of Syanne pryeon

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ී 21

Ć

McNICHOLAS & McNICHOLAS, LLP Matthew S. McNicholas, State Bar No. 190249 Alyssa K. Schabloski, State Bar No. 258876 10866 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1400 Los Angeles, California 90024 Tel: (310) 474-1582 Fax: (310) 475-7871

Up

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

MAR 2 0 2015

Sherri R. Carter by Officer/Clerk

By Deputy
Shaunya Bolden

Attorneys for Plaintiff JEFF DILLMAN

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JEFF DILLMAN,

Plaintiff,

SPIKE CABLE NETWORKS, INC., a corporation; EYEWORKS USA, INC., a corporation; BONGO, LLC, a corporation; SKIP BEDELL, in his official and individual capacities; SCOTT DERMAN, an individual; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.:

BC 5 7 6 2 7 7

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

- 1. FRAUD;
- 2. FALSE IMPRISONMENT;
- 3. DEFAMATION;
- 4. VIOLATION OF RIGHT TO NAME OR LIKENESS

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW Plaintiff, JEFF DILLMAN, and on information and belief complains and alleges as follows:

| Complaintiff, JEFF DILLMAN, and on information and belief complains and receipt #: CH465980144 |
| CHANGE: 443: 03:46 F

Complaint for Damages

8

9

11

12

14

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

Ó

1.

(")

25

26 27 28

THE PARTIES

- 1. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff JEFF DILLAM (hereinafter, "Plaintiff") was a competent adult over the age of eighteen years. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was a resident of the State of California, County of Orange.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant SPIKE CABLE NETWORKS, INC. (hereinafter, "SPIKE") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of an unknown state, regularly conducting business in Los Angeles, California, in the County of Los Angeles.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant EYEWORKS USA, INC. (hereinafter, "EYEWORKS") is a California corporation, with its principle place of business in Redondo Beach, California, in the County of Los Angeles.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant BONGO, LLC (hereinafter, "BONGO") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of an unknown state, with its principal place of business in Redondo Beach, California, in the County of Los Angeles.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant SKIP BEDELL (hereinafter, "BEDELL") was at all times relevant hereto a competent adult over the age of eighteen years, and an individual who regularly conducts business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. BEDELL regularly appears in Los Angeles to film and/or promote a "reality" television show aired by Defendant SPIKE, and produced by Defendants EYEWORKS and BONGO, as described below.
- Defendant SCOTT DERMAN (hereinafter, "DERMAN") was at all times relevant 6. hereto a competent adult over the age of eighteen years, and a resident of the State of California, County of Los Angeles.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendants DOES 1 7. through 100, inclusive, and each of them, at all times relevant hereto, were public, business, and/or other entities whose form is unknown committing torts in and/or engaged in purposeful economic activity within the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

- 8. The true names and capacities of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, are unknown to Plaintiff at this time, therefore Plaintiff sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will file DOE amendments, and/or ask leave of court to amend this complaint to assert the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and upon such information and belief alleges, that each Defendant herein designated as a DOE was and is in some manner, negligently, wrongfully, or otherwise, responsible and liable to Plaintiff for the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged, and that Plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by their conduct.
- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times material herein the Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, or employees, or ostensible agents, servants, and employees of each other Defendant, and as such, were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment or ostensible agency and employment, except on those occasions when Defendants were acting as principals, in which case, said Defendants; and each of them, were negligent in the selection, hiring, and use of the other Defendants.
- 10. At all times mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the co-tortfeasor of each of the other Defendants in doing the things hereinafter alleged.
- 11. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all times relevant hereto, Defendants, and each of them, acted in concert and in furtherance of the interests of each other Defendant. The conduct of each Defendant combined and cooperated with the conduct of each of the remaining Defendants so as to cause the herein described incidents and the resulting injuries and damages to Plaintiff.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

12. This Court has personal jurisdiction of Defendants, and each of them, because they are residents of and/or doing business in the State of California. The wrongful conduct alleged against Defendants, and each of them, occurred in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. This Court is the proper court because the injury and/or wrongful acts that are the subject of this

