JOHN P. LeCRONE (State Bar No. 115875)
johnlecrone@dwt.com
JONATHAN L. SEGAL (State Bar No. 264238)
jonathansegal@dwt.com
EVELYN F. WANG (State Bar No. 273622)
evelynwang@dwt.com
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 South Figueroa Street, 24th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017-2566
Telephone: (213) 633-6800
Fax: (213) 633-6899

Attorneys for Defendants
REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., and
REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS
(CALIFORNIA), INC.

FILED
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
MAY 2 - 2014
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AARON M. ROSENBERG, an individual, Plaintiff, vs. REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., an Arizona corporation; REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS (CALIFORNIA), INC., a California corporation; REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware corporation; REDFLEX HOLDINGS LIMITED, an Australian form of entity unknown; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,	Case No. CV14-3420 GW RZx **NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1441 (DIVERSITY)**

TO THE CLERK OF THE COURT OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441 and 1446, defendant and petitioner Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, ("Defendant") hereby removes to this Court the state action described below. In support of this Notice of Removal, Defendant alleges as follows:

1. On or about February 19, 2014, plaintiff Aaron M. Rosenberg ("Plaintiff") filed the above-entitled action as Civil Case No. BC536891 in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles ("State Action"). (A true and correct copy of the Complaint for Damages (the "Complaint") is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.) The Complaint alleges claims for wrongful termination in violation of public policy, violation of California Labor Code § 1102.5, and violation of California Labor Code § 2802 against Defendant, sham defendant Redflex Traffic Systems (California), Inc., ("Sham Defendant"), Redflex Holdings Limited, and Arizona corporation Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., which does not exist.

2. Redflex Holdings Limited has not been served in this lawsuit. There is no Arizona corporation known as Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc. (Declaration of Robert DeVincenzi filed concurrently ("DeVincenzi Decl."), at ¶ 3; Declaration of John LeCrone filed concurrently ("LeCrone Decl."), at ¶ 7.) Plaintiff served a copy of the Summons and Complaint in the State Action on Defendant's agent for service of process on April 4, 2014. A true and correct copy of the Summons received by Defendant is attached as **Exhibit B**. Plaintiff also served a copy of the Summons and Complaint in the State Action on Sham Defendant's agent for service of process on April 4, 2014. A true and correct copy of the Summons received by Sham Defendant is attached as **Exhibit C**. Accordingly, this Notice of Removal is timely filed within the 30-day period set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b). *See, Murphy Bros., Inc. v. Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc.*, 526 U.S. 344, 354 (1999) ("the defendant's period for removal will be no less than 30 days from service").

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 S. FIGUEROA ST, SUITE 2400
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-2566

3. Sham Defendant consents to removal of this action.

4. The Complaint also identifies "Does 1 through 25" as defendants in the above-entitled action. Because "Does 1 through 25" are fictitious, as discussed below, and because they have not yet been served, their consent to joinder in removal is not necessary. In addition, because Redflex Holdings Limited has not been served, its consent to joinder in removal is not necessary. *See Salveson v. Western States Bankcard Ass'n*, 731 F.2d 1423, 1429-30 (9th Cir. 1984) (defendants named in the state court action but not yet served need not be joined in the removal); *see also Cmty. Bldg. Co. v. Maryland Cas. Co.*, 8 F.2d 678, 678-79 (9th Cir. 1925) ("defendants over whom the court has not acquired jurisdiction may be disregarded in removal proceedings, and that the defendants who have been summoned must of necessity be allowed to exercise their right of removal").

DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP

5. This is a civil action over which this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), and is one which may be removed to this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), in that it is a civil action between citizens of different states and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs. Because the State Action is pending in the Central District of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, removal of the State Action to this District Court is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a).

6. According to the Complaint, Plaintiff is domiciled in California. (Ex. A, Complaint ¶ 9.) Accordingly, Plaintiff is a citizen of California.

7. In contrast, Defendant was not at the time of filing, and is not now, a citizen of the State of California. For purposes of determining corporate citizenship, a corporation is deemed a citizen of any state in which it has been incorporated and the state where it has its principal place of business. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1). Here, at the time of the filing of the State Action, Defendant was a corporation incorporated in the state of Delaware, with its principal place of business in Arizona,

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 S. FIGUEROA ST, SUITE 2400
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-2566

and Defendant's residence has not changed. As the Supreme Court has held, a corporation's principal place of business is where "the corporation's high level officers direct, control, and coordinate the corporation's activities. Lower federal courts have often metaphorically called that place the corporation's 'nerve center.' . . . [T]he 'nerve center' will typically be found at a corporation's headquarters." *The Hertz Corp. v. Friend,* 559 U.S. 77, 81; 130 S. Ct. 1181, 1186 (Feb. 23, 2010) (internal citations omitted). Here, Defendant maintains its principal offices in Arizona, and its high-level officers direct, control and coordinate its operations primarily from its offices in Arizona. Accordingly, for purposes of jurisdiction under 28 U.S. § 1332(a), Defendant is a citizen of Delaware with its principal place of business in Arizona. (DeVincenzi Decl. ¶ 2.) Defendant is not now nor was it at the time of filing a citizen of the State of California; and Defendant's high level officers do not direct, control and coordinate its operations from California. *Id.*

8. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), "[f]or purposes of removal . . . the citizenship of defendants sued under fictitious names shall be disregarded." Consequently, the fictitious "Does 1 through 100" shall be disregarded for determining diversity jurisdiction.

9. Sham Defendant is a California corporation with its principal place of business in California who has been fraudulently joined and named in the Complaint for the specific purpose of defeating diversity jurisdiction. Sham Defendant will promptly move for dismissal from this action.

10. The joinder of non-diverse Sham Defendant should be ignored for the purpose of determining diversity because Plaintiff cannot state a valid cause of action against Sham Defendant. *Morris v. Princess Cruises, Inc.,* 236 F.3d 1061, 1067 (9th Cir. 2001) ("Joinder of a nondiverse defendant is deemed fraudulent, and the defendant's presence in the lawsuit is ignored for the purpose of determining diversity [i]f the plaintiff fails to state a cause of action against a resident defendant, and the failure is obvious according to the settled rules of the state. Further, the

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 S. FIGUEROA ST, SUITE 2400
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-2566

defendant is entitled to present the facts showing the joinder to be fraudulent") (internal quotations and citations omitted).

11. In his Complaint, for the purposes of obscuring the roles and identities of each party he has named, Plaintiff combines the identities of four corporations – one of which (Redflex Arizona) does not even exist – into one, collectively defining them as Redflex. (Ex. A, Complaint ¶¶ 5-6.) Indeed, Plaintiff fails to allege specific facts against any particular Redflex entity.

12. Plaintiff was the employee of only one of the entities named in the Complaint – Defendant. (DeVincenzi Decl. ¶¶ 4, 6-7, Ex. A.) Plaintiff was not an employee of Sham Defendant: Sham Defendant had no control over Plaintiff's hours of work, type of work, or working conditions, did not pay Plaintiff or set his wages, and did not administer Plaintiff's benefits or maintain any of his employment or payroll records. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.)

13. Additionally, Plaintiff's allegations that Sham Defendant acted as Defendant's agent with respect to Plaintiff, or that Sham Defendant is Plaintiff's alter-ego are conclusory, boiler-plate allegations, and, as such, should be discarded. *See Neilson v. Union Bank of Cal., N.A.,* 290 F. Supp. 2d 1101, 1116 (C.D. Cal. 2003) ("Conclusory allegations of 'alter ego' status are insufficient to state a claim. Rather, a plaintiff must allege specifically both of the elements of alter ego liability, as well as facts supporting each."); *Hydroxycut Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig. v. Iovate Health,* 801 F. Supp. 2d 993 ("Although Plaintiffs' claim of agency is not subject to a heightened pleading requirement, Plaintiffs must allege sufficient fact to support a plausible claim of agency."). Even if Plaintiff was able to show that Sham Defendant was Defendant's alter ego, it would still not lead to diversity jurisdiction, as a subsidiary is not liable for its parent's deeds. *See TPS Utilicom Servs. v. AT&T Corp.,* 223 F. Supp. 2d 1089, 1103 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (holding that "the subsidiary corporation is not liable for the acts of the parent or shareholder merely on the basis

of alter ego" and finding that a subsidiary was a sham defendant) (citation and quotation omitted).

