FNDのRSE型 FILED 1 DOUGLAS C. MCCLURE ALAMEDA COUNTY State Bar No. 45556 DENISE BILLUPS-SLONE 2 DEC 3 0 1992 State Bar No. 151606 MCNAMARA, HOUSTON, DODGE, McCLURE & NEY 3 1211 Newell Avenue, Second Floor RONALD G. OVERHOLT, Exec. Off./Clerk Post Office Box 5288 4 Wikathy McKenn Walnut Creek, California 94596 5 Telephone: (510) 939-5330 (510) 939-0203 Facsimile: 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs RICHARD E. DODGE and JEANNE M. 7 DODGE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 8 9 No. 7 . 005703-0 10 RICHARD E. DODGE and JEANNE M. DODGE. COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES 11 Plaintiffs, 12 vs. 13 JOHN WARMERDAM, LAURA WARMERDAM, BURT SERNE, 14 CORNELIUS VAN WYK, ELIZABETH VAN WYK, DUTCH PRIDE DAIRY, a 15 California corporation, DUTCH PRIDE DAIRY, a limited 16 partnership, AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES, NEWMAN REALTY, 17 FLETCHER, EGAN & PARADISO, PARADISO CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, 18 DOES 1 THROUGH 85, inclusive, 19 Defendants. 20 21 Plaintiffs allege as follows: 22 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS 23 Plaintiffs are now and have been since March, 1978, the 24 record owners of certain real property located at 7400 Amador 25 Valley Boulevard in the City of Dublin, County of Alameda, State of 26

California (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

Defendant NEWMAN REALTORS were the representatives and

McNamara, Houston, Dodge, McClure & Ney attorners at LAW 9.0. BOX 5288 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

27

28

2.

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

agents of the seller defendants hereinafter described in connection with the sale of the real property to plaintiffs in March, 1978. A copy of the Sales Agreement is attached hereto and identified as Exhibit A.

- 3. Defendants, JOHN WARMERDAM, LAURA WARMERDAM, BURT SERNE, CORNELIUS VAN WYK, ELIZABETH VAN WYK, DUTCH PRIDE DAIRY, a California corporation, DUTCH PRIDE DAIRY, a limited partnership, and DOES 1 - 30, were at all times relevant prior to the March, 1978, sale, the owners, operators and/or partners in ownership of the real property. Said defendants are hereinafter referred to as the "Seller Defendants".
- Defendants, JOHN WARMERDAM, LAURA WARMERDAM, BURT SERNE, CORNELIUS VAN WYK, ELIZABETH VAN WYK, DUTCH PRIDE DAIRY, a California corporation, DUTCH PRIDE DAIRY, a limited partnership, and DOES 31 - 60, were at all times relevant, lessees and operators of a business or businesses located at 7400 Amador Valley Boulevard, Dublin, Alameda County, California. Said defendants are hereinafter referred to as "Lessee Defendants".
- Defendants FLETCHER, EGAN & PARADISO, PARADISO CONSTRUC-TION COMPANY and DOES 61 - 75 were the contractors and installers or the underground storage tanks described herein.
- 6. Defendants AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES and DOES 76 85 were consulting engineers retained by plaintiffs to engineer and obtain a clearance of the real property in question from the County of Alameda, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Regional Fire District and all other interested governmental agencies.
- On or about the times referred to on the attached lease exhibits, the owner and operator defendants leased the real

property and all improvements thereon from plaintiffs as more fully described in the lease attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

- 8. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that each of the seller and lessee defendants at all relevant times had custody and control of the two underground storage tanks located on the property which were used as underground storage tanks for the storage and sale of gasoline.
- 9. In 1990, plaintiffs were required by various governmental agencies to remove two underground storage tanks on their property.
- 10. In March of 1990, plaintiffs were required by various governmental agencies to test and monitor the soil and underground water surrounding said tanks as a result of potential contamination which had been discovered at the time the tanks were removed in January, 1990. Plaintiffs have closed and removed the tanks and are testing and monitoring the real property in conformance with governmental requirements.
- 11. As a result of the closure and removal of said tanks and the testing and monitoring of the soil and groundwater, plaintiffs became aware that the soil and groundwater at or about the location of the tank may be contaminated by certain substances, including without limitation, petroleum products, which the government has determined are hazardous to and threaten the quality of the environment, including soil and groundwater (hereinafter referred to as "Hazardous Substances").
- 12. As a result of the existence of said Hazardous Substances, Plaintiffs have been required by the government to remove portions of the soil and clean up other portions of the property. Plaintiffs have also been required to monitor and remediate damage

to the groundwater under the property.

without limitation, costs incurred in removal of the tanks, testing, analyzing and monitoring the soil and groundwater and in cleaning up the soil and groundwater to remove and/or reduce the currently-known contamination. Said contamination has also adversely affected the monetary value and marketability of the Real Property in an exact amount currently unknown to Plaintiffs.

