johansson severe and irreparable injury that cannot be adequately compensated by monetary damages. By reason of the foregoing, Johansson is further entitled to permanent injunctive relief, enjoining the further sale and commercial usage of the Photographs and the further display, publication or dissemination of the Photographs, and mandating the return to Johansson and/or destruction of all negatives, reproductions and copies of the Photographs.

11.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing

(Against All Defendants)

- 121. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 70 through 78, 84 through 88, 94 through 98 and 104 through 109 and 113 through 119, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- party will conduct itself in good faith and will fairly deal with the other and, further, that neither party will interfere with or deprive the other of the benefits of the parties' agreement. Pursuant to the implied covenant, Defendants have a duty to conduct themselves in accordance with the terms and conditions of the parties' agreement, and to otherwise not engage in any acts which would impair or harm Plaintiff's rights under the parties' agreement and to otherwise receive the expected value and consideration thereunder. Pursuant to the implied covenant, Defendants further accepted a duty to honor the contractual obligations of the parties' agreement and utilize the test shoot Photographs only for casting purposes for the one potential professional job and not to withhold benefits under the parties' agreement nor use the Photographs obtained thereunder for one's own self-dealing or benefit or to the detriment of the other.
- 123. By virtue of the relationship between Johansson, on the one hand, and Defendants, on the other hand, Johansson placed her trust and confidence in Defendants to perform all of their duties and obligations pursuant to the terms and conditions of the parties' agreement and representations, and to honor the implied covenant to act in good faith and deal with Johansson, and to not take any action which would impair or harm Johansson's rights.
- 124. As alleged herein, Defendants systematically engaged in a series of actions in bad faith to deprive Johansson her benefits under the parties' agreement. Such actions include, but are not limited to, the following: providing Johansson, unbeknownst to her, with a model release form instead of a sign-in age verification form for her signature; failing to submit Johansson's "test shoot" Photographs for consideration for a professional modeling job; failing to negotiate through

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Johansson's authorized agent for terms of compensation and use of Johansson's services and/or image; publicly posting and displaying the private test shoot Photographs on Richardson's Website; licensing (or otherwise allowing use of) the Photographs for publication and public display in the Beautiful Losers exhibition, and possibly other uses, display, and dissemination, all without Johansson's knowledge or consent; continuing to use, exploit, publish and publicly display the Photographs after being placed on notice that Johansson did not knowingly consent to or authorize any of said uses; and failing and refusing to cease and desist from further use, exploitation, publication and public display, and possibly other uses, of the Photographs after being placed on notice that Johansson did not knowingly consent to or authorize any of said uses.

- 125. Defendants' actions also represent a violation of the trust she placed in Defendant by permitting him to take intimate photographs of her in a private setting with the expressed agreement that the resulting photographic portrayals of Johansson would not be sold, licensed, published, or otherwise commercially exploited without Johansson's permission and would be used solely as test images for a purported potential professional modeling job.
- Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that, by engaging in 126. the conduct herein alleged, Defendants have breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing owed to Johansson by virtue of the terms and conditions of the parties' agreement, and has acted in bad faith by Defendants, and preventing Johansson from receiving the benefits and consideration under the parties' agreement for which Johansson bargained, or otherwise causing Johansson harm.
- 127. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon allege that Defendants pursued this course of conduct in bad faith with the intent to interfere with, injure and frustrate Johansson's enjoyment of the benefits and rights which otherwise would have been conferred pursuant to the terms of the parties' agreement.
- 128. Johansson has performed all conditions, covenants, promises, duties and obligations on her part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement, except to the extent such performance was waived, excused, or prevented by reason of the acts and omissions of Defendants.

12	29.	As set forth above, Johansson did not discover or have knowledge or any reason
whatsoev	er to	know or suspect that Defendants breached the implied covenant of good faith and
fair deali	ng un	til within two years of the commencement of the litigation herein.