14. All of Plaintiff's allegations against all defendants are premised entirely on the existence of an employer/employee relationship:

a. California Labor Code § 1102.5 only addresses conduct by "an employer" or a "person acting on behalf of the employer" (emphasis added).

b. California Labor Code § 2802 requires that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful." (emphasis added).

c. A cause of action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy may only be stated by an employee against his employer. *See Miklosky v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.*, 44 Cal. 4th 876, 901 (2008) ("We conclude therefore that the common law *Tameny* cause of action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy lies only against an employer.") (emphasis added). Indeed, "there can be no *Tameny* cause of action without the prior existence of an employment relationship between the parties." *Id.* at 900 (emphasis added).

15. Plaintiff is not, and has never been, an employee of Sham Defendant. First, as noted on Plaintiff's written employment contract, which Plaintiff executed, Plaintiff was the employee of Defendant. (DeVincenzi Decl. ¶ 7, Ex. A.) Second, to the extent that Plaintiff has any relationship with Sham Defendant, his relationship was not an employer/employee relationship. The relevant factors in determining

whether there is employment include whether the Sham Defendant had the exclusive power to control Plaintiff's wages or rate of pay, his hours of work, the type of work he did, his place of work and working conditions, whether it had the power to discharge him, and the parties' belief as to the employment relationship. *See Jones v. County of Los Angeles*, 99 Cal. App. 4th 1039, 1045 (2002) (holding that a court employee was not jointly employed by the County simply because the County paid the employee's salary). Even if one factor weighs in favor of finding an employer/employee relationship, it is insufficient. *See Futrell v. Payday Cal.*, 190 Cal. App. 4th 1419, 1430-35 (2010) (payroll company that calculates pay, tax withholdings and issues paychecks not employer because it did not control employees). Here, the only entity that could, and did, exercise the level of control over Plaintiff necessary to create an employment relationship was Defendant. (DeVincenzi Decl. ¶¶ 6-9, Ex. A.) Sham Defendant had no control over Plaintiff, did not supervise him, could not terminate him, did not control his wages or rate of pay, did not control his duties, and did not control his place of employment. (DeVincenzi Decl. ¶ 5.) In fact, Plaintiff reported to Karen Finley, who was Defendant's Chief Executive Officer, and had no involvement with Sham Defendant. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.) The Board of Directors for Defendant made the decision to terminate Plaintiff and informed Plaintiff that he was terminated. (*Id.* at ¶ 9.)

16. Additionally, Sham Defendant had no role in Plaintiff's participation in any investigations alleged in the Complaint, and had nothing to do with the alleged reimbursement or indemnification of Plaintiff. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 10-11.) At no time did Sham Defendant act as Defendant's agent with respect to the alleged investigation discussed in the Complaint, or with respect to Plaintiff's termination of employment. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 5, 9-11.)

17. Because Plaintiff was only the employee of Defendant, and was not employed by Sham Defendant, Plaintiff cannot state a claim for either wrongful

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 S. FIGUEROA ST, SUITE 2400
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-2566

termination or violation of California Labor Code § 1102.5 or § 2802 against Sham Defendant.

18. For the reasons set forth in paragraphs 5 through 16, above, there is complete diversity between Plaintiff and Defendant, and this action may be removed to this Court. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a).

AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY

19. With respect to the amount in controversy, the threshold amount is satisfied in this action. In measuring the amount in controversy for purposes of diversity jurisdiction, "a court must assume that the allegations of the complaint are true and assume that a jury will return a verdict for the plaintiff on all claims made in the complaint." *Kenneth Rothschild Trust v. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter*, 199 F. Supp. 2d 993, 1001 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (quotations omitted). In addition, courts should aggregate damages in determining whether the amount in controversy exceeds $75,000. *Id.* at 1001-1002; *Bank of Cal. Nat'l Ass'n v. Twin Harbors Lumber Co.*, 465 F. 2d 489, 491 (9th Cir. 1972).

20. Certain allegations, separately and together, sufficiently satisfy the amount in controversy requirement and confirm that Plaintiff is seeking in excess of $75,000.

a. First, the Complaint seeks to recover back pay, benefits and future earnings. (*See* Ex. A, Complaint at Prayer ¶¶ 3-5, 9). At the time Plaintiff's employment terminated on February 20, 2013, Plaintiff was earning approximately $256,791 per year. (DeVincenzi Decl. ¶ 12.) Over one year has elapsed since the separation of Plaintiff's employment; therefore, Plaintiff's lost salary earnings alone at this time are in excess of $256,791.

b. Second, Plaintiff seeks to recover damages for emotional distress, and punitive damages. (*See* Ex. A, Complaint at Prayer ¶ 10.) Emotional distress damages have value for purposes of determining

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 S. FIGUEROA ST, SUITE 2400
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-2566

the amount in controversy. *See Kroske v. U.S. Bank Corp.*, 432 F. 3d 976, 980 (9th Cir. 2005) (emotional distress damages of at least $25,000 considered in calculating amount in controversy).

c. Third, Plaintiff seeks to recover punitive damages. (*See* Ex. A, Complaint at Prayer ¶ 13.) "It is well established that punitive damages are part of the amount in controversy in a civil action." *Gibson v. Chrysler Corp.*, 261 F.3d 927, 945 (9th Cir. 2001).

d. Thus, based on the nature of Plaintiff's allegations, the extent and number of claims asserted, and the relief sought by Plaintiff in the Complaint – including past and future lost employment earnings and benefits, emotional distress damages, and punitive damages – it is apparent that the amount in controversy exceeds $75,000.

21. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) because Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in and the acts alleged in the Complaint took place in the Central District of California.

STATE COURT FILE

22. The following constitutes all of the process, pleadings or orders received by Defendant or otherwise found in the State Action file. True and correct copies are attached:

Ex. A:	Complaint
Ex. B:	Summons to Defendant
Ex. C:	Summons to Sham Defendant
Ex. D:	Civil Case Cover Sheet
Ex. E:	Addendum and Statement of Location
Ex. F:	Notice of Order to Show Cause Hearing
Ex. G:	Notice of Case Assignment – Unlimited Civil Case
Ex. H:	Voluntary Efficient Litigation Stipulations
Ex I:	Stipulation – Early Organizational Meeting

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 S. FIGUEROA ST, SUITE 2400
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-2566

Ex. J: Stipulation – Discovery Resolution

Ex. K: Informal Discovery Conference

Ex. L: Stipulation and Order – Motions in Limine

23. Concurrently with the filing of this Notice, Defendant has provided written notice of removal to all adverse parties and has filed a copy of this Notice of Removal with the Clerk of the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

24. Based upon the foregoing, Defendant hereby removes this action from the Los Angeles County Superior Court to this Court, and requests that further proceedings be conducted in this Court as provided by law.

DATED: May 2, 2014

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
JOHN P. LeCRONE
JONATHAN L. SEGAL
EVELYN F. WANG

By: John P. LeCrone

Attorneys for Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., and Redflex Traffic Systems (California), Inc.

EXHIBIT A

Thomas H. Bienert, Jr., (State Bar No. 135311)
tbienert@bmkattorneys.com
Michael R. Williams, (State Bar No. 192222)
mwilliams@bmkattorneys.com
Ali Matin, (State Bar No. 268452)
amatin@bmkattorneys.com
BIENERT, MILLER & KATZMAN, PLC
903 Calle Amanecer, Suite 350
San Clemente, California 92673
Telephone (949) 369-3700/Facsimile (949) 369-3701

Attorneys for Plaintiff
AARON M. ROSENBERG

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court Of California
County Of Los Angeles

FEB 19 2014

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: Judi Lara, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – STANLEY MOSK COURTHOUSE

AARON M. ROSENBERG, an individual;

Plaintiff,

v.

REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., an Arizona Corporation; REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS (CALIFORNIA), INC., a California Corporation; REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware Corporation; REDFLEX HOLDINGS LIMITED, an Australian form of entity unknown; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. BC536891

COMPLAINT FOR:

(1) WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY
(2) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 1102.5 ET AL.
(3) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2808 ET AL.