Į

action occurred in its jurisdictional area and/or at least one Defendant now resides in its jurisdictional area.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 13. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was a general contractor and owner of Dillman Developments. In or around the summer of 2013, Dillman Developments bid on and was awarded the contract to remodel the Los Angeles home of Defendant DERMAN and Samantha Cadman ("Cadman"). The contract was signed on or about June 8, 2013, and work began on or about July 1, 2013. Payment was on a reimbursement basis through Wells Fargo bank.
- 14. In or around September 2013, the building inspector flagged a frame issue with one of the beams. An engineering proposal was made on or about September 19, 2013. On or about September 30, 2013, Defendant DERMAN and Cadman moved into the home despite the frame issue. Engineering for the beam was approved on or about October 15, 2013; however, payment was stopped for all work, including work that had already been completed, on or about the day prior. In the course of the payment and work disputes, the homeowners terminated the contract on or about October 25, 2013. On or about November 26, 2013, the homeowners filed a claim for Dillman Developments' bid bond. At or around this time, Defendant DERMAN and/or Cadman applied to appear on Defendant SPIKE TV's "reality" series "To Catch a Contractor" ("TCAC").
- 15. According to the TCAC website, the show "aims to turn the table on contractors who have done their clients wrong. Host Adam Carolla ("Carolla") helps homeowners regain their dignity and their humble abodes from the clutches of crooked contractors." TCAC co-stars Defendant BEDELL, a contractor, and his wife, Alison Bedell, an allegedly licensed private investigator. In the course of her alleged "investigation" into Plaintiff, Alison claimed to have found out where Plaintiff lived, what car he drove, and other personal information. A recent search of the Security and Investigative licenses issued by the California Department of Consumer Affairs revealed no license for any "Bedell."
- 16. Defendants, and each of them, then set a trap for Plaintiff to come to a ruse house where the TCAC cast and crew were waiting, along with DERMAN and his wife. On or about December 5, 2013, Plaintiff arrived at 8225 Handley Avenue in Los Angeles, California. A woman

watering the lawn invited Plaintiff into the house, and offered to get "Elizabeth Stevens" the woman from whom Plaintiff was supposedly supposed to pick up a check for materials to begin contracting work. Unbeknownst to Plaintiff, the woman watering the lawn was Alison Bedell. Plaintiff had been lured to the house under false pretenses. Not suspecting anything out of the ordinary, Plaintiff sat down on the couch to wait. The trap was sprung. Within seconds, numerous cast and crew members descended upon Plaintiff where he was being held. Carolla and BEDELL charged into the living room, a bouncer guarded the door, and various crew members with cameras and boom mikes surrounded Plaintiff. DERMAN and his wife watched from monitors set up in another room.

- though the name TCAC was already reserved and marketing had begun. Defendants SPIKE, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and BEDELL, and each of them, through the TCAC producer, told Plaintiff he had three options: (1) Plaintiff could return the money—which Plaintiff and his workers had been paid for work performed; (2) Plaintiff could walk away, in which case they will still drag his company name through the mud and assist the homeowners with suing him; or (3) he could sign a Release, go on the show, and finish the remodel of the home. These were not empty threats. Carolla confirmed the threats on camera, stating words to the effect of, "We'll give him three options. One, he can pay you back in full. Two, he can come back and do the job correctly under our supervision. Or three, we'll help you guys take him to court."
- 18. Plaintiff was stunned and intimidated. When Plaintiff attempted to leave, Defendant BEDELL moved to block Plaintiff's path to the door, indicating Plaintiff would not permitted to leave. BEDELL grew up as a champion wrestler and actively trains in Mixed Martial Arts. Plaintiff felt physically intimidated and alarmed by BEDELL's actions. Further, the exit was blocked by a large bouncer employed on behalf of Defendants SPIKE, EYEWORKS, and BONGO, and each of them. At no time did Plaintiff feel free to leave the premises.
- 19. To induce Plaintiff to sign the Release, Defendants, and each of them, knowingly and intentionally caused false representations to be made to Plaintiff. Plaintiff was told the show was a "resolution" show, about making amends. Plaintiff was also told he would look like a good

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

guy if Plaintiff came back to complete the work on the home. Plaintiff was further told if Plaintiff signed the Release, there would be no claim on the bid bond. Due to the false imprisonment of Plaintiff based on the ambush the cast and crew and the security detail, including BEDELL and the bouncer blocking the exit, the threats of litigation and other claims against Plaintiff, and subsequent fraudulent inducement by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff felt he had no choice but to sign the Release, and so signed the Release under extreme duress.