- 130. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions and material breaches of the covenants of good faith and fair dealing, Johansson has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, which include, but are not limited to compensatory, consequential and incidental damages. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon allege, that such damages are within the jurisdictional limits of this court, and when Johansson has ascertained the full amount of those damages, she will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint accordingly and/or provide proof of said damages at trial.
- 131. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the officers, directors and/or managing agents of Defendants authorized, directed and/or ratified the wrongful acts of Defendants and are consequently liable to Johansson.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

(Against All Defendants)

- 132. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 70 through 78, 84 through 88, 94 through 98 and 104 through 109, 113 through 119 and 122 through 129, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 133. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer mental anguish and emotional distress. Defendants' continued conduct of selling, exploiting, publicly distributing, disseminating and then knowingly allowing the further publication and public dissemination and exploitation of the Photographs was done with knowledge that Plaintiff's emotional distress would thereby increase, and was done with a wanton and reckless disregard of the consequences to Plaintiff.

1	ll
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	ŀ
10	
11	ŀ
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	•
18	(
19	.
20	
21	
22	ā
23	l
24	C
25	e
26	C
27	,

- 134. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts by Defendants, and each of them, Johansson has been damaged in an amount greater than Two Million (\$2,000,000) Dollars, which include, but are not limited to compensatory, consequential and incidental damages.
- 135. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the aforementioned acts of Defendants were done intentionally or with a conscious disregard of Johansson's rights, and with the intent to vex, injure or annoy Johansson, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice thus entitling Johansson to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them, and to deter such conduct in the future, which amount will be proved at trial.
- 136. Johansson is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the officers, directors and/or managing agents of Defendants authorized, directed and/or ratified the wrongful acts of Defendants and are consequently liable to Johansson.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Declaratory Relief

(Against All Defendants And DOES 1-100, Inclusive)

- 137. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 70 through 78, 84 through 88, 94 through 98 and 104 through 109, 113 through 119 and 122 through 129, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
 - 138. A dispute in controversy now exists between Johansson and Defendants.
- agreed to and executed a valid written model release, the Alleged Model Release, which had the legal effect of granting to him all rights to exploit the Photographs in any way, including for public dissemination, advertising and commercial purposes of any kind, and that Johansson was not entitled and is not entitled to any compensation for the grant of any such rights, and that the grant of such rights was in perpetuity. Defendant further contends that the Alleged Model Release is valid and enforceable in all respects and that Defendant Richardson has the right to publicly display, disseminate and/or license the Photographs for publication and/or otherwise commercially

exploit them.

On the other hand, Johansson denies agreeing to the terms contained in the Alleged 140. Model Release and denies having knowingly signed the Alleged Model Release, and further denies ever having assigned or licensed to Defendants, or any of them, or anyone else for that matter, any rights to publicly display, disseminate, and/or use or exploit the Photographs for advertising, commercial purposes, or otherwise, and contends that the only agreement between Richardson and Johansson was contained in the Agreement alleged hereinabove, the terms of which would not permit Richardson to exploit the Photographs in the manner which Richardson has carried out, and continues to carry out, and would not permit Richardson to publicly display, disseminate, sell, license or otherwise exploit any of the Photographs without having negotiated and obtained a model release, approved by Johansson's agent and thereafter signed by Johansson, for each use other than as one time test shoot photographs for the purported professional modeling job. Johansson further alleges that since she did not knowingly sign the Alleged Model Release nor agree to the terms contained therein or that the Alleged Model Release is null and void and unenforceable, Defendant Richardson had no right to publicly display, disseminate and/or license the Photographs for publication and/or otherwise commercially exploit them.

141. Johansson contends that:

- a. Johansson and Defendant entered into the verbal Agreement, the terms of which are alleged hereinabove, including the agreement that the Photographs were merely "test photos" for use for the one Casting Session only and not for public dissemination, display, publication, or for any commercial use;
- b. Johansson did not knowingly sign the Alleged Model Release, signing merely what she, a non-native English speaker, believed to be a standard model sign-in and age verification form (based upon Defendants' representations), a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit "A" hereto.
- c. Even if the Alleged Model Release had been signed by Johansson with knowledge of its true contents (which is strongly disputed), the Alleged Model Release and any agreement which Defendant relies upon are void and unenforceable for each of the

23

24

25

26

following reasons:

- i. In the unlikely event it were determined that the Johansson had signed the Alleged Model Release, the execution of it would have to have been obtained through fraud, deceit or false pretenses;
- ii. The Alleged Model Release was and is lacking essential, material terms, including the duration of the purported grant of rights, the consideration for Johansson to grant these rights, and other material terms;
- iii. The Alleged Model Release was lacking any consideration to Johansson.
- iv. The Alleged Model Release did not contain any provision regarding the term or duration of the rights being granted and there was no oral agreement regarding that provision.
- v. There was by necessity a mutual mistake of fact regarding rights purportedly being granted by Johansson to Defendant, since Johansson would never have granted the broad, unrestricted, inpurpetuity rights that Defendant claims, would never have permitted any full nude images of herself to be publicly displayed or disseminated, and would not have done a photo shoot to be used for commercial purposes without receiving reasonable compensation, without limiting the type of use and time period of the purposed use of the Photographs, without identifying specifically the publication or type of publication in which the Photographs could be published, without identifying specifically the type of product or advertisement or other commercial use in which the Photographs could be used, and other customary terms;
- vi. If there was not a mutual mistake of fact, then there was, at minimum, a unilateral mistake by Johansson regarding the terms and legal effect of the Alleged Model Release, which mistake had to have been induced by Defendant intentionally or negligently, including Defendant's supposedly soliciting and obtaining Johansson's signature on the Alleged Model Release without dealing

with this matter through Johansson's professional modeling agent;

- vii. The Alleged Model Release was subject to suspension and termination as a result of the use of or licensing by Defendant and/or his agents of certain of the Photographs for publication in the context of a sexually explicit Websites and exhibitions;
- xiii. Because of the outrage by Johansson regarding the unauthorized publication of the Photographs on Richardson's Website, Defendant agreed to terminate any further publication of the Photographs.
- d. The terms of the Alleged Model Release were unconscionable rendering the Alleged Model Release unenforceable for the following reasons, among others:
 - i. Johansson was and is a non-native English speaker/reader at the time Defendant claims that he solicited Johansson's signature on the Alleged Model Release, Johansson was given only seconds to sign the Alleged Model Release, Johansson was not given an opportunity to have her agent or attorney review the Alleged Model Release, and Johansson was not provided a copy of the Alleged Model Release;
 - ii. Johansson was represented at the time, in the fall of 2003, by a professional modeling agency and management firm. LA Models. Defendant was aware that Johansson was represented by an agent and manager and was also aware that if Defendant wanted to do a photo shoot of Johansson for commercial exploitation and wanted Johansson to sign a model release, Defendant should deal with Johansson's agent and manager, and should submit any purposed model release to Johansson's agent and manager.
 - iii. Defendant told Johansson's agent that he intended to do a "test shoot" with Johansson, and therefore, Johansson's agent had no reason to believe that Defendant would try to have Johansson sign a model release allowing any publication or commercial use of the Photographs.
 - e. The Disputed Model Release lacks numerous material terms and provisions,

which are customarily included in model releases.

142. As a result, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Johansson and Defendants concerning the enforceability and validity of the Alleged Model Release, in that Johansson contends that she never knowingly signed a model release nor agreed to the terms contained in the Alleged Model Release, believing it (based upon both express representations by Richardson and that Johansson is a non-native English speaker) to be merely a sign-in and age verification form, while Defendants claim that she did. The Alleged Model Release does not set forth the terms that Johansson claims were actually agreed to between Richardson and her per the terms of the Agreement and/or representations made by Defendant.

- 143. Johansson, therefore, seeks a judicial declaration that:
- a. Johansson did not knowingly sign the Alleged Model Release and did not agree to its terms, that there was no meeting of the minds as to any of the terms contained therein, and, therefore, the Alleged Model Release has no legal force or effect and is invalid and unenforceable;
- b. Even if Johansson had knowingly signed the Alleged Model Release, versus signing on the belief that it was merely a model sign-in and age verification form (which is strongly disputed), the Alleged Model Release is still void and unenforceable the reasons alleged hereinabove;
- c. The only agreement pertaining to the Photographs between Johansson and Defendants and the only right that Defendant obtained was the right to take "test shoot" photographs for casting purpose consideration, but not publicly display, disseminate, license or sell them for publication or otherwise use them for commercial or advertising purposes, as alleged hereinabove;
- d. As a condition of Richardson being entitled to exploit, sell or license any of the Photographs or exploit Johansson's photograph or modeling services, Richardson was obligated to seek Johansson's consent, through Johansson's modeling agency LA Models, negotiate compensation and obtain a model release signed by Johansson for each proposed use, failing which Richardson, nor any of the other Defendants, would not have

any right to publicly display, disseminate, exploit or license any of the Photographs for publication;