Plaintiff Aaron M. Rosenberg submits the following complaint for: Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy; Violation of Labor Code § 1102.5 et al.; and Violation of Labor Code § 2808 et al., and respectfully alleges as follows:

PARTIES IN THE ACTION

1. Plaintiff Aaron M. Rosenberg ("Plaintiff"), an individual, was at all pertinent times mentioned herein a resident of the County Los Angeles, California.

2. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc. is an Arizona corporation ("Redflex AZ") engaged in the development and manufacturing of digital photo enforcement devices, including red light camera, speed camera, and school bus arm camera systems, which utilize sensor and image capture technologies.

3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant Redflex Traffic Systems (California), Inc. is a California corporation ("Redflex CA") engaged in the development and manufacturing of digital photo enforcement devices, including red light camera, speed camera, and school bus arm camera systems, which utilize sensor and image capture technologies.

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc. is a Delaware corporation ("Redflex DE") engaged in the development and manufacturing of digital photo enforcement devices, including red light camera, speed camera, and school bus arm camera systems, which utilize sensor and image capture technologies.

5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant Redflex Holdings Limited ("Redflex Holdings") is an Australian company, the form of entity unknown, and the parent company of Redflex AZ, Reflex CA, and/or Redflex DE.

6. Redflex AZ, Redflex CA, Redflex DE, and Redflex Holdings shall be collectively referred to herein as "Redflex."

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at all times relevant, Defendants, and each of them, including Does 1 through 25, inclusive, and each of them, were the agents, servants, employees, representatives, co-conspirators, retailers, distributors, wholesalers, management companies, subsidiaries, parent companies, and/or joint venturers of the remaining Defendants, and were

at all times material hereto acting within the course, scope, and purpose of their agency, employment and/or that all of the acts and conduct described herein were subsequently performed with the knowledge, acquiescence, ratification, and consent of the respective principals, and the benefits thereof accepted by their principals.

8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that all of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate Defendant, was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective Defendant corporate employers, officers, and management-level employees of the corporate employers. Additionally, the corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of their employees, agents and representatives and each of them; and upon completion of the acts and conduct described herein, corporate employees, agents and representatives, and the Defendant corporations, respectively and collectively, ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded, acquiesced, approved, and consented to each and every of the acts and conduct of the corporate employees, agents and representatives.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court because Plaintiff and Redflex CA are domiciled in California. Plaintiff alleges that Redflex AZ, Redflex DE, and Redflex Holdings have availed themselves of forum benefits by directing Redflex CA's activities, have a pervasive and continual degree of control over Redflex CA, and/or have engaged in interstate business activities within California. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Redflex DE is qualified to do business in California and does business in California.

10. Plaintiff alleges that venue in the above-entitled Court is proper pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, because Redflex CA resides in Culver City, California. Plaintiff further alleges that Redflex DE is qualified to do business in California and does business in California.

///

///

///

///

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

11. In or about March 2002, Plaintiff and Redflex entered into an employment agreement. During his tenure with Redflex, Plaintiff repeatedly was promoted. As Plaintiff's title and position changed within the company, the Parties entered into separate employment agreements in 2006, 2008, and 2011 reflecting such change.

12. Throughout his employment with Redflex, Plaintiff received outstanding performance reviews. Among the key factors in Redflex's positive assessment of Plaintiff's job performance was his success in building relationships with government employees and officials in the jurisdictions in which Redflex did or sought to do business. From the outset of his employment with the company, Redflex management instructed and otherwise made clear to Plaintiff that one of the ways in which he was to build such relationships was through the use of entertainment, gifts, and other inducements to government employees and officials. At no time prior to late 2012 did Redflex provide Plaintiff with any training regarding the legal limitations on the use of such entertainment, gifts, or inducements. Rather, Plaintiff repeatedly was instructed and encouraged by his supervisors to do whatever was necessary to build and maintain positive relationships with government employees and officials.

13. The entertainment, gifts, and inducements were reflected in Plaintiff's periodic expense reports and/or other corporate records, which were routinely reviewed and approved by Redflex management. On many occasions, Plaintiff incurred and/or approved such expenses at the express direction of his supervisors at Redflex. At no time did Redflex management inform Plaintiff that his expenses relating to government employees or officials were unlawful or inconsistent with Redflex's corporate policies and procedures. Indeed, at no time during his employment with Redflex did Plaintiff engage in any conduct outside of the course and scope of his employment as defined by Redflex management, including the company's Board of Directors and Chief Executive Officer.

14. In approximately October 2012, as Redflex's corporate policies and procedures regarding entertainment, gifts, and inducements to government employees and officials began to come to light publicly, Redflex falsely portrayed Plaintiff as a rogue employee, inaccurately claiming that he was solely responsible for an improper expense incurred in 2010 for the benefit of a City of Chicago employee. Despite this false accusation, however, Redflex took no adverse employment action against

Plaintiff. Indeed, in statements to the press, Redflex management stated that it had reprimanded Plaintiff and sent him to "anti-bribery training" after learning of the improper 2010 expense. Both statements were patently false, and in fact Redflex had never reprimanded or taken any adverse employment action whatsoever against Plaintiff relating to his use of company funds to provide entertainment, gifts, or inducements to government employees or officials.

15. In November 2012, after receiving Redflex's first ever "foreign corrupt practices act" training, Plaintiff contacted Redflex's General Counsel to report his concerns about the legality of certain of Redflex's expense practices. Redflex's General Counsel instructed Plaintiff to report his concerns to Sidley Austin, a private law firm that Redflex was paying to conduct an "internal investigation" of the company's practices. Notably, Redflex's General Counsel did not instruct Plaintiff to report any of his concerns or the facts underlying them to any law enforcement or government authorities.

16. Plaintiff subsequently participated in the "internal investigation" conducted by Redflex's lawyers at Sidley Austin. In a series of interviews beginning in December 2012, Plaintiff informed Sidley Austin attorneys of Redflex's corporate practice and policy of providing entertainment, gifts, and inducements to government employees and officials. Following these disclosures in December of 2012, Redflex still took no adverse employment action against Plaintiff.

17. On or about February 4, 2014, Plaintiff met with the Office of the Inspector General of the City of Chicago ("Chicago IG") in California (the "Chicago IG Meeting") as part of an investigation by the Chicago IG into Redflex's expense practices relating to Chicago city employees and officials. Plaintiff, though his counsel, had expressly requested that no Redflex representatives attend the Chicago IG Meeting, stating that Plaintiff "would like to be able to provide full and complete cooperation to the Inspector General's Office without worrying that such cooperation will result in retaliation or other adverse action against him by Redflex." Redflex's lawyers at Sidley Austin insisted on attending the Chicago IG Meeting over Plaintiff's objection.

18. During the Chicago IG Meeting, with a Sidley Austin attorney present, Plaintiff provided detailed information regarding the conduct of Redflex employees, executives, and Board members in providing and encouraging entertainment, gifts, and other inducements to Chicago city employees and officials, as well as similar conduct in other jurisdictions.

19. Two weeks later, on February 20, 2013, Redflex terminated Plaintiff's employment. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Redflex terminated Plaintiff's employment in direct retaliation for Plaintiff's disclosure of facts regarding Redflex's corporate expense practices and other potentially unlawful conduct to government authorities.

REDFLEX'S FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY PLAINTIFF

20. On or about February 14, 2013, Plaintiff made a demand under section 2802 of the California Labor Code and other applicable law for payment of legal fees and expenses that he had incurred, and is continuing to incur, including but not limited to fees and expenses incurred in connection with the Chicago IG investigation. Such legal fees and expenses are a direct consequence of the discharge of his duties at Redflex and/or performed at the direction and impetus of his superiors at Redflex.

21. On February 20, 2013, Redflex wrongfully refused Plaintiff's demand. Redflex has not, to this day, indemnified Plaintiff as required by California Labor Code § 2802 and other applicable law.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy Against All Defendants)

22. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set herein.

23. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Redflex were in an employer-employee relationship. Redflex terminated Plaintiff's employment on February 20, 2013.

24. Redflex violated public policy by terminating Plaintiff's employment in retaliation for Plaintiff's protected conduct as described above.

25. As a direct and proximate result of the Redflex's of conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount beyond the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court and to be established by proof at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Labor Code § 1102.5 et al. Against All Defendants)

26. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set herein.

27. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and Redflex were in an employer-employee relationship. Redflex terminated Plaintiff's employment on February 20, 2013.

28. Plaintiff engaged protected activity as described above. Redflex terminated Plaintiff for engaging in such protected activity

29. As a direct and proximate result of the Redflex's of conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount beyond the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court and to be established by proof at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Labor Code § 2802 et al.)

30. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set herein.

31. Plaintiff engaged the services of legal counsel to, among other things, represent and assist him with the Chicago IG investigation. Plaintiff has incurred legal fees and expenses and continues to incur such fee and expenses. These legal expenditures were necessary and incurred as a direct consequence of Plaintiff's discharge of his duties as a Redflex employee, and performed at the direction and impetus of his superiors at Redflex.

32. Plaintiff has refused to indemnify Plaintiff in violation Labor Code § 2802, and, as a result Redflex's refusal, Plaintiff has suffered losses in an amount to be established by proof at trial.

33. As a direct and proximate result of the Redflex's of conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount beyond the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court and to be established by proof at trial.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against each Defendant as follows:

1. General damages in excess of $25,000;
2. Compensatory damages;
3. Backpay and benefits;
4. Backpay and benefits under Labor Code § 98.6 et al.;
5. Loss of future earnings;
6. Pecuniary losses;
7. Damages under Labor Code § 1105 et al.;
8. Civil penalties under Labor Code § 1102.5 et al.;
9. Damages for loss of earnings and earning power;
10. Damage for emotional distress;
11. Declaratory judgment;
12. Declaratory judgment that Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802;
13. Punitive damages;
14. For interest at the maximum legal rate;
15. For costs of suit herein incurred; and
16. For such other and further relief as to the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: February 19, 2014

BIENERT, MILLER & KATZMAN, PLC

By: _____
Thomas H. Bienert, Jr.
Michael R. Williams
Ali Matin
Attorneys for Plaintiff
AARON M. ROSENBERG

EXHIBIT B

SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)

SUM-100

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court Of California
County Of Los Angeles

FEB 19 2014

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: Judi Lara, Deputy

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., an
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO): Arizona Corporation; REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS (CALIFORNIA), INC., a California Corporation; REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware Corporation; REDFLEX HOLDINGS LIMITED, an Australian form of entity unknown; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: AARON M. ROSENBERG, an
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): individual

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (*www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp*), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (*www.lawhelpcalifornia.org*), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (*www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp*), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of $10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de $10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):
Superior Court County of Los Angeles
Stanley Mosk Courthouse
111 N. Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90012-3014

CASE NUMBER: *(Número del Caso):* BC 536891

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Thomas H. Bienert, Jr. (SBN 135311) (949) 369-3700 (949) 369-3701
BIENERT, MILLER & KATZMAN, PLC
903 Calle Amanecer, Suite 350
San Clemente, California 92673

DATE: *(Fecha)* SHERRI R. CARTER Clerk, by Judi Lara *(Secretario)*, Deputy *(Adjunto)*

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons *(form POS-010).)*
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, *(POS-010)).*

(SEAL)

FEB 19 2014

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served
1. [ ] as an individual defendant.
2. [ ] as the person sued under the fictitious name of *(specify):*
3. [X] on behalf of *(specify):* REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS INC. a Delaware Corporation

under: [X] CCP 416.10 (corporation) [ ] CCP 416.60 (minor)
[ ] CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) [ ] CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
[ ] CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) [ ] CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
[ ] other *(specify):*

4. [ ] by personal delivery on *(date):*

NATIONAL REGISTERED AGENTS, INC

SERVICE OF PROCESS SUMMARY TRANSMITTAL FORM

To: VIRGINIA O'MALLEY
REDFLEX GENERAL COUNSEL
23751 N 23RD AVE #150
PHOENIX, AZ 85085-1854

SOP Transmittal # 524788892

800-592-9023 - Telephone

Entity Served: REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC. (Domestic State: DELAWARE)

Enclosed herewith are legal documents received on behalf of the above captioned entity by National Registered Agents, Inc or its Affiliate in the State of DELAWARE on this 17 day of April, 2014. The following is a summary of the document(s) received:

1. **Title of Action:** Aaron M. Rosenberg, etc., Pltf. vs. Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., etc. et al., Dfts.
2. **Document(s) Served:** COMPLAINT,SUMMONS
   Other: Cover Sheet/Addendum and Statement/Order/Notice/Attachment/Stipulation(s)
3. **Court of Jurisdiction/Case Number:** County of Los Angeles - Stanley Mosk Courthouse, CA
   Case # BC536891
4. **Amount Claimed, if any:** N/A
5. **Method of Service:**

   _X_ Personally served by: _X_ Process Server ___ Deputy Sheriff ___ U. S Marshall

   ___ Delivered Via: ___ Certified Mail ___ Regular Mail ___ Facsimile

   ___ Other (Explain):
6. **Date and Time of Receipt:** 04/17/2014 10:05:00 AM CST
7. **Appearance/Answer Date:** Within 30 days after this summons
8. **Received From:** Thomas H. Bienert, Jr.
   Bienert, Miller & Katzman, PLC
   903 Calle Amanecer
   Suite 350
   San Clemente, CA 92673
   949-369-3700
9. **Federal Express Airbill #** 798581643910
10. **Call Made to:** Not required
11. **Special Comments:**

SOP Papers with Transmittal, via Fed Ex 2 Day
Image SOP
Email Notification, VIRGINIA O'MALLEY VOMALLEY@REDFLEX.COM
Email Notification, SARAH CRIDER SCRIDER@REDFLEX.COM
REMARKS : The documents received have been modified to reflect the name of the entity being served.

NATIONAL REGISTERED AGENTS, INC

CopiesTo:

Transmitted by Amy McLaren

The information contained in this Summary Transmittal Form is provided by National Registered Agents, Inc for informational purposes only and should not be considered a legal opinion. It is the responsibility of the parties receiving this form to review the legal documents forwarded and to take appropriate action.

ORIGINAL

EXHIBIT C

4-4-14 3:10pm

SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)

SUM-100

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., an
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO): Arizona Corporation; REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS (CALIFORNIA), INC., a California Corporation; REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware Corporation; REDFLEX HOLDINGS LIMITED, an Australian form of entity unknown; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: AARON M. ROSENBERG, an
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): individual

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court Of California
County Of Los Angeles

FEB 19 2014

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: Judi Lara, Deputy

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of $10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de $10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

CASE NUMBER: *(Número del Caso):* BC 536891

Superior Court County of Los Angeles
Stanley Mosk Courthouse
111 N. Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90012-3014

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Thomas H. Bienert, Jr. (SBN 135311) (949) 369-3700 (949) 369-3701
BIENERT, MILLER & KATZMAN, PLC
903 Calle Amanecer, Suite 350
San Clemente, California 92673

DATE: *(Fecha)* SHERRI R. CARTER Clerk, by *(Secretario)* Judi Lara, Deputy *(Adjunto)*

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

(SEAL)

FEB 19 2014

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served
1. [ ] as an individual defendant.
2. [ ] as the person sued under the fictitious name of *(specify)*: REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS (CALIFORNIA), INC., a
3. [X] on behalf of *(specify)*: California Corporation
under: [X] CCP 416.10 (corporation) [ ] CCP 416.60 (minor)
[ ] CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) [ ] CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
[ ] CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) [ ] CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
[ ] other *(specify)*:
4. [ ] by personal delivery on *(date)*:

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use
Judicial Council of California
SUM-100 [Rev. July 1, 2009]

SUMMONS

Legal Solutions Plus

Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 465

NATIONAL REGISTERED AGENTS, INC.