- 20. The Release provided Plaintiff with a total of \$10,000 for his "participation." Plaintiff received \$5000 for the initial day (December 5, 2013) plus \$2500 for each of two followup days. TCAC provided additional support. Filming took place over December 5, 6, and 20. Despite the remodel work being completed, Defendant DERMAN and Cadman, with the assistance of the other Defendants, and each of them, revised the prior bid bond claim on or about December 23, 2013—mere days after the episode finished taping.
- On or about March 23, 2014, the TCAC episode called "House of Cards" aired on 21. SPIKE TV. Defendants, and each of them, presented false information about Plaintiff. While brandishing a photograph of Plaintiff, the use of which Plaintiff had specifically objected, BEDELL called Plaintiff a "criminal." This footage was aired to approximately 1 million viewers. The show aired internationally in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and Portugal.
- Plaintiff is not, and has never been, a criminal. Plaintiff has never been arrested for, 22. much less convicted of, any misdemeanor or felony crime. Further, much of the footage aired had been staged. To boost Alison Bedell's role in the show, she claimed, "I got a lead from the DMV on an old vehicle that was registered to that address. Once I had that address, I followed him." Such "investigative work" was entirely unnecessary. Plaintiff's address was readily available to DERMAN. There was no need to track him down. Therefore, Plaintiff was readily available if Defendants had reached out, as opposed to creating drama for the sake of ratings and advertising revenue. Plaintiff appeared too sympathetic for the "docu-reality" drama Defendants, and each of them, were seeking. The episode contains little footage of Plaintiff speaking directly. Plaintiff sincerely regretted the unfortunate circumstances that led to the construction work being halted. Defendant DERMAN and Cadman claimed Plaintiff ruined their holidays, so Plaintiff asked if their

)

//

family could be flown out, using part of the \$10,000 Plaintiff was to receive. This request was refused. Plaintiff also asked if part of the \$10,000 could be used to fix Defendant DERMAN's motorcycle. Again, this request was denied.

- 23. Further, on the day the episode first aired, Defendant DERMAN claimed Plaintiff was a sexual predator who sexually assaulted him. On DERMAN's Facebook page, one Tiffany Marquez commented, "Is this anything like Catch a Predator?" to which DERMAN intentionally and maliciously responded, "Yes Tiffany Marquez! Adam corolla [sic] busts a contractor who touched me in the naughty places." DERMAN never retracted the false and defamatory accusation he posted. "To Catch a Predator" was a hidden camera investigative series by Dateline NBC. The show impersonated underage youth online to lure potential sexual predators, who were then confronted on the show and later, with law enforcement present. DERMAN's malicious statement is entirely untrue.
- 24. The wrongful conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, is continuing and ongoing as of the present date. The false and defamatory publications of DEFENANTS, and each of them, continue to be available to third parties with Internet access, worldwide.
- 25. Plaintiff has suffered both general and special damages in the past and present and will continue to suffer such damages in the future for an unknown period of time. This has caused damage to his professional reputation, and will adversely affect his income and other benefits. Moreover, it has adversely affected his personal health and well being, including medical expenses, that are anticipated into the future and may force an early retirement. Plaintiff has also suffered extensive general damages in the form of anxiety, anguish, and mental suffering. Plaintiff's damages are continuing and in an amount not yet determined, but in excess of \$25,000.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANTS SPIKE, EYEWORKS, BONGO,

AND DOES 1-100, INCLUSIVE

FRAUD

- 26. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1–25 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein again.
- 27. Defendants, and each of them, by the acts herein described, represented certain facts to Plaintiff as true, including but not limited to luring Plaintiff to the ruse house under false pretenses and misrepresenting the nature of the show. These representations by Defendants, and each of them, were false and/or not true. Defendants, and each of them, knew the representations were false when they made them, or made them recklessly and without regard for their truth. Defendants had no reasonable grounds for believing the representations were true when they were made.
- 28. Defendants, and each of them, intended that Plaintiff rely on these representations to inure specific benefits to Defendants. Plaintiff reasonably relied on the representations of Defendants, and each of them, to his detriment and harm. Plaintiff's reliance on the representations of Defendants, and each of them, was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.
- 29. As a proximate result of the representations to Plaintiff by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered injury to his health and his personal, business, and professional reputation including suffering embarrassment, humiliation, mental distress, shunning, anguish, fear, loss of employment, and employability, and economic loss, all to Plaintiff's economic, emotional and general damage in an amount according to proof.
- 30. Defendants, and each of them, by and though their managing agents and officers, committed the acts alleged herein recklessly, maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, for an improper and evil motive amounting to malice (as described above), and with a reckless and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. All actions of Defendants, and each of them, their agents, employees, managing agents and officers as herein alleged were known, authorized, ratified, and approved by Defendants, and each of them. Plaintiff

is thus entitled to recover punitive and exemplary damages from Defendants, and each of them, for the wanton, obnoxious, and despicable acts in an amount based on the wealth and ability to pay according to proof at the time of trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