- 14. Plaintiffs are unable to determine the extent to which contamination from Hazardous Substances will continue to be discovered in the soil and/or groundwater at the Property causing Plaintiffs to incur future costs in testing, analysis and cleanup or the degree to which said contamination will prevent or adversely affect the future use or market value of the Real Property despite Plaintiffs' best efforts to clean up the Property.
- 15. Plaintiffs have incurred damages in addition to the aforesaid resulting from Defendants' conduct which include, among other things, damage to the Property, loss of use and income, loss of business opportunities, investigative costs, professional fees and further damage, the exact amount of which is unknown but which exceeds the sum of \$50,000.
- 16. Beginning in March of 1990, and continuing thereafter, defendant AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES, for a valuable consideration, agreed to prepare and direct a plan of soil and groundwater decontamination. Plaintiffs relied on the representations of defendant AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES, to their detriment. Defendant AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES, failed to provide for an overall decontamination plan and failed to obtain clearance by various govern-

mental agencies after the initial cleanup work which was completed. As a result of the negligence and failures of defendant AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES, plaintiffs have been required to retain the services of new decontamination specialists and incur additional expenses and costs pursuant to order of various governmental agencies.

17. Prior to Plaintiffs' purchase of the real property, Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the underground storage tanks were designed, manufactured, produced, installed and sold by Defendants FLETCHER, EGAN & PARADISO, PARADISO CONSTRUCTION COMPANY and DOES 61 - 75.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Lease-Waste) [Against All Lessee Defendants]

- 18. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by this reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 17 as though fully set forth herein.
- 19. Plaintiffs have duly performed all the terms and conditions of the written Lease to be performed by Plaintiffs.
- 20. Said Lease specifically required Lessees to maintain said premises and appurtenances, and every part thereof, in good and sanitary order, condition and repair.
- 21. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that during the term of Defendants' tenancies, Defendants committed waste by, among other things, using the underground tank in a manner that released, or caused to be released, suddenly and accidentally or otherwise, Hazardous Substances into the soil and/or groundwater of the Property.
- 22. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breaches as aforesaid, Plaintiffs have been damaged as set forth above in an

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

amount in excess of \$50,000, the exact amount of which is presently unknown.

By the terms of the Lease, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred in By reason of Defendants' breaches, prosecuting this action. Plaintiffs have been compelled to incur attorneys' fees and will continue to incur costs and fees in connection with this action.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Waste - Treble Damage) [Against All Lessee Defendants]

- Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 23, as though fully set forth herein.
- 25. The wrongful conduct of Lessee Defendants as hereinabove set forth was done knowingly and intentionally and with the knowledge that the continued use of said underground storage tanks further contamination to soil and groundwater. causing was Defendants willfully and maliciously engaged in such conduct with the knowledge that it would result in substantial injury to the Property and Plaintiffs' interests therein. Plaintiffs therefore seek from Defendants treble the amount of damages they have incurred pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 732.

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Lease - Failure to Maintain in Good Condition) [Against all Lessee Defendants]

- Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 25, as though fully set forth herein.
  - The Lease attached to this complaint as Exhibit B 27.

obligates the Lessee Defendants to maintain and repair the subject Property and to keep it in good and sanitary order and repair.

- 28. The Lessee Defendants failed to maintain, repair and keep the Property in good condition and repair and failed to surrender possession of the Property at the expiration of the lease term in as good a condition as it was when received, reasonable wear and tear excepted.
- 29. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breaches as aforesaid, Plaintiffs have been damaged as set forth above in an amount in excess of \$50,000, the exact amount of which is unknown at the present time.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Negligence) [Against all Defendants]

- 30. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 1 through 29, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- Plaintiffs allege that Defendants, and each of them, 31. have at all times relevant negligently designed, loaded, transported, formulated, modified. used, engineered, discarded, and handled Hazardous applied, stored, disposed, Substances including without limitation petroleum products, in the course of business in such manner as to allow said substances to suddenly, accidentally and negligently be released or escape into the soil and groundwater at the Property and to cause property damage.
- 32. Plaintiffs allege that the negligent conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as set forth in this complaint, have proximately caused Plaintiffs to suffer harm and damages and has

27

 proximately caused chemical and toxic substance contamination of Plaintiffs' Property and environment as set forth above. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants, and each of their acts of negligence and carelessness, as aforesaid, have and will cause Plaintiffs to incur damages a set forth above.

- 33. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants knew or should have known that the Hazardous Substances were and are dangerous and harmful to the environment; that Defendants, and each of them, knew or should have known the probable and proximate consequences of their conduct, and that Defendants negligently and/or willfully failed to reduce or eliminate the probability that these harms would occur.
- 34. As a direct and proximate esult of Defendants' acts, Plaintiffs have been damaged as set forth above in an amount in excess of \$50,000, the exact amount of which is unknown at the present time.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Equitable Indemnity) [Against All Defendants]

- 35. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 36. Should Plaintiffs be held liable to any person or governmental entity for damages, property damage, fines, or cleanup expenses arising from this contamination, Plaintiffs' liability will be predicated in whole or in part upon the negligence and carelessness of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above. Plaintiffs should therefore be held harmless and indemnified by Defendants for the costs of the analysis, cleanup and monitoring of

1.0

1.4

the Property. Plaintiffs seek indemnification in whole or in part based generally upon the principles of equitable and partial indemnity as well as contribution pursuant to principles of comparative negligence, comparative fault and apportionment of liability and damages and upon the provisions of Section 1431.1, et seq., of the Civil Code, otherwise entitled The Fair Responsibility Act of 1986. Plaintiffs also base their rights to indemnification upon the California Water Code Section 13300 et seq. and Health & Safety Code Section 25363.

### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Lease - Liability Insurance)
[Against all Lessee Defendants]

- 37. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 36, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 38. Defendants, and each of them, agreed to take out and keep in force during the terms of the Lease public liability insurance insuring the contingent liability of Plaintiffs for and against damage, including personal injury and property damage.
- 39. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants breached said portion of the Lease be failing to obtain public liability insurance running in favor of plaintiffs.

#### SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Lease - Failure to Comply with Terms)
[Against All Lessee Defendants]

- 40. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 39, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 41. Said Lease specifically prohibited Defendants, and each of them, from assigning or in any other way subletting the subject

Property without the written consent of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants, and each of them, breached the Lease in this regard and leased or otherwise transferred the beneficial use of the subject Property to other Defendants resulting in the damages heretofore and hereinafter described.

## EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Declaratory Relief) [Against All Defendants]

- 42. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 41, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 43. As a result of the aforesaid circumstances, an actual controversy has arisen between Plaintiffs and Defendants in that Plaintiffs claim that they are entitled to a statutory and contractual right of indemnification a well as an equitable right of indemnification either in whole or in part from Defendants for any and all costs incurred as alleged in this complaint filed by Plaintiffs and any other Cross-Complaints filed in this action, including indemnification for attorneys' fees, court costs and costs of suit. Defendants allege they are not liable for the costs, expenses and obligations to remove the pollution and contamination.
- 44. Unless all obligations, rights and duties arising out of the action from the respective parties herein are determined in this proceeding and a declaration relative thereto is issued by this Court, Plaintiffs will be subjected to an unreasonable economic burden and will sustain irreparable injury.

28 | - - - -

### 2

3

**4** 5

6

8

7

10

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract - Failure to Comply With Laws)
[Against All Lessee Defendants, Aqua Terra and Does 76-85]

- 45. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 44, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- During the Defendants' tenancy at the Property and at 46. exact times unknown to Plaintiffs, Defendants breached their implied covenants of good faith and fair dealing with Plaintiffs by failing to comply with the Laws of the City of Dublin, County of Alameda, State of California, and other governmental agencies by, among other things, failing and refusing to timely obtain the appropriate permits from the City of Dubin for the underground storage tank, by failing to properly test and monitor the underground storage tank pursuant to the ordinances and laws of the City of Dublin, County of Alameda and the State of California, by failing and refusing to clean up the Property, by failing to cooperate fully with Plaintiffs in Plaintiffs' efforts to comply with the requirements and recommendations of governmental agencies regulating, or otherwise involved in, the protection of the environment, and by failing and refusing to indemnify and hold Plaintiffs harmless from Defendants' failure to abide by such laws a required by their Lease and/or the contrat entered into by the parties.
- 47. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breaches as aforesaid, Plaintiffs have been damaged a set forth above in an amount in excess of \$50,000, the exact amount of which is unknown at the present time.

McNamara, Houston

2 3

5

6

7

4

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Law - Interference with Plaintiffs' Ability to Obtain Relief from the State Water Resources Control Board) [Against Seller and Lessee Defendants]

- 48. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 12 through 47, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- In order to obtain reimbursement in whole or in part for the damages herein alleged, Plaintiffs have applied to the Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund administered by the State Water Resources Control Board. Plaintiffs' application for reimbursement has been denied because of the failure of Defendants, and each of them, to obtain a permit for operation of the underground storage tanks.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Strict Liability in Tort: Ultra-Hazardous Activity) [Against All Lessee Defendants]

- Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference 50. each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 thorough 49, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are strictly liable 51. for their conduct in using, storing and/or disposing of hazardous Substances as alleged in this Complaint, as such actions constitute ultrahazardous activity.
- 52. Plaintiffs allege that they have been damaged as alleged above, as a result of Defendants' course of conduct by engaging in the aforesaid ultrahazardous activity.
- Regardless of any degree of care which Defendants may allege, Defendants should be held liable for the damage which Plaintiffs have sustained by virtue of Defendants engaging in the

aforesaid ultrahazardous activity as set forth above.

2

#### TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Fraud)

3

[Against All Lessee and Seller Defendants and Newman Realtors]

4 5 54. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 53. inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege 55. that Defendants, and each of them, including Defendant Sellers and NEWMAN REALTORS, were aware that the underground storage tanks at the time of the sales transaction heretofore alleged were continuously discharging gasoline and other contaminants into the soil and groundwater surrounding said tanks.
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege 56. that Defendants knew or should have known of the existence of the ongoing contamination at the time of the sales transaction.
- Defendants did not disclose the existence of the 57. contamination at the time of the sales transaction.
- At the time of the transaction, Plaintiffs were not 58. aware of the existence of the contamination as heretofore alleged and had no reason to know of said contamination.
- The agreed upon purchase price for the Property was the fair market value of the property free of underground con-Had Plaintiffs been informed of the presence of tamination. underground contamination, they would not have purchased the property.
- Defendants breached the land purchase agreement by 60. delivering the Property with underground contamination that made the Property unsuitable for Plaintiffs' development.

61. The cost of remediating the underground contamination is high enough to make the Plaintiffs' development of the property for commercial purposes uneconomical. The presence of the contamination has made the Property unmarketable.

#### THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Fraud - Intentional Misrepresentation)
[Against All Lessee and Seller Defendants and Newman Realtors]

- 62. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 63. Defendants omitted, concealed and suppressed the fact that the underground storage tanks had caused contamination of the groundwater and soil beneath the Property.
- 64. Defendants knew or should have known that the soil and water contamination would have been material to Plaintiffs' decision to purchase the Property.
- 65. Defendants made the misrepresentations and omitted or concealed the facts alleged above with the intent to defraud Plaintiffs and to induce Plaintiffs to purchase the Property. Defendants made the representations without any reasonable grounds for believing them to be true and Plaintiffs detrimentally relied on such misrepresentations.
- 66. At the time Plaintiffs purchased the Property, they did not know the true facts and had no reason to suspect the presence of underground contamination and had no duty to inspect the subsurface conditions of the Property.
- 67. Plaintiffs would not have purchased the Property had they known the true facts alleged above.
  - 68. As a proximate result of Defendants' fraudulent

omissions and representations, Plaintiffs have been damaged in an amount heretofore and hereinafter alleged.

69. The aforementioned conduct of Defendants was an intentional misrepresentation, deceit or concealment of a material fact known to Defendants with the intention on the part of Defendants to defraud Plaintiffs and was despicable conduct justifying an award of exemplary damages pursuant to **Code of Civil Procedure** Section 3294.

## FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Trespass) [Against All Defendants]

- 70. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 69, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 71. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' conduct, including without limitation, misuse of the underground storage tanks on the Property and disposal of Hazardous Substances on or about the soil and groundwater as hereinabove alleged, constitutes wrongful acts of continuing trespass on the Property.
- 72. Plaintiffs allege that they have been damaged to a degree unknown, as alleged above, as a result of Defendants' wrongful trespass on the Property.
- 73. The acts of the Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above, were willful, wanton, oppressive and in conscious disregard for Plaintiffs' rights and the safety of others and justify an award of exemplary and/or punitive damages according to proof and attorneys' fees pursuant to **Code of Civil Procedure** Section 1021.9.

28 | - - - -

## (Negligence Per Se) [Against All Defendants]

-

74. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 73, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.

75. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' failure to comply with the applicable ordinances and laws of the City of Dublin, County of Alameda, the State of California and the United States government, are a breach of Defendants' duties to Plaintiffs, and constitutes negligence per se. Plaintiffs are in the class of those intended to be protected by said statutes.

76. Plaintiffs have been damaged as hereinabove alleged, as a result of Defendants' violations of said ordinances and statutes.

## SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Nuisance) [Against All Defendants]

77. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 76, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.

78. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and their conduct as alleged above, and the resulting contamination of the Property substantially interfered with and continues to interfere with Plaintiffs' use, enjoyment and right of private occupancy of the Property in that the Hazardous Substances have contaminated, and continue to contaminate, the soil, subsurface soil layers and groundwater situated at, under or on the Property. Plaintiffs accordingly have not been able to freely use and enjoy the Property because Defendants' conduct has created a private nuisance.

79. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' conduct, as above

stated, affected and continues to affect the community-at-large in that Defendants, and each of them, have created a present danger to the public in the form of Hazardous Substance contamination to the environment. Plaintiffs have been particularly affected by this nuisance created by Defendants because of the specific injury to their property and therefore, have standing to bring an action against Defendants for public nuisance.

80. Plaintiffs have been damaged by the private and public nuisance created by Defendants as alleged above.

## SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Statutory Contribution) [Against All Defendants]

- 81. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 80, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 82. Plaintiffs have been required to take removal and/or remedial action to respond to the existence of the Hazardous Substances at the Property and have incurred substantial expenditures in their efforts to take such removal and/or remedial action.
- 83. Such expenditures amounted to a sum in excess of \$50,000. Plaintiffs continue to incur expenditures in connection with such removal or remedial action.
- 84. Plaintiffs have incurred removal and/or remedial costs in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, the California Water Code, the Federal CERCLA/RCRA acts and other applicable laws. No portion of said costs are attributable to Plaintiffs' actions. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that said costs and expenditures are attributable to Defendants, and each of

i

their actions as aforesaid. As a result, Defendants, and each of them, have become and are now liable to Plaintiffs for the removal and/or remedial costs incurred by Plaintiffs.

### EIGHTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligent Misrepresentation)

[Against All Lessee, Seller Defendants and Newman Realtors]

- 85. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 84 as though fully set forth herein.
- 86. On or about the times mentioned above, Defendants, and each of them, fraudulently and falsely represented to Plaintiffs that either, A) there were not underground storage tanks on the property; or, B) that any tanks were secure and safe, were not leaking, and were not contaminating the soil and groundwater under the property. The representations made by the Defendants, and each of them were in fact false. The true facts, on information and belief, were that each of the subject tanks was, and has been leaking, leaching, discharging, releasing, or otherwise expelling chemicals into the soil and groundwater, suddenly and accidently or otherwise.
- 87. When the Defendants, and each of them, made these representations they knew or should have known them to be false, and the representations were made by the Defendants with the intent to induce Plaintiffs to act in a manner herein alleged.
- 88. Plaintiffs, at the time these representations were made by the Defendants, were ignorant of the falsity of Defendants' representations and believed them to be true. In reliance on these representations, Plaintiffs were induced to and did purchase the said property, lease the said property and allow the property to remain unsecured, thereby potentially spreading the toxic

11

10

12 13

15

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

chemicals. Had Plaintiffs known the actual facts, they would not have taken such actions. Plaintiffs' reliance on Defendants' representations were justified because Plaintiffs had a contractual relationship with the Defendants. As a result of the contractual relationship, the Defendants, and each of them, had an obligation to deal honestly and fairly with the Plaintiffs and to keep them informed and advised of the true facts.