SERVICE OF PROCESS SUMMARY TRANSMITTAL FORM

To: VIRGINIA O'MALLEY
REDFLEX GENERAL COUNSEL
23751 N 23RD AVE #150
PHOENIX, AZ 85085-1854

SOP Transmittal # 524711455

213-337-4615 - Telephone

Entity Served: REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS (CALIFORNIA), INC. (Domestic State: CALIFORNIA)

Enclosed herewith are legal documents received on behalf of the above captioned entity by National Registered Agents, Inc. or its Affiliate in the State of CALIFORNIA on this 04 day of April, 2014. The following is a summary of the document(s) received:

1. **Title of Action:** Aaron M. Rosenberg, etc., Pltf. vs. Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., etc., et al. including Redflex Traffic Systems (California), Inc., etc., Dfts.

2. **Document(s) Served:** SUMMONS & COMPLAINT
Other: Cover Sheet/Addendum and Statement/Order/Notice/Instructions/Stipulation(s)

3. **Court of Jurisdiction/Case Number:** Los Angeles County - Superior Court - Central District, CA
Case # BC536891

4. **Amount Claimed, if any:** N/A

5. **Method of Service:**

_X_ Personally served by: _X_ Process Server ___ Deputy Sheriff ___ U. S Marshall
___ Delivered Via: ___ Certified Mail ___ Regular Mail ___ Facsimile
___ Other (Explain):

6. **Date and Time of Receipt:** 04/04/2014 03:10:00 PM CST

7. **Appearance/Answer Date:** Earliest Answer Date - Within 30 days after service (Document(s) may contain additional answer dates)

8. **Received From:** Thomas H. Bienert, Jr.
Bienert, Miller & Katzman, PLC
903 Calle Amanecar, Suite 350
San Clemente, CA 92673
949-369-3700

9. **Federal Express Airbill #** 798456170159

10. **Call Made to:** Not required

11. **Special Comments:**
SOP Papers with Transmittal, via Fed Ex 2 Day
Image SOP
Email Notification, VIRGINIA O'MALLEY VOMALLEY@REDFLEX.COM
Email Notification, SARAH CRIDER SCRIDER@REDFLEX.COM

NATIONAL REGISTERED AGENTS, INC.

CopiesTo:

Transmitted by Nancy Flores

The information contained in this Summary Transmittal Form is provided by National Registered Agents, Inc. for informational purposes only and should not be considered a legal opinion. It is the responsibility of the parties receiving this form to review the legal documents forwarded and to take appropriate action.

ORIGINAL

EXHIBIT D

CM-010

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):
Thomas H. Bienert, Jr. (SBN 135311)
Michael R. Williams (SBN 192222)
BIENERT, MILLER & KATZMAN, PLC
903 Calle Amanecer, Suite 350
San Clemente, California 92673
TELEPHONE NO.: (949) 369-3700 FAX NO.: (949) 369-3701
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Aaron Rosenberg

FOR COURT USE ONLY
CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
FEB 19 2014
Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: Judi Lara, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los Angeles
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, California 90012-3014
BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk Courthouse

CASE NAME: Aaron Rosenberg v Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., et al.

CASE NUMBER: BC586891

JUDGE:
DEPT:

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET
[X] Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds $25,000)
[ ] Limited (Amount demanded is $25,000 or less)

Complex Case Designation
[ ] Counter [ ] Joinder
Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)

Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2).

1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:

Auto Tort
- [ ] Auto (22)
- [ ] Uninsured motorist (46)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort
- [ ] Asbestos (04)
- [ ] Product liability (24)
- [ ] Medical malpractice (45)
- [ ] Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort
- [ ] Business tort/unfair business practice (07)
- [ ] Civil rights (08)
- [ ] Defamation (13)
- [ ] Fraud (16)
- [ ] Intellectual property (19)
- [ ] Professional negligence (25)
- [ ] Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)

Employment
- [X] Wrongful termination (36)
- [ ] Other employment (15)

Contract
- [ ] Breach of contract/warranty (06)
- [ ] Rule 3.740 collections (09)
- [ ] Other collections (09)
- [ ] Insurance coverage (18)
- [ ] Other contract (37)

Real Property
- [ ] Eminent domain/inverse condemnation (14)
- [ ] Wrongful eviction (33)
- [ ] Other real property (26)

Unlawful Detainer
- [ ] Commercial (31)
- [ ] Residential (32)
- [ ] Drugs (38)

Judicial Review
- [ ] Asset forfeiture (05)
- [ ] Petition re: arbitration award (11)
- [ ] Writ of mandate (02)
- [ ] Other judicial review (39)

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)
- [ ] Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
- [ ] Construction defect (10)
- [ ] Mass tort (40)
- [ ] Securities litigation (28)
- [ ] Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
- [ ] Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41)

Enforcement of Judgment
- [ ] Enforcement of judgment (20)

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
- [ ] RICO (27)
- [ ] Other complaint (not specified above) (42)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition
- [ ] Partnership and corporate governance (21)
- [ ] Other petition (not specified above) (43)

2. This case [ ] is [X] is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:
   a. [ ] Large number of separately represented parties
   b. [ ] Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve
   c. [ ] Substantial amount of documentary evidence
   d. [ ] Large number of witnesses
   e. [ ] Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
   f. [ ] Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. [X] monetary b. [X] nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. [X] punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 3
5. This case [ ] is [X] is not a class action suit.
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)

Date: February 19, 2014
Thomas H. Bienert, Jr. (SBN 135311)
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)
(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)

NOTICE
- Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result in sanctions.
- File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.
- If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.
- Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

EXHIBIT E

SHORT TITLE: Rosenberg v. Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER BC536891

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

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

Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:

JURY TRIAL? [X] YES CLASS ACTION? [ ] YES LIMITED CASE? [ ] YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL ____ [ ] HOURS/[9] DAYS

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

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

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

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

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

1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk 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.

	A	B	C
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	[ ] A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	[ ] A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	[ ] A6070 Asbestos Property Damage [ ] A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
	Product Liability (24)	[ ] A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	[ ] A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons [ ] A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	[ ] A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) [ ] A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) [ ] A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress [ ] A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

SHORT TITLE: Rosenberg v. Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above
Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
	Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
	Defamation (13)	☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
	Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
	Professional Negligence (25)	☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice ☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
	Other (35)	☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
Employment	Wrongful Termination (36)	☒ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
	Other Employment (15)	☐ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Contract	Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	☐ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) ☐ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) ☐ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) ☐ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
	Collections (09)	☐ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
	Insurance Coverage (18)	☐ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	Other Contract (37)	☐ A6009 Contractual Fraud ☐ A6031 Tortious Interference ☐ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
Real Property	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels _____	2.
	Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
	Other Real Property (26)	☐ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure ☐ A6032 Quiet Title ☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer	Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure (34)	☐ A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
	Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE: Rosenberg v. Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER

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

SHORT TITLE: Rosenberg v. Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER

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

REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case. ☐1. ☒2. ☒3. ☐4. ☐5. ☐6. ☐7. ☐8. ☒9. ☐10.	ADDRESS: Basedon information and belief a Defendant resides in Culver City, California

CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:
Los Angeles	CA	90230

Item IV. *Declaration of Assignment*: I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that the above-entitled matter is properly filed for assignment to the Stanley Mosk courthouse in the Central District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)].

Dated: 02/19/14

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

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

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

EXHIBIT F

NOTICE SENT TO:

Bienert, Miller & Katzman, PLC
903 Calle Amanecer, Suite 350
San Clemente CA 92673

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
FILED Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

FEB 28 2014

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By Mark Isunza, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

AARON M ROSENBERG
Plaintiff(s),
VS.
REDFLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS INC ET AL
Defendant(s).

CASE NUMBER
BC536891

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE HEARING

To the party/attorney of record:

You are ordered to appear for an Order to Show Cause Hearing on May 5, 2014 at 8:30 am in Dept. 52 of this court, Central District, 111 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, and show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for:

Failure to file Proof of Service of [ ] Petition [✓] Summons and [✓] Complaint [ ] Cross-Complaint pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.110(b) and (c) as to:

Failure to comply or appear may result in sanctions, pursuant to one or more of the following: California Rules of Court, rule 2.30, and rule 3.1340; Code of Civil Procedure sections 177.5, 575.2, 583.150, 583.310, 583.360, 583.410, 583.420, 583.430; and Government Code section 68608.