- e. As a result of Richardson's tortious and unconscionable conduct, as alleged in part hereinabove, Richardson has unclean hands and is barred and estopped to enforce any aspect of the Agreement, if any such rights still exist;
- f. That the Agreement is void and unenforceable because of a lack of consideration and a total failure of consideration;
- g. Because of Richardson's malicious wrongful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff has the right to and does hereby terminate and rescind the Agreement and any other agreements in its entirety, and therefore, even if any purported rights still exist under the Agreement, such rights have been terminated, extinguished and forfeited as a result of Richardson's outrageous conduct, as alleged herein;
- h. If a trier of fact found that Richardson believed that there was an agreement with Johansson different from the terms of what Johansson reasonably believed and understood to be the Agreement, Richardson and Johansson failed to have a meeting of the minds with regard to the use or exploitation of any of the Photographs and/or there was a mutual mistake of fact with regard to the purported terms of any agreement and, therefore, Richardson would have acquired no right and currently has no right to publicly display, disseminate, license, sell, or otherwise commercially exploit any of the Photographs in any manner whatsoever;
- i. Richardson and the other Defendants have no legal or contractual right to publicly display, disseminate, license, sell, publish, or otherwise commercially exploit or use any of the Photographs; and
- j. By the conduct of Defendant and the other Defendants, said Defendants should be required to deliver to Johansson all of the Photographs (including negatives, slides, proofs, and all prints of same).

///

//,

144. Johansson is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants deny and dispute Johansson's contentions as alleged herein.

145. As a result, Johansson desires a judicial determination of the respective rights and duties of Johansson and Defendants pursuant to the Alleged Model Release. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time so that Johansson may ascertain the rights and duties of Plaintiff and Defendants.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Injunctive Relief

(Against All Defendants And DOES 1-100, Inclusive)

- 146. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 35, 37 through 42, 48 through 52, 54 through 56, 58 through 60 and 70 through 78, 84 through 88, 94 through 98 and 104 through 109, 113 through 119 and 122 through 129, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 147. Johansson is informed and believes and thereon alleges that as a result of the conduct of Defendants described herein, Johansson has and will suffer great and irreparable harm and damage. Johansson is informed and believes and thereon alleges that as a result of the conduct of Defendants described herein, Johansson has sustained and will sustain actual damages that may be difficult to ascertain with certainty.
- 148. Johansson alleges on information and belief that she has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries which she has suffered and will continue to suffer in the future unless the wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, is restrained and enjoined, because it is and will be impossible for Johansson to determine the precise amount of damage, and no amount of money can restore the potential harm to Johansson caused by Defendants, and each of them, as a result of the conduct alleged herein.
- 149. Johansson is informed and believes and thereon alleges that there is a serious risk that she will suffer irreparable harm absent the injunctive relief sought herein, in that the wrongs that have been and will in the future be performed by Defendants, and each of them, are of a continuing character, and will expose Johansson to a continuing injury. Johansson is further

٠,

informed and believes and thereon alleges that there is a serious risk that she will suffer irreparable harm absent the injunctive relief sought herein, in that the wrongs that have been and will in the future be done by Defendants, and each of them, will give rise to a multiplicity of judicial proceedings absent the injunctive relief sought herein.

Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from publishing, distributing, selling, and/or otherwise publicly displaying and/or disseminating the Photographs and from making any use of the Photographs or images of the Photographs and from making unauthorized use of Johansson's name, photograph and/or likeness for commercial purposes; and upon a final hearing seek an Order permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from publishing, distributing, selling, and/or otherwise publicly displaying and/or disseminating the Photographs and from making any use of the Photographs or images of the Photographs and from making unauthorized use of Johansson's name, photograph and/or likeness for commercial purposes.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 1. General and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in an amount not less than One Million (\$1,000,000) Dollars, in accordance with proof at trial;
- 2. Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and deter Defendants, the exact sum in an amount to be determined as appropriate to the Court;
 - 3. Rescission and restitution:

AS TO THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 4. General and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in an amount not less than One Million (\$1,000,000) Dollars, in accordance with proof at trial;
 - 5. Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and deter

3696-2\PLE\COM 042505

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

44

COMPLAINT

AS TO THE SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

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

- 16. General and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in an amount which has yet to be ascertained, but in excess of the jurisdictional limit of this Court, in accordance with proof at trial;
- 17. Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and deter Defendants, the exact sum in an amount to be determined as appropriate to the Court;
- For an injunction to prevent Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and 18. employees, from publicly displaying, disseminating, publishing, distributing, selling, and/or otherwise exploiting the Photographs and from making any further or other use of the negatives. prints, reproductions and/or copies of the Photographs or images of the Photographs contained therein:

AS TO THE SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 19. General and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in an amount which has yet to be ascertained, but in excess of the jurisdictional limit of this Court, in accordance with proof at trial;
- 20. Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and deter Defendants, the exact sum in an amount to be determined as appropriate to the Court;
- For an injunction to prevent Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and 21. employees, from publicly displaying, disseminating, publishing, distributing, selling, and/or otherwise exploiting the Photographs and from making any further or other use of the negatives, prints, reproductions and/or copies of the Photographs or images of the Photographs contained therein;

AS TO THE EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 22. General and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in an amount which has yet to be ascertained, but in excess of the jurisdictional limit of this Court, in accordance with proof at trial;
- Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and deter 23. 28 || Defendants, the exact sum in an amount to be determined as appropriate to the Court;

3696-2\PLE\COM 042505

45

COMPLAINT

24. For an injunction to prevent Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from publicly displaying, disseminating, publishing, distributing, selling, and/or otherwise exploiting the Photographs and from making any further or other use of the negatives, prints, reproductions and/or copies of the Photographs or images of the Photographs contained therein;

AS TO THE NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

25. General and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in an amount which has yet to be ascertained, but in excess of the jurisdictional limit of this Court, in accordance with proof at trial;

AS TO THE TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

26. General and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in an amount which has yet to be ascertained, but in excess of the jurisdictional limit of this Court, in accordance with proof at trial;

AS TO THE ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 27. General and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in an amount not less than Two Million (\$2,000,000) Dollars, in accordance with proof at trial;
- 28. Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and deter Defendants, the exact sum in an amount to be determined as appropriate to the Court;

AS TO THE TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

29. For a judicial declaration as against Defendants, and each of them, in accordance with the requests set forth in the Twelfth Cause of Action;

AS TO THE THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

30. For an injunction to prevent Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from publicly displaying, disseminating, posting, publishing, distributing, selling, and/or otherwise exploiting the Photographs and from making any further or other use of the negatives, prints, reproductions and/or copies of the Photographs or images of the Photographs contained therein, and from making unauthorized use of Johansson's name, photograph and/or

likeness for commercial purposes; 1 2 For an order directing the Defendants to immediately make available to and return 31. to Johansson all of the Photographs, including all negatives, prints, reproductions and/or copies 3 of the Photographs in their possession and control or in the control of any agents or representative; 4 AS TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION: 5 6 32. For costs of the suit incurred; 7 32. For Attorneys' fees; 8 33. For interest at the statutory rate; and, 9 For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper. 34. 10 DATED: May 19, 2005 11 LAVELY & SINGER PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 12 MARTIN D. SINGER MICHAEL D. HOLTZ 13 EVAN N. SPIEGEL 14 By: 15 Attorneys for Plaintiff 16 GABRIELA JOHANSSON 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