- The proximate result of Defendants' negligent mis-89. representation and the facts herein alleged, is that Plaintiffs have been induced to expend enormous sums of money, and time to cleanup, remediate, and otherwise neutralize toxic chemicals and hazardous waste emanating from the subject property.
- The aforementioned conduct of the Defendants was a 90. negligent misrepresentation, deceit, or concealment of a material fact known to the Defendants with the intention on the part of the Defendants of thereby depriving the Plaintiffs of property and legal rights and otherwise causing injury, and was despicable conduct that subjected and continues to subjec the Plaintiffs to hardship and economic loss as described heretofore.

#### NINETEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Contract) [Against Seller Defendants]

- plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 90, inclusive, as though fully set forth below.
- Under the property purchase agreement, the Seller 92. Defendants were obligated to deliver the property to the Plaintiffs free from contamination, and to have the property subject to no liabilities.

	93.	The	agr	eed	upo	n purchas	e pri	ce	for	the	proper	ty	was	the
fair	marke	t va	lue	of	the	property	free	of	the	und	lergroui	nd	stor	age
tank	s¹ con	tami	nati	on.										

- 94. The Seller Defendants breached the purchase agreement by delivering the property with underground storage tanks and contamination that made the property unsuitable for its intended purpose.
- 95. The cost of remediating the underground storage tanks and related contamination is high enough to make Plaintiffs' operation of this property non-economical. The presence of the contamination has made the property unmarketable. For these reasons, Defendants' breach has caused a failure of consideration.
- 96. Plaintiffs have performed all of their obligations under the purchase agreement or is excused from such obligations.
- 97. Seller Defendants' breach has damaged Plaintiffs in an amount not yet determined but in excess of this Court's jurisdiction in an amount equal to at least the cost of removing the underground storage tank and investigating or remediating and monitoring the contamination, the loss of profits for the use of the property, the loss of market value of the property and the loss or delay of the rental value of the property.

# TWENTIETH CAUSE OF ACTION (Unfair Business Practices) [Against All Defendants]

- 98. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 97, inclusive, and as though fully set forth herein.
- 99. The actions done by the defendants in this case violate, among other laws, sections of the California Business and Profes-

sions Code, including Sections 17000, et seq. 17082, 17500, 17503, and constitute unfair competition and other business offenses.

- 100. As a result of this conduct, Plaintiffs have been damaged in an amount currently unknown but within the jurisdictional limits of this Court.
- 101. In addition, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, Plaintiffs are entitled to treble damages and attorneys' fees.

## TWENTY FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Professional Negligence) [Against Aqua Terra & Does 76-85]

- 102. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 100, inclusive, as though fully set forth below.
- Defendant AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES to do all things necessary to insure that the Property was decontaminated and that the relevant governmental agencies would sign off the Property leaving Plaintiffs with no further liabilities referable to contamination cleanup. Defendants, including AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES, negligently failed to perform the acts for which they had been engaged and further negligently performed the cleanup of the subject property so that Plaintiffs have been required to continue to expend sums in an amount presently unknown to satisfy government requirements concerning the Property decontamination.

## TWENTY-SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Fraud and Intentional Misrepresentation) [Against Aqua Terra and Does 76-85]

104. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 103, inclusive, as though fully set forth

below.

105.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

TECHNOLOGIES, and DOES 76-85, purposefully omitted, concealed and suppressed the fact that they had failed to decontaminate the hazardous waste located at or about the Property as they had represented to Plaintiffs. Defendants also purposefully misrepresented to Plaintiffs that the relevant governmental agencies would sign off the property, leaving Plaintiffs with no further liabilities referable to contamination cleanup. Defendants made these representations without any reasonable grounds for believing them to be true and Plaintiffs' detrimentally relied upon such misrepresentations.

At all times herein mentioned, Defendants AQUA TERRA

Defendants made the above misrepresentations and/or 106. omitted or concealed the facts alleged above with the intent to defraud Plaintiffs and to induce Plaintiffs to pay them valuable consideration.

107. At the time Plaintiffs agreed to retain AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES and DOES 76 - 85 for the purpose of decontaminating the Property, Plaintiffs did not know the true facts and had no reason to suspect that Defendants would fail to properly decontaminate the Property or that the relevant governmental agencies would fail to sign off the Property. Plaintiffs had no reason to suspect the continuing presence of underground contamination and had no duty to inspect the subsurface conditions of the Property.

As a proximate result of Defendants' 108. omissions and misrepresentations, Plaintiffs have been damaged in an amount heretofore and hereinafter alleged.

109. The aforementioned conduct of Defendants was

28

intentional misrepresentation, fraud, deceit or concealment of a material fact known to Defendants with the intention on the part of Defendants to defraud Plaintiffs and was despicable conduct justifying award of exemplary damages pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 3294.

#### TWENTY-THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligent and Strict Product Liability)
[Against Defendants Fletcher, Egan & Paradiso and Does 61-75]

- 110. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 109, inclusive, as though fully set forth below.
- 111. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that said underground storage tanks were defectively and negligently designed, modified, manufactured, sold and warranted so as to fail shortly after installation.
- 112. As a result of the failure of said tanks, the soil and groundwater contamination as herein alleged occurred causing damage to plaintiff in excess of \$50,000.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray to judgment against all defendants, as follows:

- A. For general damages in an amount in excess of \$50,000, and as according to proof, representing the economic losses incurred by Plaintiffs alleged herein, including costs of removal of the tanks, cleanup of oil and groundwater and testing and monitoring of soil and groundwater, diminished market value, loss of income and/or business opportunities, property damage and loss of use of the Property and investigative, administrative and professional costs incurred;
  - B. For special damages according to proof;

- For treble damages according to proof pursuant to all C. applicable statutes and laws;
- D. For punitive and exemplary damages where applicable in an amount commensurate with the acts complained of and the financial condition of Defendants, and each of them;
- E. For a judicial declaration that Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs for all past, present and future costs incurred by Plaintiffs in connection with cleanup of the Hazardous Substance at the subject property;
- For attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and
- For such other and further relief as this Court deems G. proper.

