Kenneth D. Freundlich (SBN119806) FREUNDLICH LAW SEP 01 2513 16133 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1270 Encino, CA 91436 P: 818.377.3790 John A. Clarke/Executive Officer/Clerk F: 310.275.5351 4 | E-Mail: ken@freundlichlaw.com 5 Max J. Sprecher (SBN: 169285) LAW OFFICES OF MAX J. SPRECHER 6 | 5850 Canoga Avenue, 4th Floor Woodland Hills, CA 91367 P: 818.996.2255 D38 Mauken Dutty F: 818.996.4204 E-Mail: max@sprecherlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs Harold Brown, Lee Oskar Levitin, Howard Scott, Morris Dickerson and Laurian Miller on her own behalf and as assigned of the Heirs of Charles 10 11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 12 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT 13 B C 4 4 4 7 7 R HAROLD BROWN, an individual; LEE OSKAR) Case No. LEVITIN, an individual; HOWARD SCOTT, an) individual; MORRIS DICKERSON, an **COMPLAINT FOR:** individual, and LAURIAN MILLER, on behalf of herself and as assignee of the claims of the 1. **BREACH OF CONTRACT (Collective** Heirs of Charles Miller. bargaining agreement); 17 VIOLATION OF RIGHT OF Plaintiffs, **PUBLICITY:** 18 LANHAM ACT VIOLATION (FALSE **DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN)** VS. 19 PEPSICO, Inc., a North Carolina Corporation, 20 TBWA\ CHIAT \DAY LA, a division of TBWA) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED Worldwide, Inc., a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive 21 22 Defendants. 23 24 COMES NOW Plaintiffs HAROLD BROWN, an individual; LEE OSKAR LEV 25 individual; HOWARD SCOTT, an individual; MORRIS DICKERSON, an individual, and 26 LAURIAN MILLER, on her own behalf and as assignee of the claims of the Heirs of Charles 27 Miller, alleging and stating under oath as follows: 28

100万円である

The Parties

- Plaintiff Harold Brown is an individual, currently residing in Los Angeles County,
 California.
- Plaintiff Morris Dickerson is an individual and a resident of Los Angeles County,
 California.
 - 3. Plaintiff Lee Oskar Levitin is an individual and a resident of Redmond, Washington.
 - 4. Plaintiff Howard Scott is an individual and a resident of Arlington, Texas.
- 5. Plaintiff Laurian Miller ("L. Miller") is an individual and a resident of Los Angeles County, California. Miller is a surviving daughter of Charles Miller ("Miller") whose other survivors include his wife, Eddy Miller ("E. Miler"), two sons, Donald Miller ("D. Miller") and Mark Miller ("M. Miller"), and a second daughter Annette Miller ("A. Miller"). Miller died in June 1980, intestate, and his interests in the subject matter of this lawsuit where collectively inherited by E. Miller, D. Miller, M. Miller, L. Miller and A. Miller. Thereafter all of the surviving Millers assigned all of their inherited rights in, *inter alia*, the subject matter of this lawsuit, to L. Miller and appointed L. Miller to represent their interests in the subject matter of this lawsuit. It is on her own behalf and as assignee and representative of Miller's surviving family, that L. Miller is a Plaintiff.
- 6. Plaintiffs Brown, Dickerson, Levitin, Scott, and Miller are the founding, original members of the recording group known as "War", and the authors and original performers of many famous songs and recordings including the legendary musical hits Why Can't We Be Friends?, The World Is a Ghetto, Cisco Kid, and Low Rider.
- 7. Defendant PepsiCo, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of North Carolina with its principal place of business located at 700 Anderson Hill Road, Purchase, New York. ("Pepsi").
- 8. Defendant TBWA\CHIAT\DAY LA is a division of TBWA Worldwide, Inc., a Delaware corporation with a principal office located at 5353 Grosvenor Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90066-6931. ("TBWA").
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that fictitiously named
 Defendants DOES 1 through 25 are in some manner legally responsible and liable for Plaintiffs'

9

7

11

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

27

28

claims, damages and prayers for relief as alleged herein. Plaintiffs presently lack sufficient information and belief to sue said defendants by their correct names, and therefore will amend this complaint to allege their accurate identities, capacities and liabilities at such time as the same becomes known.