AND DOES 1-100, INCLUSIVE

FALSE IMPRISONMENT

- 31. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1–30 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein again.
- 32. DEFENDANTS, and each of them, intentionally deprived Plaintiff of his freedom of movement by use of physical barriers, force, threats of force, menace, fraud, deceit, and unreasonable duress. DEFENDANTS, and each of them, created and conspired in a common plan to lure Plaintiff to a confined and enclosed space, the ruse house, and coerce him under physical and other threats to sign a Release so DEFENDANTS, and each of them, could benefit.
- 33. The restraint, confinement, and/or detention of Plaintiff by DEFENDANTS, and each of them, compelled Plaintiff to stay on the property of the ruse house. Plaintiff did not knowingly or voluntarily consent to restraint, confinement, and/or detention. Plaintiff was lured to the ruse house under false pretenses knowingly and intentionally orchestrated by DEFENDANTS, and each of them.
- 34. As a proximate result of the restraint, confinement, and/or detention of Plaintiff by DEFENDANTS, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered injury to his health and his personal, business, and professional reputation including suffering embarrassment, humiliation, mental distress, shunning, anguish, fear, loss of employment, and employability, and economic loss, all to Plaintiff's economic, emotional and general damage in an amount according to proof.
- 35. DEFENDANTS, and each of them, by and though their managing agents and officers, committed the acts alleged herein recklessly, maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, for an improper and evil motive amounting to

malice (as described above), and with a reckless and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. All actions of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, their agents, employees, managing agents and officers as herein alleged were known, authorized, ratified, and approved by DEFENDANTS, and each of them. Plaintiff is thus entitled to recover punitive and exemplary damages from DEFENDANTS, and each of them, for the wanton, obnoxious, and despicable acts in an amount based on the wealth and ability to pay according to proof at the time of trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

AND DOES 1-100, INCLUSIVE

DEFAMATION

- 36. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1–35 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein again.
- 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes that DEFENDANTS, and each of them, by the herein described acts, conspired to, and in fact, did negligently, recklessly, and intentionally caused excessive and unsolicited internal and external publications of defamation of and concerning Plaintiff, to third persons and to the community, which are still available on the internet. These false and defamatory statements included, but are not limited to, express and implied accusations that Plaintiff is a criminal and a sexual predator.
- 38. The defamatory publications consisted of oral and written statements, knowingly false and unprivileged communications, tending directly to injure Plaintiff and Plaintiff's personal, business, and professional reputations. These false and defamatory publications were and are in violation of Civil Code § 45 and 46(3) and (5). The statements and similar ones published by Defendants and each of them, expressly and impliedly asserted that Plaintiff is a criminal and a sexual predator.
- 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and fears, that these false and defamatory per se statements will continue to be published by DEFENDANTS and each of them and will be foreseeably republished by their recipients, all to the ongoing harm and injury to Plaintiff's

business, professional and personal reputations. Plaintiff also seeks redress in this action for all foreseeable republication including his own compelled self-publication of these defamatory statements.