DATED: December 29, 1992

MCNAMARA, HOUSTON, DODGE, McCLURE & NEY

epuse Billups-Stone

Denise Billups-Slone Attorneys for Plaintiffs DODGE

1	WITH DOWNER OF MENTIONS STATE PARD FORM
<u>.</u>	WALNUT CREEK
Receive from BICHARD F. & JEANNE	M. DODGE March 24, 1978
ender <u>Johnson Recorde</u> of Foc	WALNUT CREEK  California March 24, 1978  March
and the state of the contract of the state o	- MANS All a properties of the
- 200 details be to law 437 est that was	The state of the s
Man Deart Assessor o Parcel #	property known as 7400 Amador Velley Blvd. Dublin, Calif. 941-201-1-4 and being a one story Dutch Pride Dairy Stop.
The total purchase price is ONE HUNDRED TH	OUSAND DOLLARS
The purchase price is to be paid to Seller and a doubt do	(\$ 100,000,00 ) Dally
. THE TOWNS PATOR TO BE ALL	L CASH INCLUDING DEPOSIT THE CLOSING DATE \$100,000.00 plus closing
costs.	grootcoo.co plus closing
RICHARD E. & JEANNE DODGE and	Porton Dedda Dad
9 year lease at \$1,000.00 pe	Dutch Pride Dairy, a Limited Partnership, will execute a er month with two 5 year options. Option lease price to be due. Lease will contain a clause the
negotiated when options are	due Tease price to he
taxes on equipment and Lesso	or to pay taxes on Real Estate and improvements. Lease to
be approved in escrow.	Lease to
This is continued	
Cornelius and Elizabeth van	wetween Dutch Pride Dairy, a Limited Partnership, and
The state of the s	Wyk being exercised prior to 4/1/78.
FIXTURES. The purchase price covers all existing fix	tures including, but not limited to, walf-to-wall floor covering, diapes, window coverings and screens, curtain and
drapery rods, awnings, trees, shrubs and equipmen	at the state wall moor covering, drapes, window coverings and screens, curtain and
74-1 F 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A	
Buyers	s and encumbrances except as mentioned herein, evidenced by a policy of title insurance to be paid for by
Safeco . Hitle is subject to taxes, e	and the property of the property of the party of the part
Seller shall pay any expense in connection with the comme	title company. Escrow company shall be Newman Escrow
materially damaged or destroyed prior to the close of as	or the detects. If Selier tails to deliver title as herein provided or if the improvements on said property should be
PRORATIONS, Taxes premiums on insurance second	able to Demonstrate shall terminate
of deed. Any assessments for improvements in construct	ion recently completed and other charges against said property shall be prorated as of the date of recordation
advance rentals, or consideration involving future lease.	readity chall be and a cleaning general
WARRANTY. Seller warrants that prounds and impro-	remonts will be a school of the sense to pay their respective closing costs
trical systems shall be in working order at close of escre	w. Seller agrees to permit inspection thereof prior to close of escrow and to pay for any necessary repairs  livered to Buyer Sealease above
DCCUPANCY. Occupancy of said property is to be de	livered to Buyer seelesse above
The second of the second secon	Vesentations guarantees
FIME. Time is of the present of this arrange at this	ements upon which Buyer relies in executing this agreement are contained herein.
Comment of the state of the sta	omornig apon tille nells. executore administratore executors and
	v are incorporated as part of this agreement.
Structural Pest Control Agreement	YES .
	Occupancy Agreement   VA Amendment
The Flood Insurance Disclosure	FHA Amondment
PEPAULT. If Buyer defaults in his performance of the to	
ered by Seller as a result thereof have been ascertained, an	d upon the determination, said deposit may be applied toward payment of such damages. If any party to this agree-
lent or the Broker(s) named herein shall hereafter institut	a sourceting in a result in the person to the person of the sample of th
no action shall be entitled to a reasonable attorney's for	in addition to an est, the prevailing party in this agreement, the prevailing party in
rovided, however, that if said purchase and sale is not com	inleted because of Private for
toker(s) and Broker(s) shall have the right to institute to	enal potion against D
oker(s) a commission of Tem	es to self the property on the terms and conditions described herein and acknowledges receipt of a copy hereof.  — percent of the sales price due upon execution of the account on set forth herein, and agrees to pay below marined.
e undersigned Seller acknowledges consist at	percent of the sales price due upon execution of this agreement by Seller
and a secure released nulesz accepted to Mu	iting on or large Presentation
	EXHIBIT A

A REAL ESTATE BROKER IS THE PERSON QUALIFIED TO ADVISE ON REAL ESTATE, IF JOH DESIRE LEGAL ADVICE CONSULT TO ID ATTICLE.