3696-2\PLE\COM 042505

28

47

COMPLAINT

		CM-010
MARTIN D. SINGER, ESQ. (SBN 78	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
⊢EVAN N. SPIEGEL, ESQ. (SBN 198	071)	
I LAVELY & SINGER PROF. CORP.	•	FILED
2049 CENTURY PARK EAST, SUIT	E 2400	
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIÁ 9006 TELEPHONE NO.: (310) 556-3501		LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): GABRIELA JOHANS	FAX NO.: (310) 556-3615	MAY 1 9 2005
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LC		MAI I # ZUUJ
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. HILL STREET	071102220	JOHN A. CLARKE, EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK
MAILING ADDRESS:	0010	BY The for
CITY AND ZIP CODE: LOS ANGELES, CA 9 BRANCH NAME: CENTRAL DISTRICT	10012	J. SUNGA, DEPUTY
CASE NAME: JOHANSSON V. RICHA	ARDSON	
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Compley Case Designed	0.005
	Complex Case Designation Counter Joinder	CASE NUMBER B C 333681
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendant	JUDGE:
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000 s \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 1811)	
	below must be completed (see instruction	DEPT.:
1. Check one box below for the case type that	best describes this case:	no on page 2).
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 1800–1812)
Uninsured motorist (46)	Collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Construction defect (10)
I — '	Other contract (37)	Mass tort (40)
Asbestos (04)	Real Property	Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Eminent domain/inverse	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Medical malpractice (45) Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the
Non-Pl/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	above listed provisionally complex case
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	types (41)
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of Judgment
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Enforcement of judgment (20)
X Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	RICO (27)
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	
 This case is X is not comple requiring exceptional judicial management: 	ex under rule 1800 of the California Rules	s of Court. If case is complex, mark the factors
a. Large number of separately represe	ented parties d. Large number o	of witnesses
b. Extensive motion practice raising di		th related actions pending in one or more courts
issues that will be time-consuming	to resolve in other countie	s, states or countries, or in a federal court
c. Substantial amount of documentary	evidence f. Substantial pos	t-judgment judicial supervision
Type of remedies sought (check all that appl	'y):	•
a. X monetary b. X nonmonetary;	declaratory or injunctive relief c. X	punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 16 -	FRAUD; RT OF PUBL; INV PRIV	/ACY; BREACH K; DEC() REL
	action suit.	-) //
Date: MAY 19, 2005	S	
EVAN N. SPIEGEL, ESQ.		a golge
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	NOTICE (SIGN.	ATURE OF PARTY OR APTORNEY FOR PARTY)
 Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the fire 	st paper filed in the action or proceeding.	(except small claims cases or cases float
the Floodie, Failing, or Wellare and III	stitutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, ru	ile 201.8.) Failure to file may result in
sanctions. • File this cover sheet in addition to any cover		
 It this case is complex under rule 1800 et se 	ancet required by local court rule. 3. of the California Rules of Court you m	uset sense a conv of this server sheet are all
other parties to the action or proceeding.	4. 1. 2.0 Samorria raica or Court, you if	ider serve a copy or this cover sneet on all

Inless this is a complex case, this cover sheet shall be used for statistical purposes only.

 Inless this is a complex case, this cover sheet shall be used for statistical purposes only.

 Civil Case Cover Sheet

 Indeed this is a complex case, this cover sheet shall be used for statistical purposes only.

 Civil Case Cover Sheet

 Indeed this is a complex case, this cover sheet shall be used for statistical purposes only.

 Civil Case Cover Sheet

 Indeed this is a complex case, this cover sheet shall be used for statistical purposes only.

 Civil Case Cover Sheet

 Indeed this is a complex case, this cover sheet shall be used for statistical purposes only.

Legal Solutions Q Plus

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers

If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you **must** complete and file, along with your first paper, the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must check **all five** items on the sheet. In item 1, you must check **one** box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the **primary** cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. You do not need to submit a cover sheet with amended papers. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 201.8(c) and 227 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Complex Cases

In complex cases only, parties must also use the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 1800 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

Auto Tort

Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property
Damage/Wrongful Death
Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the
case involves an uninsured
motorist claim subject to
arbitration, check this item
instead of Auto)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wrongful Death)

Asbestos (04) Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24) Medical Malpractice (45) Medical Malpractice Physicians & Surgeons Other Professional Health Care Malpractice Other PI/PD/WD (23) Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism) Intentional Infliction of **Emotional Distress** Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort Business Tort/Unfair Business