[✓] To avoid a mandatory appearance all required documents must be filed in [ ] this Dept [✓] Clerk's Office, Room 102 at least 5 court days prior to the date of the hearing.

[ ] The Court may infer from your failure to appear that possession of the premises is no longer at issue, and that your case is not entitled to preference in setting pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1179a.

[ ] You are ordered to give notice of said hearing forthwith to any party served with summons and complaint prior to OSC Hearing and file a Proof of Service in this department or Clerk's Office at least 5 court days prior to the date of the hearing.

Dated: February 28, 2014

Susan Bryant-Deason
Judicial Officer

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I, the below named Executive Officer/Clerk of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that on this date I served the Order to Show Cause Hearing upon each party or counsel named above by depositing in the United States mail at the courthouse in Los Angeles, California, one copy of the original filed/entered herein in a separate sealed envelope to each address as shown above with the postage thereon fully prepaid.

Date: February 28, 2014

Sherri R. Carter, EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK
By _____, Deputy Clerk

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE HEARING

LACIV 166-1 (Rev. 09/08)
LASC Approved 06-04

LASC Local Rules, Chapter 7
Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.30

EXHIBIT G

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
NOTICE OF CASE ASSIGNMENT - UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (NON-CLASS ACTION)

Case Number BC536891

THIS FORM IS TO BE SERVED WITH THE SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

Your case is assigned for all purposes to the judicial officer indicated below. There is additional information on the reverse side of this form.

	ASSIGNED JUDGE	DEPT	ROOM		ASSIGNED JUDGE	DEPT	ROOM	
	Hon. Daniel Buckley	1	534		Hon. Ernest M. Hiroshige	54	512	
	Hon. Barbara A. Meiers	12	636		Hon. Malcolm H. Mackey	55	515	
	Hon. Terry A. Green	14	300		Hon. Michael Johnson	56	514	
	Hon. Richard Fruin	15	307		Hon Rolf M. Treu	58	516	
	Hon. Rita Miller	16	306		Hon. Michael L. Stern	62	600	
	Hon. Richard E. Rico	17	309		Hon. Mark Mooney	68	617	
	Hon. Kevin C. Brazile	20	310		Hon. William F. Fahey	69	621	
	Hon. Robert L. Hess	24	314		Hon. Soussan G. Bruguera	71	729	
	Hon. Mary Ann Murphy	25	317		Hon. Ruth Ann Kwan	72	731	
	Hon. Yvette M. Palazuelos	28	318		Hon. Teresa Sanchez-Gordon	74	735	
	Hon. Barbara Scheper	30	400					
	Hon. Mary H. Strobel	32	406					
	Hon. Michael P. Linfield	34	408		**Hon. Emilie H. Elias**	**324**	**CCW**	
	Hon. Gregory Alarcon	36	410		**Hon. Elihu M. Berle***	**323**	**CCW**	
	Hon. Maureen Duffy-Lewis	38	412					
	Hon. Michelle R. Rosenblatt	40	414					
	Hon. Ronald M. Sohigian	41	417					
	Hon. Holly E. Kendig	42	416					
	Hon. Mel Red Recana	45	529					
	Hon. Debre Katz Weintraub	47	507					
	Hon. Elizabeth Allen White	48	506					
	Hon. Deirdre Hill	49	509					
	Hon. John L. Segal	50	508					
	Hon. Mitchell L. Beckloff	51	511					
	Hon. Susan Bryant-Deason	52	510		OTHER			
	Hon. Steven J. Kleifield	53	513					

*Complex

All cases designated as complex (other than class actions) are initially assigned to Judge Elihu M. Berle in Department 323 of the Central Civil West Courthouse (600 S. Commonwealth Ave., Los Angeles 90005). This assignment is for the purpose of assessing whether or not the case is complex within the meaning of California Rules of Court, rule 3.400. Depending on the outcome of that assessment, the case may be reassigned to one of the judges of the Complex Litigation Program or reassigned randomly to a court in the Central District.

Given to the Plaintiff/Cross-Complainant/Attorney of Record on FEB 19 2014 SHERRI R. CARTER, Executive Officer/Clerk

By _____, Deputy Clerk

INSTRUCTIONS FOR HANDLING UNLIMITED CIVIL CASES

The following critical provisions of the Chapter Three Rules, as applicable in the Central District, are summarized for your assistance.

APPLICATION

The Chapter Three Rules were effective January 1, 1994. They apply to all general civil cases.

PRIORITY OVER OTHER RULES

The Chapter Three Rules shall have priority over all other Local Rules to the extent the others are inconsistent.

CHALLENGE TO ASSIGNED JUDGE

A challenge under Code of Civil Procedure section 170.6 must be made within 15 days after notice of assignment for all purposes to a judge, or if a party has not yet appeared, within 15 days of the first appearance.

TIME STANDARDS

Cases assigned to the Individual Calendaring Court will be subject to processing under the following time standards:

COMPLAINTS: All complaints shall be served within 60 days of filing and proof of service shall be filed within 90 days of filing.

CROSS-COMPLAINTS: Without leave of court first being obtained, no cross-complaint may be filed by any party after their answer is filed. Cross-complaints shall be served within 30 days of the filing date and a proof of service filed within 60 days of the filing date.

A Status Conference will be scheduled by the assigned Independent Calendar Judge no later than 270 days after the filing of the complaint. Counsel must be fully prepared to discuss the following issues: alternative dispute resolution, bifurcation, settlement, trial date, and expert witnesses.

FINAL STATUS CONFERENCE

The Court will require the parties at a status conference not more than 10 days before the trial to have timely filed and served all motions in limine, bifurcation motions, statements of major evidentiary issues, dispositive motions, requested jury instructions, and special jury instructions and special jury verdicts. These matters may be heard and resolved at this conference. At least 5 days before this conference, counsel must also have exchanged lists of exhibits and witnesses and have submitted to the court a brief statement of the case to be read to the jury panel as required by Chapter Eight of the Los Angeles Superior Court Rules.

SANCTIONS

The court will impose appropriate sanctions for the failure or refusal to comply with Chapter Three Rules, orders made by the Court, and time standards or deadlines established by the Court or by the Chapter Three Rules. Such sanctions may be on a party or if appropriate on counsel for the party.

This is not a complete delineation of the Chapter Three Rules, and adherence only to the above provisions is therefore not a guarantee against the imposition of sanctions under Trial Court Delay Reduction. Careful reading and compliance with the actual Chapter Rules is absolutely imperative.

EXHIBIT H

VOLUNTARY EFFICIENT LITIGATION STIPULATIONS

Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

Los Angeles County
Bar Association
Litigation Section

Los Angeles County
Bar Association Labor and
Employment Law Section

Consumer Attorneys
Association of Los Angeles

Southern California
Defense Counsel

Association of
Business Trial Lawyers

California Employment
Lawyers Association

The Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation, Discovery Resolution Stipulation, and Motions in Limine Stipulation are voluntary stipulations entered into by the parties. The parties may enter into one, two, or all three of the stipulations; however, they may not alter the stipulations as written, because the Court wants to ensure uniformity of application. These stipulations are meant to encourage cooperation between the parties and to assist in resolving issues in a manner that promotes economic case resolution and judicial efficiency.

The following organizations endorse the goal of promoting efficiency in litigation and ask that counsel consider using these stipulations as a voluntary way to promote communications and procedures among counsel and with the court to fairly resolve issues in their cases.

◆Los Angeles County Bar Association Litigation Section◆

◆ Los Angeles County Bar Association Labor and Employment Law Section◆

◆Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles◆

◆Southern California Defense Counsel◆

◆Association of Business Trial Lawyers◆

◆California Employment Lawyers Association◆

EXHIBIT I

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER:	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		
PLAINTIFF:		
DEFENDANT:		
STIPULATION – EARLY ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING		CASE NUMBER:

This stipulation is intended to encourage cooperation among the parties at an early stage in the litigation and to assist the parties in efficient case resolution.