į,

m, .n.

be approved in escrow.	_essor to pay taxes	or Real Estate and improvements. Leas:	io
This is contingent on opt	ion between Dutch Pro Van Wyk being exerc	ride Dairy, a Limited Partnership, and ised prior to 4/1/78.	
	,		
			<del></del>
			<u>-</u>
b. FIXTURES. The purchase price covers all eduratory rods, awnings, trees, shrubs and 60	xisting fixtures including, but not lin	nited to, walf-to-wall floor covering, drapes, window coverings and screens,	, curtain a
1 1100 13 400 666	of all liens and encumbrances except to taxes, easements and restrictions of	ot as mentioned herein, evidenced by a policy of title insurance to be record. Buyer to obtain a preliminary title report issued by	paid for
	Side company Fs/	fow company chall be. Mosemon Timeses	
Sener anan bay any expense in connection with	the removal of title defects. If Seller f	ails to deliver title as harnes provided or if the	ety should
d. PRORATIONS. Taxes, premiums on insural of deed. Any assessments for improvements in	nce acceptable to Buyer, rents, interes construction, recently completed or	on, the deposit shall be returned to him and this contract shall terminate t and other charges against said property shall be prorated as of the date of a lien at close of escrow shall be paid for by SELLER. Security and clean Buyer. Buyer and Seller to pay their respective closing costs	e.
- TO THE TENED WHITE HIS GOODINGS	and improvements will be maintained.	that roof is water trobe and sheeps!	
The state of the s	as or eacing, asits agrees to betwit	INSPECTION Thereof prior to close of eccrow and to now for any	er, and ele
The second of the property	12 to be assisted to privet " Sea Tes	ase anove	
g. REPRESENTATIONS. Buyer acknowledges	that no representations, guarantees, p	romises or warranties of any kind or nature have been made by Seller or Se	eller's acen
and the specified herein, old that all la	ICIO DI SIZIZIRENZO BUDNI WINEN MINDE	(alias in avacuiting this open	
1. SLIPPLEMENTS. The complements charles	t which is binding upon the heirs, exe	cutors, administrators, successors and assigns of the respective parties here	eto.
i. SUPPLEMENTS. The supplements checked	I Yes below are incorporated as part	of this agreement.	
Structural Pest Control Agreement	Occupancy Agreement	YE\$	
Special Studies Zone Disclosure	☐ W VA Amendment	0	
☐ Flood Insurance Disclosure	☐ 6 FHA Amendment		~
J. DEFAULT. If Buyer defaults in his performan	ice of the terms and conditions of this	agreement, the deposit paid by Buyer shall be retained in trust until the d	
ment or the Broker(s) named herein shall hereaf said action shall be entitled to a reasonable att	ter institute any action in a court of corney's fee, in addition to any other just not completed because of Buyer's fee.	said deposit may be applied toward payment of such damages. If any party to empetent jurisdiction against any other party to this agreement, the prevail idgment of the court. The Broker's commission provided below shall be painted to perform his philables have a Research to perform his philables.	o this agree ling party (
		prectly for said commission e terms and conditions described herein and acknowledges receipt of a co	
L. The undersigned Seller accepts the foregoing offi	er and agrees to sell the property descri	ibed above on the terms and conditions set forth herein, and agrees to pay be	opy hereof.
	hercent of the 29tes DUC	e alle upon execution of this agreement by Sollar	elow name
r rue nuneizikinen benet acknowlendez teceibi bi	t a copy hereof and authorizes Broker	(s) to deliver a duty signed conv to Ruyar	
L. This offer shall be deemed revoked unless according	epted in writing on or Marke Pres	entation	
A REAL ESTATE BROKER IS THE INTERPOLATION OF THE PROPERTY OF T	PERSON QUALIFIED TO ADVISE ON RESON of the physical condition of the pro	AL ESTATE. IF YOU DESIRE LEGAL ADVICE CONSULT YOUR ATTORNEY.  Perty, consult a qualified expert in the appropriate field.  Newman Realtors	Ú
* JEANNE M. DOME	78 3/24/78	565 Ygnacio Valley Rd. 933-8400	
c/o Newman Realtors		COMMISSION DIVISION TO Newman Realtors	
BUYEN & ADDREAS	PHONE	27 212 1110000 2100 1 00 1 0	-
secry, D,	DATE	Same as above	
x Hel hillden ander	MADELLOS	Bu). Fd	
To he we he	MARCH 25	A contract of the contract of	*****
Later House Real Drs.	year year of the	# i hs	
The control of the co	Co dist	( NO	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	•		

CALAS VA

#### LEASE

THIS LEASE executed in duplicate at Antioch, California, on this / day of April, 1978, between Lessors, Richard and Jeanne Dodge, 1120 Walker Ave. Walnut Creek, California, and Lessee, John Warmerdam 3810 Delta Fair Blvd., Antioch, California.

#### IT IS AGREED BETWEEN THE PARTIES HERETO AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. <u>DESCRIPTION OF PREMISES</u>: The Lessor hereby leases to Lessee and Lessee hires from Lessor on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth all of those certain premises with appurtenances as situated in Antioch, California and upon which the business known as "Dutch Pride Drive-In Dairy" is now located and commonly known as 7400 Amador Valley Blvd., Dublin, California.
- 2. TERMS AND EXTENSION OF LEASE: The term of the within lease shall commence on April 1, 1978 and end March 31, 1987. The Lessee has the option to renew the lease for an additional 2 5 year terms at the end of this lease. Rent to be negotiated between Lessor and Lessee.
- 3. RENT: Lessee agrees to pay to Lessor, \$ 1,000 per month without deduction or offset, at such place as may be designated by Lessor. Payable monthly in advance on the first day of each month, commencing April 1, 1978.