Practice (07)
Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil harassment) (08)
Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13)
Fraud (16)
Intellectual Property (19)
Professional Negligence (25)
Legal Malpractice
Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)
Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

Employment

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06) Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) Contract/Warranty Breach—Seller Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence) Negligent Breach of Contract/ Warranty Other Breach of Contract/Warranty Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09) Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff Other Promissory Note/Collections Case Insurance Coverage (not provisionally complex) (18) Autó Subrogátion Other Coverage Other Contract (37) Contractual Fraud Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

Eminent Domain/Inverse
Condemnation (14)
Wrongful Eviction (33)
Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)
Writ of Possession of Real Property
Mortgage Foreclosure
Quiet Title
Other Real Property (not eminent
domain, landlord/tenant, or
foreclosure)

Unlawful Detainer

Commercial (31)
Residential (32)
Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise, report as Commercial or Residential.)

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)
Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)
Writ of Mandate (02)
Writ—Administrative Mandamus
Writ—Mandamus on Limited Court
Case Matter
Writ—Other Limited Court Case
Review
Other Judicial Review (39)
Review of Health Officer Order
Notice of Appeal—Labor
Commissioner Appeals

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rule 1800-1812)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)
Construction Defect (10)
Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)
Securities Litigation (28)
Toxic Tort/Environmental (30)
Insurance Coverage Claims
(arising from provisionally
complex case type listed above)
(41)

Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20)
Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)
Confession of Judgment (nondomestic relations)
Sister State Judgment
Administrative Agency Award
(not unpaid taxes)
Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax
Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint RICO (27)

Other Complaint (not specified above) (42)
Declaratory Relief Only Injunctive Relief Only (non-harassment)
Mechanics Lien
Other Commercial Complaint
Case (non-tort/non-complex)
Other Civil Complaint
(non-tort/non-complex)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate
Governance (21)
Other Petition (not specified above)
(43)
Civil Harassment
Workplace Violence
Elder/Dependent Adult
Abuse
Election Contest
Petition for Name Change
Petition for Relief from Late
Claim
Other Civil Petition

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

[[]	nis tor	m is requi	red pursuant to I	LASC Local I	Rule 2.0 in all	new civil	case filings in the Los Angel	es Superior Court.
Item I.	Chec	k the type	s of hearing and	I fill in the es	timated leng	th of heari	ng expected for this case:	
JURY T	RIAL?	X YES	CLASS ACTION?	YES I	LIMITED CASE?	YES	TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 5-9	HOURS/ X DAY

Item II. Select 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 Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0.

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

- 1. Class Actions must be filed in the County Courthouse, Central District.
- 2. May be filed in Central (Other county, or no Bodily Injury/Property Damage).
- 3. Location where cause of action arose.
- 4. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.
- 5. Location where performance required or defendant resides.
- 6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.
- 7. Location where petitioner resides.
- 8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
- 9. Location where one or more of the parties reside.
- 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office.

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

Tort 1	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above
<u>آ</u>	Auto (22)	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Auto	Uninsured Motorist (46)	A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
ζĒ	Asbestos (04)	A6070 Asbestos Property Damage A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
ry/Property Death Tort	Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
al Injury/I ngful De	Medical Malpractice (45)	A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 2., 4. 1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death	A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) A7230 Intentional Bodity Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 2., 4.
δā	(23)	A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 4.
Tot	Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 2., 3.
y/Froperty Death Tort	Civil Rights (08)	A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Injury	Defamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
son s l Wron	Fraud (16)	A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Ton	Intellectual Property (19)	A6016 Intellectual Property	2., 3.

ment	
Wrongful Death Tort (Cont'd.)	Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage/

ymem	
Wrongful Death	
ul Deat	9641944
h Tort (
\overline{a}	2

Real Property

IL CASE COVER SHEET ADDEND AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION	рөлс 1 0-
	