The parties agree that:

1. The parties commit to conduct an initial conference (in-person or via teleconference or via videoconference) within 15 days from the date this stipulation is signed, *to discuss and consider whether there can be agreement on the following*:

   a. Are motions to challenge the pleadings necessary? If the issue can be resolved by amendment as of right, or if the Court would allow leave to amend, could an amended complaint resolve most or all of the issues a demurrer might otherwise raise? If so, the parties agree to work through pleading issues so that a demurrer need only raise issues they cannot resolve. Is the issue that the defendant seeks to raise amenable to resolution on demurrer, or would some other type of motion be preferable? Could a voluntary targeted exchange of documents or information by any party cure an uncertainty in the pleadings?

   b. Initial mutual exchanges of documents at the "core" of the litigation. (For example, in an employment case, the employment records, personnel file and documents relating to the conduct in question could be considered "core." In a personal injury case, an incident or police report, medical records, and repair or maintenance records could be considered "core.");

   c. Exchange of names and contact information of witnesses;

   d. Any insurance agreement that may be available to satisfy part or all of a judgment, or to indemnify or reimburse for payments made to satisfy a judgment;

   e. Exchange of any other information that might be helpful to facilitate understanding, handling, or resolution of the case in a manner that preserves objections or privileges by agreement;

   f. Controlling issues of law that, if resolved early, will promote efficiency and economy in other phases of the case. Also, when and how such issues can be presented to the Court;

   g. Whether or when the case should be scheduled with a settlement officer, what discovery or court ruling on legal issues is reasonably required to make settlement discussions meaningful, and whether the parties wish to use a sitting judge or a private mediator or other options as

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:

discussed in the "Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Information Package" served with the complaint;

h. Computation of damages, including documents not privileged or protected from disclosure, on which such computation is based;

i. Whether the case is suitable for the Expedited Jury Trial procedures (see information at www.lasuperiorcourt.org under "Civil" and then under "*General Information*").

2. The time for a defending party to respond to a complaint or cross-complaint will be extended to _____ (INSERT DATE) for the complaint, and _____ (INSERT DATE) for the cross-complaint, which is comprised of the 30 days to respond under Government Code § 68616(b), and the 30 days permitted by Code of Civil Procedure section 1054(a), good cause having been found by the Civil Supervising Judge due to the case management benefits provided by this Stipulation.

3. The parties will prepare a joint report titled "Joint Status Report Pursuant to Initial Conference and Early Organizational Meeting Stipulation, and if desired, a proposed order summarizing results of their meet and confer and advising the Court of any way it may assist the parties' efficient conduct or resolution of the case. The parties shall attach the Joint Status Report to the Case Management Conference statement, and file the documents when the CMC statement is due.

4. References to "days" mean calendar days, unless otherwise noted. If the date for performing any act pursuant to this stipulation falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Court holiday, then the time for performing that act shall be extended to the next Court day

The following parties stipulate:

Date:

_____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)

Date:

_____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date:

_____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date:

_____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date:

_____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

Date:

_____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

_____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

EXHIBIT J

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER:	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		
PLAINTIFF:		
DEFENDANT:		
STIPULATION – DISCOVERY RESOLUTION		CASE NUMBER:

This stipulation is intended to provide a fast and informal resolution of discovery issues through limited paperwork and an informal conference with the Court to aid in the resolution of the issues.

The parties agree that:

1. Prior to the discovery cut-off in this action, no discovery motion shall be filed or heard unless the moving party first makes a written request for an Informal Discovery Conference pursuant to the terms of this stipulation.

2. At the Informal Discovery Conference the Court will consider the dispute presented by parties and determine whether it can be resolved informally. Nothing set forth herein will preclude a party from making a record at the conclusion of an Informal Discovery Conference, either orally or in writing.

3. Following a reasonable and good faith attempt at an informal resolution of each issue to be presented, a party may request an Informal Discovery Conference pursuant to the following procedures:

   a. The party requesting the Informal Discovery Conference will:

      i. File a Request for Informal Discovery Conference with the clerk's office on the approved form (copy attached) and deliver a courtesy, conformed copy to the assigned department;

      ii. Include a brief summary of the dispute and specify the relief requested; and

      iii. Serve the opposing party pursuant to any authorized or agreed method of service that ensures that the opposing party receives the Request for Informal Discovery Conference no later than the next court day following the filing.

   b. Any Answer to a Request for Informal Discovery Conference must:

      i. Also be filed on the approved form (copy attached);

      ii. Include a brief summary of why the requested relief should be denied;

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:

iii. Be filed within two (2) court days of receipt of the Request; and

iv. Be served on the opposing party pursuant to any authorized or agreed upon method of service that ensures that the opposing party receives the Answer no later than the next court day following the filing.

c. No other pleadings, including but not limited to exhibits, declarations, or attachments, will be accepted.

d. If the Court has not granted or denied the Request for Informal Discovery Conference within ten (10) days following the filing of the Request, then it shall be deemed to have been denied. If the Court acts on the Request, the parties will be notified whether the Request for Informal Discovery Conference has been granted or denied and, if granted, the date and time of the Informal Discovery Conference, which must be within twenty (20) days of the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference.

e. If the conference is not held within twenty (20) days of the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference, unless extended by agreement of the parties and the Court, then the Request for the Informal Discovery Conference shall be deemed to have been denied at that time.

4. If (a) the Court has denied a conference or (b) one of the time deadlines above has expired without the Court having acted or (c) the Informal Discovery Conference is concluded without resolving the dispute, then a party may file a discovery motion to address unresolved issues.

5. The parties hereby further agree that the time for making a motion to compel or other discovery motion is tolled from the date of filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference until (a) the request is denied or deemed denied or (b) twenty (20) days after the filing of the Request for Informal Discovery Conference, whichever is earlier, unless extended by Order of the Court..

   It is the understanding and intent of the parties that this stipulation shall, for each discovery dispute to which it applies, constitute a writing memorializing a "specific later date to which the propounding [or demanding or requesting] party and the responding party have agreed in writing," within the meaning of Code Civil Procedure sections 2030.300(c), 2031.320(c), and 2033.290(c).

6. Nothing herein will preclude any party from applying ex parte for appropriate relief, including an order shortening time for a motion to be heard concerning discovery.

7. Any party may terminate this stipulation by giving twenty-one (21) days notice of intent to terminate the stipulation.

8. References to "days" mean calendar days, unless otherwise noted. If the date for performing any act pursuant to this stipulation falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Court holiday, then the time for performing that act shall be extended to the next Court day.

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:

The following parties stipulate:

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ (ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

EXHIBIT K

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		
PLAINTIFF:		
DEFENDANT:		
INFORMAL DISCOVERY CONFERENCE (pursuant to the Discovery Resolution Stipulation of the parties)		CASE NUMBER:

1. This document relates to:
   - ☐ Request for Informal Discovery Conference
   - ☐ Answer to Request for Informal Discovery Conference
2. Deadline for Court to decide on Request: _____ (insert date 10 calendar days following filing of the Request).
3. Deadline for Court to hold Informal Discovery Conference: _____ (insert date 20 calendar days following filing of the Request).
4. **For a Request for Informal Discovery Conference, briefly describe the nature of the discovery dispute, including the facts and legal arguments at issue. For an Answer to Request for Informal Discovery Conference, briefly describe why the Court should deny the requested discovery, including the facts and legal arguments at issue.**

EXHIBIT L

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER:	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:		
PLAINTIFF:		
DEFENDANT:		
STIPULATION AND ORDER – MOTIONS IN LIMINE		CASE NUMBER:

This stipulation is intended to provide fast and informal resolution of evidentiary issues through diligent efforts to define and discuss such issues and limit paperwork.

The parties agree that:

1. At least ____ days before the final status conference, each party will provide all other parties with a list containing a one paragraph explanation of each proposed motion in limine. Each one paragraph explanation must identify the substance of a single proposed motion in limine and the grounds for the proposed motion.