- 40. The defamatory meaning of all of the above-described false and defamatory statements and their reference to Plaintiff were reasonably understood by these above-referenced third person recipients and other members of the community who are known to DEFENDANTS, and each of them, but unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Because of the facts and circumstances known to those third-parties to whom the false and defamatory statements were published, it tended to injure Plaintiff in his occupation, or to expose him to hatred, contempt, ridicule, or shame, or to discourage others from associating or dealing with him.
- 41. None of the DEFENDANTS' defamatory publications against Plaintiff referenced above are true.
- 42. The above defamatory statements were understood as assertions of fact, and not as opinion. Plaintiff is informed and believes this defamation will continue to be negligently, recklessly, and intentionally published and forseeabley republished by DEFENDANTS, and each of them, and foreseeably republished by recipients of DEFENDANTS' publications, thereby causing additional injury and damages for which Plaintiff seeks redress by this action.
- 43. Each of these false defamatory per se publications were negligently, recklessly, and intentionally published in a manner equaling malice. These publications abuse any alleged conditional privilege (which Plaintiff denies existed.). All of the publications were made with hatred, ill will, and intent to vex, harass, annoy, and injure Plaintiff. These publications were made to create drama and increase ratings for TCAC to expressly and directly benefit DEFENDANTS, and each of them, among other advantages. These false and defamatory statements were made to cause damage to Plaintiff's professional and personal reputation, and to humiliate him before third-parties worldwide, exposing.
- 44. Each of these publications by DEFENDANTS, and each of them, were made with knowledge that no investigation supported the unsubstantiated and obviously false statements. Not only did DEFENDANTS, and each of them, fail to use reasonable care to determine the truth or

falsity of the statements, but also DEFENDANTS published there statements knowing them to be false, unsubstantiated by any reasonable investigation, despite the fact that TCAC claims to employ a licensed private investigator in the show—i.e., Alison Bedell. These acts of publication were known by DEFENDANTS, and each of them, to be negligent to such a degree as to be reckless. In fact, not only did DEFENDANTS, and each of them, have no reasonable basis to believe these statements, but also they had no belief in the truth of these statements, and in fact knew the statements to be false. DEFENDANTS, and each of them, excessively, negligently, and recklessly published these statements to individuals with no need to know, and who made no inquiry, and who had a mere general or idle curiosity of this information.

- 45. The complained of publications by DEFENDANTS, and each of them, were made with hatred and ill will towards Plaintiff and the design and intent to injure Plaintiff, Plaintiff's good name, his reputation, his ability to make a living, and his employment and employability. DEFENDANTS and each of them, published these statements not with an intent to protect any interest intended to be protected by any privilege, but with negligence, recklessness and/or and intent to injure Plaintiff and destroy his reputation.
- 46. As a proximate result of the publication and republication of these defamatory statements by DEFENDANTS, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered injury to his personal, business, and professional reputation including suffering embarrassment, humiliation, severe emotional distress, shunning, anguish, fear, loss of employment, and employability, and significant economic loss in the form of lost wages and future earnings, all to Plaintiff's economic, emotional and general damage in an amount according to proof.
- 47. DEFENDANTS, and each of them, by and though their managing agents and officers, committed the acts alleged herein recklessly, maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, for an improper and evil motive amounting to malice (as described above) and which abused and/or prevent the existence of any conditional privilege, which in fact did not exist, and with a reckless and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. All actions of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, their agents, employees, managing agents and officers as herein alleged were known, authorized, ratified, and approved by DEFENDANTS,

and each of them. Plaintiff is thus entitled to recover punitive and exemplary damages from DEFENDANTS, and each of them, for the wanton, obnoxious, and despicable acts in an amount based on the wealth and ability to pay according to proof at the time of trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANTS SPIKE, EYEWORKS, BONGO,

AND DOES 1-100, INCLUSIVE

VIOLATION OF RIGHT TO NAME OR LIKENESS

- 48. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1–47 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein again.
- 49. Defendants, and each of them, used Plaintiff's name, likeness, or identity without his permission, for the commercial benefit of Defendants, and each of them. The use of Plaintiff's name, likeness, or identity by Defendants, and each of them, contained false information; namely, that Plaintiff was a criminal. Defendants, and each of them, knew the use of Plaintiff's name, likeness, or identity was false, or acted with reckless disregard of its falsity, or were negligent in determining the truth of the information.
- Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered injury to his personal, business, and professional reputation including suffering embarrassment, humiliation, severe emotional distress, shunning, anguish, fear, loss of employment, and employability, and significant economic loss in the form of lost wages and future earnings, all to Plaintiff's economic, emotional and general damage in an amount according to proof.
- 51. Defendants, and each of them, by and though their managing agents and officers, committed the acts alleged herein recklessly, maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, for an improper and evil motive amounting to malice (as described above) and which abused and/or prevent the existence of any conditional privilege, which in fact did not exist, and with a reckless and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. All actions of Defendants, and each of them, their agents, employees, managing agents and officers as

ં

ιή

herein alleged were known, authorized, ratified, and approved by DEFENDANTS, and each of them. Plaintiff is thus entitled to recover punitive and exemplary damages from DEFENDANTS, and each of them, for the wanton, obnoxious, and despicable acts in an amount based on the wealth and ability to pay according to proof at the time of trial.