Judicial Petition re Arbitration (11) 2., 5. A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/ Vacate Arbitration Review Asset Forleiture (05) A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case 9 2 (8£) sgmQ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs .9 ,.2 Unlawful Detainer Unlawful Detainer -Residential (32) A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction) 2,, 6. - Unlawful Detainer -Commercial (31) A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction) 2, 6. - Johnswiul Detainer -A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) 2, 6. (9z)A6032 Quiet Title .6, .5 Other Real Property .6 .2 A6018 Mortgage Foredosure A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case .6 ,.S Wrongful Eviction Condemnation (14) A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels Domain/Inverse 2. 1nenim∃ 1, 2, 3, 8. A6027 Other Contract Dispute (not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) Tortious Interference 1503A 1, 2, 3, 5. (35) Other Contract A6009 Contractual Fraud 3. 1" S.(X (8t) A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex) 1, 2, 5, 8, Insurance Coverage A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case 2.5 (60)Collections A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff 2, 5, 6. A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) 1" 5" 2" (not insurance) A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) 1, 2, 5. (90)A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) .6 ..5 Мапапуу 2., 5. Breach of Contract/ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not Unlawful Detainer or wrongful Emplo A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals .01 (42) A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case Ofher Employment 1, 2, 3. (36) 1, 2, 3. noitsnimeT lutenorW 7509A Wrongfu! Termination Other (35) A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort .s., 3. 1,, 2,, 3, (22) A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) Negligence 1, 2, 3, A6017 Legal Malpractice Professional Sheet Category No. (Среск опуу опе) evodA & qet2 se2 -Civil Case Cover Type of Action Applicable Reasons
C JOHANSSON V. RICHARDSON SHORT TITLE: CASE NUMBER

SHORT TITLE:	JOHANSSON v. R	HARDSON	· .	CASE NUMBER	 _

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet	B Type of Action	C
()	Category No.	(Check only one)	Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Cont	Note of Manager	A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus	2., 8.
Ş.	Writ of Mandate	A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter	2.
æ	(02)	A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2.
Judicial Review (Cont'd.)	Other Judicial Review (39)	A6150 Other Writ / Judicial Review	2., 8.
	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
×	Construction Defect (10)	A6007 Construction defect	1., 2., 3.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
donally Co Litigation	Securities Litigation (28)	A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provis	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
i	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment		A6141 Sister State Judgment	2., 9.
Tet	Enforcement of Judgment	A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.
Porc		A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2., 9.
o E	(20)	A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2., 8.
		A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2., 8.
ļ		A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8., 9.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
eous (Other Consulator	A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.
Comple	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above)	A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.
<u> </u>	-	A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
≥ [(42)	A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
Sio	Partnership/Corporation Governance (21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
etiti		A6121 Civil Harassment	2.2.0
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions		A6123 Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9.
S .	Other Petitions	A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.
no e	(Not Specified Above)	A6190 Election Contest	2., 3., 9.
檀	[(43)	A6110 Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.
<u>18</u> 06	<u> </u>	A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 4., 8.
≥		A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.
L	-i		

CIV 109 03-04 LASC Approved

tiating pleading in the case.	Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copie must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other init
muhaabhe sidt has teads sevos edt to se	under 18 years of age, or if required by Court.
, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor	6. Signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, JC form 982(a)(27),
	5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
(eff. Date).	4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form CIV 109
	3. Civil Case Cover Sheet form JC 982.2(b)(1).
e Clerk.	2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the
	1. Original Complaint or Petition.
	БВОРЕВТУ СОММЕНСЕ УОЛЯ ИЕМ СО
OREADY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO	PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS COMPLETED AND
led for assignment to the LOS ANGELES District of the Los Angeles Superior Court	(Code of Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and LASC Local Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) Dated: MAY 19, 2005
	FOS ANGELES CA 90046
bvl8 feer	REASON: CHECK THE NUMBER UNDER COLUMN C WHICH APPLIES IN THIS CASE 7. \$ 2. \$ 3. \$ 4. \$ 5. \$ 6. \$ 7. \$ 8. \$ 9. \$ 10.
sidence or place of business, performance, or asson for filing in the court location you selected	Item III. Statement of Location: Enter the address of the accident, party's resother circumstance indicated in Item II., Step 3 on Page 1, as the proper rea
CASE NUMBER	SHORT TITLE: JOHANSSON V. RICHARDSON