2. The parties thereafter will meet and confer, either in person or via teleconference or videoconference, concerning all proposed motions in limine. In that meet and confer, the parties will determine:

   a. Whether the parties can stipulate to any of the proposed motions. If the parties so stipulate, they may file a stipulation and proposed order with the Court.

   b. Whether any of the proposed motions can be briefed and submitted by means of a short joint statement of issues. For each motion which can be addressed by a short joint statement of issues, a short joint statement of issues must be filed with the Court 10 days prior to the final status conference. Each side's portion of the short joint statement of issues may not exceed three pages. The parties will meet and confer to agree on a date and manner for exchanging the parties' respective portions of the short joint statement of issues and the process for filing the short joint statement of issues.

3. All proposed motions in limine that are not either the subject of a stipulation or briefed via a short joint statement of issues will be briefed and filed in accordance with the California Rules of Court and the Los Angeles Superior Court Rules.

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER:

The following parties stipulate:

Date: _____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)

Date: _____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date: _____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date: _____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

Date: _____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

Date: _____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

Date: _____ (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) ➤ _____ (ATTORNEY FOR _____)

THE COURT SO ORDERS.

Date: _____ _____ JUDICIAL OFFICER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL COVER SHEET

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself ☐)
Aaron M. Rosenberg, an individual

DEFENDANTS (Check box if you are representing yourself ☐)
Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., an Arizona corporation; Redflex Traffic Systems (California), Inc., a California corporation; Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., a Delaware corporation, Redflex Holdings Limited, an Australian form of entity unknown; and Does 1-25, inclusive,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Los Angeles
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant N/A
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

(c) Attorneys (*Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number*) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information.
Thomas H. Bienert, Jr. (SBN 135311),
Michael R. Williams (SBN 192222), Ali Matin (SBN 268452)
Bienert, Miller & Katzman, PLC
903 Calle Amanecer, Suite 350
San Clemente, California 92673
Telephone: 949-369-3700 Fax: 949-369-3701

Attorneys (*Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number*) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information.
John P. LeCrone (SBN 115875), Jonathan Segal (SBN 264238)
Evelyn F. Wang (SBN 273622)
Davis Wright Tremaine, LLP
865 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2400, Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-633-6800 Fax: 213-633-6899
(Attorneys for Defendants Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., a Delaware corporation, and Redflex Traffic Systems (California), Inc.)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.)

☐ 1. U.S. Government Plaintiff
☐ 3. Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
☐ 2. U.S. Government Defendant
☒ 4. Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES-For Diversity Cases Only
(Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	☒ 1	☐ 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State	☐ 4	☐ 4
Citizen of Another State	☐ 2	☐ 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	☐ 5	☒ 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6

IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)

☐ 1. Original Proceeding ☒ 2. Removed from State Court ☐ 3. Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4. Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5. Transferred from Another District (Specify) ☐ 6. Multi-District Litigation

V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☒ No (Check "Yes" only if demanded in complaint.)

CLASS ACTION under F.R.Cv.P. 23: ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ **MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT:** $

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)
28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441, 1446. Plaintiff alleges claims for wrongful termination, violation of Cal. Labor Code § 1102.5, and violation of Cal. Labor Code § 2802.

VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only).

OTHER STATUTES
☐ 375 False Claims Act
☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 410 Antitrust
☐ 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/Etc.
☐ 460 Deportation
☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Org.
☐ 480 Consumer Credit
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange
☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
☐ 893 Environmental Matters
☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act
☐ 896 Arbitration
☐ 899 Admin. Procedures Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision
☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

CONTRACT
☐ 110 Insurance
☐ 120 Marine
☐ 130 Miller Act
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment
☐ 151 Medicare Act
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Vet.)
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Vet. Benefits
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits
☐ 190 Other Contract
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability
☐ 196 Franchise

REAL PROPERTY
☐ 210 Land Condemnation
☐ 220 Foreclosure
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment

REAL PROPERTY CONT.
☐ 240 Torts to Land
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability
☐ 290 All Other Real Property

TORTS PERSONAL INJURY
☐ 310 Airplane
☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability
☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander
☐ 330 Fed. Employers' Liability
☐ 340 Marine
☐ 345 Marine Product Liability
☐ 350 Motor Vehicle
☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability
☐ 360 Other Personal Injury
☐ 362 Personal Injury-Med Malpratice
☐ 365 Personal Injury-Product Liability
☐ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability
☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability

IMMIGRATION
☐ 462 Naturalization Application
☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions

TORTS PERSONAL PROPERTY
☐ 370 Other Fraud
☐ 371 Truth in Lending
☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage
☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability

BANKRUPTCY
☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158
☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157

CIVIL RIGHTS
☐ 440 Other Civil Rights
☐ 441 Voting
☒ 442 Employment
☐ 443 Housing/ Accomodations
☐ 445 American with Disabilities-Employment
☐ 446 American with Disabilities-Other
☐ 448 Education

PRISONER PETITIONS
Habeas Corpus:
☐ 463 Alien Detainee
☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence
☐ 530 General
☐ 535 Death Penalty

Other:
☐ 540 Mandamus/Other
☐ 550 Civil Rights
☐ 555 Prison Condition
☐ 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinement

FORFEITURE/PENALTY
☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881
☐ 690 Other

LABOR
☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act
☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations
☐ 740 Railway Labor Act
☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act
☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation
☐ 791 Employee Ret. Inc. Security Act

PROPERTY RIGHTS
☐ 820 Copyrights
☐ 830 Patent
☐ 840 Trademark

SOCIAL SECURITY
☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)
☐ 862 Black Lung (923)
☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405 (g))
☐ 864 SSID Title XVI
☐ 865 RSI (405 (g))

FEDERAL TAX SUITS
☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)
☐ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII. VENUE: Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will most likely be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

Question A: Was this case removed from state court? ☒ Yes ☐ No If "no," go to Question B. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	STATE CASE WAS PENDING IN THE COUNTY OF:	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:
	☒ Los Angeles	Western
	☐ Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo	Western
	☐ Orange	Southern
	☐ Riverside or San Bernardino	Eastern

Question B: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a party to this action? ☐ Yes ☒ No If "no," go to Question C. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	If the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, is a party, is it:		INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:
	A PLAINTIFF? Then check the box below for the county in which the majority of DEFENDANTS reside.	A DEFENDANT? Then check the box below for the county in which the majority of PLAINTIFFS reside.	
	☐ Los Angeles	☐ Los Angeles	Western
	☐ Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo	☐ Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo	Western
	☐ Orange	☐ Orange	Southern
	☐ Riverside or San Bernardino	☐ Riverside or San Bernardino	Eastern
	☐ Other	☐ Other	Western

Question C: Location of plaintiffs, defendants, and claims? (Make only one selection per row)	A. Los Angeles County	B. Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties	C. Orange County	D. Riverside or San Bernardino Counties	E. Outside the Central District of California	F. Other
Indicate the location in which a majority of plaintiffs reside:	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Indicate the location in which a majority of defendants reside:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Indicate the location in which a majority of claims arose:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

C.1. Is either of the following true? If so, check the one that applies:

☐ 2 or more answers in Column C

☐ only 1 answer in Column C and no answers in Column D

Your case will initially be assigned to the SOUTHERN DIVISION.
Enter "Southern" in response to Question D, below.

If none applies, answer question C2 to the right. ➡

C.2. Is either of the following true? If so, check the one that applies:

☐ 2 or more answers in Column D

☐ only 1 answer in Column D and no answers in Column C

Your case will initially be assigned to the EASTERN DIVISION.
Enter "Eastern" in response to Question D, below.

If none applies, go to the box below. ⬇

Your case will initially be assigned to the WESTERN DIVISION.
Enter "Western" in response to Question D below.

Question D: Initial Division?	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD
Enter the initial division determined by Question A, B, or C above: ➡	Western

American LegalNet, Inc.
www.FormsWorkFlow.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL COVER SHEET

IX(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed **in this court** and dismissed, remanded or closed? ☒ NO ☐ YES

If yes, list case number(s): _____

IX(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed **in this court** that are related to the present case? ☒ NO ☐ YES

If yes, list case number(s): _____

Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:

(Check all boxes that apply)
- ☐ A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or
- ☐ B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or
- ☐ C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or
- ☐ D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.

X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT): _____ DATE: 5/2/14

Notice to Counsel/Parties: The CV-71 (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet).

Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))

American LegalNet, Inc.
www.FormsWorkFlow.com