- 52. As legal result of the above-described conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, mental suffering, shock, humiliation, and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, reputation, standing in the community, and other non-economic damages.
- 53. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was required, and/or in the future may be required, to engage in the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, and/or other related expenses in a sum to be ascertained according to proof.
- 54. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was and/or will be hindered, prevented, and/or precluded from performing Plaintiff's usual activities, causing Plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earnings, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with prejudgment interest pursuant to California Civil Code section 3287 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.
- 55. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, and/or special damages, in an amount according to proof.
- 56. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has and will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in an amount according to proof.

ं

i ri

26

27

28

- As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid unlawful acts of Defendants, and 57. each of them, Plaintiff suffered stress-related health consequences. Plaintiff claims general damages for such health problems in an amount to be proven at time of trial.
- Defendants' actions constituted a willful violation of the above-mentioned federal 58. and state laws. The conduct of Defendants described herein above was outrageous and was executed with malice, fraud, and oppression, and with conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights and the rights of others, and further, with the intent, design, and purpose of injuring Plaintiff.
- Defendants, and each of them, through its officers, managing agents, employees and/or supervisors, authorized, allowed, permitted, condoned, ratified, and/or enabled the retaliation and/or other wrongful conduct as described herein. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- Defendants, and each of them, committed the wrongful acts alleged herein by acting 60. knowingly and willfully, with the wrongful and illegal deliberate intention of injuring Plaintiff, from improper motives amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff is thus entitled to recover nominal, actual, compensatory, punitive, and exemplary damages in amounts according to proof at time of trial, in addition to any other remedies and damages allowable by law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks judgment against all Defendants, and each of them, on all Causes of Action, except as identified herein, for:

- Physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, 1. nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to reputation, and other non-economic damages, as allowed by law and in a sum to be ascertained according to proof;
- Loss of wages, income, earnings, earning capacity, support, domestic services, 2. benefits, and other economic damages as allowed by law and in a sum to be ascertained according to proof;

(ير)

- Health care, services, supplies, medicines, health care appliances, modalities, and 3. other related expenses as allowed by law and in a sum to be ascertained according to proof;
- Other actual, consequential, and/or incidental damages as allowed by law and in a 4. sum to be ascertained according to proof;
 - For punitive and exemplary damages as allowed by law and according to proof; 5.
 - Attorney fees and costs as allowed by law and according to proof; 6.
 - 7. Costs of suit herein incurred;
 - 8. Pre-judgment interest;
- Injunctive relief as to Plaintiff's Third and Fourth Causes of Action, such that 9. Defendants, and each of them, and all of their agents, officers, employees, representatives, directors, affiliates, successors, assigns, attorneys, and all other persons or entities acting, for, with, by, through, or under authority from Defendants, or in concert or participation with Defendants, and each of them, be enjoined permanently, from: using, copying, reproducing, or making available, the TCAC episode and the Facebook postings in any manner, and that all defamatory or other violative materials, electronic, digital, or otherwise, in the possession or control of Defendants, and each of them, be delivered up and destroyed, and a retraction issued, pursuant to law; and
 - Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper. 10.

Dated: March 20, 2015

McNICHOLAS & McNICHOLAS, LLP

Alvssa K. Schabloski Attorneys for Plaintiff

JEFF DILLMAN

28

27

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

4 Dated: March 20, 2015

McNICHOLAS & McNICHOLAS, LLP

Ву:

Matthew S. McNicholas Alyssa K. Schabloski Attorneys for Plaintiff JEFF DILLMAN

•		• ORIGINAL.
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar na McNICHOLAS, LLP Matthew S. McNicholas, SBN 190249/Alyss 10866 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90024 TELEPHONE NO.: 310/474-1582 ATTORNEY FOR (Norme): Plaintiff Jeff Dillman SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LO STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 900 BRANCH NAME: Central, Stanley Mosk	a K. Schabloski, SBN 258876 FAX NO.: 310/475-7871 S ANGELES	Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles MAR 2 0 2015 Sherri R. Carter Executive Officer/Clerk By Shaunya Bolden
CASE NAME: DILLMAN v. SPIKE CABLE NETW CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET Unlimited Limited (Amount (Amount demanded demanded is	Complex Case Designation Counter Joinder Filed with first appearance by defenden	
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less) 	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402) w must be completed (see instructions	
1. Check one box below for the case type that 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) Perfemantion (13) Fraud (16) Intellectual property (19) Professional negligence (25) Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) Employment Wrongful termination (36) Other employment (15) 2. This case is vis not comp	Contract Breach of contract/warranty (06) Rule 3.740 collections (09) Insurance coverage (18) Other contract (37) Real Property Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14) Wrongful eviction (33) Other real property (26) Untawful 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 Petitlon Partnership and corporate governance (21) Other petition (not specified above) (43)
factors requiring exceptional judicial manages a. Large number of separately representations. Extensive motion practice raising issues that will be time-consuming c. Substantial amount of documenta	sented parties d. Large numb difficult or novel e. Coordination to resolve in other cou ry evidence f. Substantial	er of witnesses with related actions pending in one or more courts nties, states, or countries, or in a federal court postjudgment judicial supervision
6. If there are any known related cases, file a Date: March 20, 2015 Alyssa K. Schabloski Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the under the Probate Code, Family Code, or in sanctions. File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet in addition to any covered the parties to the action or proceeding.	NOTICE first paper filed in the action or proceed Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. R er sheet required by local court rule, seq. of the California Rules of Court, ye	(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY) ing (except small claims cases or cases filed ules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result ou must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
Unless this is a collections case under rule	3.740 or a complex case, this cover s	neet will be used for statistical purposes only. Pege 1 of 2 Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.30, 3.220, 3.400–3.403, 3.740;

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

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

Cal. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10

American LegalNet, Inc. www.FormsWorkflow.com

ORIGINAL

CASE NUMBER

BC 5 7 6 2 7 7

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 fillings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

Item I. Check the types of	f hearing and fill in the estimated length of	hearing expected for this case:
JURY TRIAL? VES (CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE?	YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 7-10 HOURS/ DAY
Item II. Indicate the corre	ct district and courthouse location (4 steps	- If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4)
		nd the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your
case in the left margin b	elow, and, to the right in Column A , the Ci	ivil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.
_	-	elow which best describes the nature of this case.
checked. For any exce	circle the reason for the court location cho ption to the court location, see Local Rule 2	ice that applies to the type of action you have 2.0.
Applie	cable Reasons for Choosing Courthous	e Location (see Column C below)
 May be filed in central (ot 3. Location where cause of 	ed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. her county, or no bodily injury/property damage). action arose. ury, death or damage occurred.	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.

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

Civil Case Cover Sheet	B Type of Action (Check only one)	Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above 3
Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Uninsured Motorist (46)	□ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Asbestos (04)	□ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage □ A7221 Asbestos - Personal InjuryWrongful 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.

Auto

Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

() () ()

SHORT TITLE: DILLMAN v. SPIKE CABLE NETWORKS, INC., et al.

CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of Action (Check only one)	Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above
operty th 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.
ury/P	Defamation (13)	☑ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
nal Inj rongf	Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Professional Negligence (25)	□ A6017 Legal Malpractice □ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
20	Other (35)	☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
nent	Wrongful Termination (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Employment	Other Employment (15)	☐ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Contract	Breach of Contract/ Warranty (08) (not insurance)	□ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) □ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Selter 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.
	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2
roperty	Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Real P	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.
lawful l	Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	□ A6020FUnlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
٦	Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

DILLMAN v. SPIKE CABLE NETWORKS, 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
	Asset Forfeiture (05)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
/iew	Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicia! Review	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 /Judiciai Review	2., 8.
Ö	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
Litigat	Construction Defect (10)	□ A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
I <mark>y</mark> Co	Securities Litigation (28)	☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
isiona	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	☐ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Prov	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.
ं स	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
ि. Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	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.
会工のことのことと 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: DILLMAN V, SF	PIKE CABLE NETW	ORKS, INC.,	et al.
Item III. Statement of Loc circumstance indicated in	cation: Enter the add	ress of the acc n Page 1, as t	cident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.
REASON: Check the approunder Column C for the typ this case.	e of action that you hav	e selected for	ADDRESS:
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:	
Los Angeles	CA	J00/5	
and correct and that the a	above-entitled matter istrict of the Superior	is properly file	erjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true ed for assignment to the Stanley Mosk courthouse in the mia, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Dated: March 20, 2015		•	Almse Haber

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

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

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