10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the Defendants herein was the agent of the other Defendants, and the wrongful conduct alleged herein was done within the scope of said agency.

Common Allegations .

- 11. In or about 1975, Plaintiffs, along with two other "War" band members, wrote the musical composition "Why Can't We Be Friends?" (herein, the "Song").
- 12. In or about 1975, as members of the band known as "War", Plaintiffs, recorded the Song and the sound recording (herein, the "Recording") was released worldwide. The voices and performances of Plaintiffs are prominently and recognizably featured in the Recording, which was made subject to the jurisdiction of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists ("AFTRA").
- 13. The Recording was a single from an album of the same name which was certified "Gold" by the RIAA. The Recording was nominated for a "Grammy" award in 1976. The Recording was played during the first U.S.-Soviet space mission as a symbol of friendship, and has also been licensed numerous times in television and motion pictures. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the Recording has been played on radio and in clubs and other live settings more than 500,000 times. As a result of this exposure, "Why Can't We Be Friends" has become the "signature song" for Plaintiffs individually and as the original band "War", closely associated with the members of the group. Because of its distinctive, lyric and musical content and massive public exposure, the Recording has attained a powerful secondary meaning to millions of music fans, who closely associate it with the individual members of the group who originally recorded it. The Recording was also readily accessible to the Defendants herein.
- 14. In or about July 2010, Defendants commenced "saturation" television broadcasting of commercials for one of Pepsi's top fourteen mega-brands - Pepsi Max - featuring Plaintiffs'

6

10 11

12 13

15

16

17 18

20 21

19

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

Recording of "Why Can't We Be Friends" as the musical soundtrack (herein the "Commercials"). In addition, the theme of the Song is an integral and interwoven part of the theme and structure of the Commercials. The Commercials were part of a national, multi-media campaign, including heavy internet presence, which featured the Recording and were made under the jurisdiction of the Screen Actors Guild ("SAG").

- 15. Plaintiffs did not consent to the use of their performances embodied in the Recording in the Commercials.
- 16. Plaintiffs' voices are prominent and recognizable in the Recording and the Commercials. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that Plaintiffs' voices in the Commercials were recognized by fans and many of them were deceived into falsely believing that Plaintiffs endorsed "Pepsi Max" and/or that that Plaintiffs' consented to the use of their voices in one of their "signature" Songs to advertise Pepsi's products.
- 17. The use of the Recording in the Commercials was a deliberate violation of the collective bargaining agreements with SAG and AFTRA. The Recording was produced subject to the jurisdiction of SAG and/or AFTRA and so were the Commercials. The collective bargaining agreements with AFTRA and SAG prohibit the use of the Recording in commercial advertising without the express, separately negotiated consent of the recording artists. The relevant language from the SAG and AFTRA agreements states: "[N]o part of ... any phonograph record, tape or other audio recording ... made under the jurisdiction of AFTRA ... shall be used in commercials without separately bargaining with the [singers] and reaching an agreement regarding such use prior to utilization of such ... soundtrack...." See Section 28 of the SAG Commercials Contract, as extended by the 2006 Extension, as further extended by the SAG 2009 Commercials Memorandum of Agreement. These separately negotiated consents are independent from any license(s) Defendants may have obtained from the owners/licensors of the publishing rights to the Song and/or the physical recorded masters.
- 18. Plaintiffs first learned about the Commercials when they were broadcast on television. None of the Defendants contacted Plaintiffs seeking permission, none of the Defendants negotiated for Plaintiffs' consent and none of the Defendants obtained Plaintiffs' consent.

First Cause of Action

(Violation of Collective Bargaining Agreements -against Defendants and Does 1 through 25)

- 19. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference each of the preceding and subsequent allegations of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 20. The Recording was made in a union recording session under the jurisdiction of AFTRA.
- 21. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the Commercials were made subject to the jurisdiction of SAG and AFTRA, including the terms of the respective collective bargaining agreements.
- 22. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendant TBWA acted as agent for Pepsi and as "signatory" to SAG and AFTRA for production of the Commercials.
- 23. Under the SAG and AFTRA collective bargaining agreements, the Recording may not be used in a television commercial unless the consent of the recording artists is separately negotiated and their express consent is obtained and recording artists are entitled to bring a civil suit for monetary damages if their recordings are used in commercials without their consent.
- 24. Defendants breached the SAG and AFTRA agreements by failing to contact Defendants before the Commercials were produced, failing to negotiate for Plaintiffs' consent to the use of the Recording in the Commercials, and failing to actually obtain Plaintiffs' consent to the use of the Recording in the Commercials.
- 25. As a result of Defendants' breach of the SAG and AFTRA agreements, Plaintiffs have been damaged in an amount not yet fully ascertained but believed to be in excess of \$10,000,000.

Second Cause of Action

(Violation of Right of Publicity – against All Defendants and DOES 1-25)

26. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference each of the preceding and subsequent allegations of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

	27.	Defendants knowingly used Plaintiffs' voices without Plaintiffs' consent and in
viola	tion of P	laintiffs' right of publicity. The alleged use of the Recording is directly tied to the
comi	nercial p	urpose of the Commercials. Plaintiffs are entitled to damages for such infringemen
in an	amount	not yet presently known but susceptible to proof at trial and believed to be in excess
of \$1	0,000,00	0.

28. Defendants' conduct was deliberate, willful and in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. Accordingly, punitive damages are requested from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof.

Third Cause Of Action

(Violation of Lanham Act (false endorsement) – against All Defendants and DOES 1-25)

- 29. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference each of the preceding and subsequent allegations of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 30. The Commercials caused consumer confusion as to whether Plaintiffs endorsed Pepsi and consented to the use of the Recording in the Commercials.
- 31. Plaintiffs did not endorse Pepsi, and did not consent to the use of the Recording in the Commercials
- 32. Defendants' conduct constitutes a false endorsement, false designation of origin and misrepresentation in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (a).
- 33. By reason of Defendants' violations of the Lanham Act, Plaintiffs have been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial but believed to be in excess of \$10,000,000.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows:

- 34. For compensatory damages in an amount not yet fully ascertained, but susceptible to proof at time of trial, and in any event not less than \$10,000,000;
- 35. For restitutionary damages and confiscation of unlawful profits in an amount according to proof;
 - 36. For punitive damages in an amount according to proof;

国籍公司科艺科教

	·	CM-010				
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, St. Kenneth D. Freundlich (SBN: 119806)	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY				
Freundlich Law		FILED				
16133 Ventura Blvd. Suite 1270		SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
Encino, CA 91436 TELEPHONE NO.: (818) 377-3790	FAX NO.: (310) 275-5350	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs	FAX NO.: (310) 273-3330	SEP 0 1 2010				
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LO	OS ANGELES	266 0 1 5010				
STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street		and the same of the officer of Clark				
MAILING ADDRESS: Same		John A. Clarke/Executive Officer/Clerk				
city and zip code: Los Angeles, CA 900	012	By				
BRANCH NAME: Central District		AMBER CAPLEON-ODATION				
CASE NAME:						
Harold Brown, et al. v. PepsiCo, Inc	., et al.					
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:				
✓ Unlimited		B C 4 4 4 7 7 8				
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder					
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defend					
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)					
	ow must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).				
1. Check one box below for the case type that						
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)				
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	·				
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)				
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)				
Asbestos (04)	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)				
Product liability (24)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)				
Medical malpractice (45)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)				
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case				
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)				
Business tort/unfair business practice (07		Enforcement of Judgment				
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)				
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint				
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)					
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	RICO (27)				
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)				
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition				
Employment Street (33)	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)				
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)				
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the				
factors requiring exceptional judicial mana	gement:	dies of Court. If the case is complex, mark the				
a. Large number of separately repre		er of witnesses				
b. Extensive motion practice raising		with related actions pending in one or more courts				
		. •				
r	issues that will be time-consuming to resolve in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court c. Substantial amount of documentary evidence f. Substantial postiudament judicial supervision					
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. 🗸 monetary b nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. 📝 punitive						
4. Number of causes of action (specify): Breach of Collective Bargaining Agmt; Right of publicity and Lanham Act						
	ss 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: September 1, 2010						
Kenneth D. Freundlich	Cen	et Villacht				
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(5	SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)				
Districtiff on and Single Control of the Control of	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.		es of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result				
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	u 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.						
These this is a confections case under rule	5.740 or a complex case, this cover she	eet will be used for statistical purposes only. Page 1 of 2				
Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.30, 3.220, 3.400–3.403, 3.740; Cal. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10 www.courtinfo.ca.gov				

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

SHORT TITLE:						-
Harold Brown,	et.	al.	v.	Pepsico, Inc.	et.	al.

CASE NUMBER

BC444778

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

Item I Step the le Step Step	 II. Select the correct dis 1: After first completing If margin below, and, to 2: Check one Superiod In Column C, circle 	ss action? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 3- strict and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", sking the Civil Case Cover Sheet Form, find the main civil case cover sheet of the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected for Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action it location, see Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0.	tip to Item III, Pg. 4): heading for your case in ed. re of this case.
	Class Actions must be fil May be filed in Central (Called in	ed in the County Courthouse, Central District. Other county, or no Bodily Injury/Property Damage). action arose. ury, death or damage occurred. urg, death or defendant resides. 6. Location of property or perm 7. Location where petitioner residence required or defendant resides. 9. Location where one or more 10. Location of Labor Commission.	 nanently garaged vehicle. sides
tep	4: Fill in the information	on requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration	ì.
Ę	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
AU	Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Otner Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	☐ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage ☐ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	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., 2., 4. 1., 2., 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., 2., 4. 1., 2., 4. 1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 4.
<u> </u>	Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 2., 3.
Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
ž		☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
ngtul De	Defamation (13)	□ A0010 Detaination (stander/liber)	1., 2., 5.

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER
Harold Brown, et. al. v. Pepsico, Inc. et. al.	

A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons -See Step 3 Above
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.
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.
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.
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- 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- Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.
Asset Forfeiture (05) Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case ☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 6. 2., 5.

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER
Harold Brown, et. al. v. Pepsico,Inc. et. al.	

Writ of Mandate (02) Other Judicial Review (39)	 □ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus □ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter □ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review 	2., 8.
(02) Other Judicial Review		2.
Other Judicial Review	☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	
		2.
	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction defect	1., 2., 3.
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.
	☐ A6141 Sister State Judgment	2., 9.
Enforcement	☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2., 6.
of Judgment	☐ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2., 9.
(20)	☐ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2., 8.
	☐ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2., 8.
	☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 8., 9.
RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
	☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1., 2., 8.
Other Complaints	☐ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2., 8.
(Not Specified Above)	☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
(42)	A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8.
Partnership Corporation Governance(21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
	☐ A6121 Civil Harassment	2., 3., 9.
	☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment	2., 3., 9.
Other Petitions	☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2., 3., 9.
(Not Specified Above)	☐ A6190 Election Contest	2.
(43)	☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name	2., 7.
	☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 4., 8.
	☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.
LACIV 109 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION	LASC, rule 2.0 Page 3 of 4

SHORT TITLE: Harold Brown, et. al. v. Pepsico,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 filling in the court location you selected.

·	THE NUMBER UND APPLIES IN THIS C		ADDRESS: Plaintiffs and Defendants do business in Los Angeles County
□1. ☑2. □3. □4.	□5. □6. □7. □	8. □9. □10.	
CITY: Los Angeles	STATE: CA	ZIP CODE: 90012	
			perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is filed for assignment to the LA Superior Court courthouse in the

District of the Los Angeles Superior Court (Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and LASC Local Rule 2.0,

Dated: September 1, 2010

subds. (b), (c) and (d)).

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 form CM-010.
- 4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form LACIV 109 (Rev. 01/07), LASC Approved 03-04.
- Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- 6. Signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, JC form FL-935, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age, or if required by Court.
- 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.