- 4. <u>USE</u>: 'rne premises are leased to Lessee for the purpose of the sale of dairy products and for the sale of similar and related items.
- 5. ALTERATIONS: Lessee shall not make or suffer to be made any alterations of said premises or any part thereof without the written consent of Lessor first hand and obtained and any additions to, or alterations of, the said premises, except movable furniture and trade fixtures, shall become at once a part of the realty and belong to Lessor. Lessee shall keep the leased premises free from any liens arising out of any work performed, material furnished, or obligations incurred by Lessee.
- 6. TAXES. Lessor shall pay all real property taxes and any general or special assessment that may be assessed against leased premises during the term or any extension thereof.

Lessee shall be liable for all taxes levied against personal property and trade fixtures or improvements placed by Lessee in or upon leased premises.

- 7. TAXES AS ADDITIONAL RENTAL: Lessee shall in addition to all other sums agreed to be paid by him under this lease, pay unto Lessor, upon his demand, the increased property taxes assessed against the leased premises based on the 1977 property tax bill.
- 8. <u>UTILITIES:</u> Lessee shall pay for all water, gas, heat, light, power, telephone service, and all other service applied to the leased premises.

- 9. REMOVAL OF TRADE FIXTURES: Provided that Lessee is in full and complete performance of the provisions of this Lease, Lessee may remove all unattached movable furniture, trade fixtures and store equipment installed on the leased premises by Lessee and the same shall be removed by Lessee at the expiration or termination of this Lease or any renewal thereof, provided that the same may be removed without damage to the building. If damage is caused by such removal Lessee agrees to repair such damage at his own costs forthwith.
- 10. REPAIRS: Lessee shall at his sole costs, keep and maintain said premises and appurtenances, and every part thereof, (excepting exterior walls and roofs which Lessor agrees to repair including, windows and skylights) in good and sanitary order, condition and repair.
- 11. LIABILITY INSURANCE: Lessee agrees to take out and keep in force during the life hereof, at Lessee's expense, public liability insurance to protect against any liability to the public, incident to the use of or resulting from any accident occurring in or about said premises, the liability under such insurance to be not less than \$ 100,000 for any one person injured or \$300,000 for any one accident or \$20,000 for property damage. These policies shall insure the contingent liability of Lessor and Lessee agrees to furnish to Lessor a certificate of said insurance.
- 12. ATTORNEY'S FEES: If either party commences an action against the other party arising out of or in connection with this Lease, the prevailing party shall be entitled to have and recover from the losing party, costs of suit and reasonable attorney's fees which shall be fixed by the court.

- 13. HOLDING OVER: Any holding over after March 31, 1987, the expiration of said term with the consent of Lessor, shall be construed to be a tenancy from month to month at a rental of \$1000 a month and shall otherwise be on the terms and conditions herein specified so far as applicable.
- this Lease, or any interest therein, and shall not sublet the said premises or any part thereof, or any right or privilege appurtenant thereto, or suffer any other person to occupy or use the said premises or any portion thereof without the written consent of Lessor first had and obtained, and a consent to one assignment, subletting, occupation or use by another person shall not be deemed to be a consent to any subsequent assignment, subletting, occupation or use by another person. Any such assignment or subletting without such consent shall be void and shall, at the option of Lessor, terminate this Lease. This Lease shall not, nor shall any interest therein be assignable, as to the interest of Lessee by operation of law without the written consent of Lessor.
- 15. BINDING ON SUCCESSORS: The covenants and conditions herein contained shall, subject to the provisions as to assignment, apply to and bind the heirs, successors, executors, administrators, and assigns, of all the parties hereon, and all of the parties hereto shall be jointly and severly liably hereunder.
  - 16. TIME: Time is of the essence of this Lease.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Lessor and Lessee have executed this Lease on April / 1978.

JEANNE DODGE "LESSOR" RICHARD DODGE LESS

ENDORSED DOUGLAS C. MCCLURE 1 FILED State Bar No. 45556 ALAMEDA COUNTY 2 DENISE BILLUPS-SLONE State Bar No. 151606 DEC 3 0 1992 3 McNAMARA, HOUSTON, DODGE, McCLURE & NEY 1211 Newell Avenue, Second Floor RONALD G. OVERHOLT, Exec. Off/Clerk Post Office Box 5288 4 ' Kathy McKern Walnut Creek, California 94596 5 Telephone: (510) 939-5330 Facsimile: (510) 939-0203 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs RICHARD E. DODGE and JEANNE M. 7 DODGE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 8 9 No. V. 005768-3 RICHARD E. DODGE and JEANNE M. ) 10 DODGE, DECLARATION OF COUNSEL 11 Plaintiffs, CERTIFYING VENUE (LOCAL RULE 3.4[2]) 12 vs. 1.3 JOHN WARMERDAM, LAURA WARMERDAM, BURT SERNE, 14 CORNELIUS VAN WYK, ELIZABETH VAN WYK, DUTCH PRIDE DAIRY, a 15 California corporation, DUTCH 16 PRIDE DAIRY, a limited partnership, AQUA TERRA TECHNOLOGIES, NEWMAN REALTY, 17 FLETCHER, EGAN & PARADISO, PARADISO CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, 18 DOES 1 THROUGH 85, inclusive, 19 Defendants. 20

#### DENISE BILLUPS-SLONE declares:

- 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice before all of the Courts of the State of California and am associated with the law firm of McNAMARA, HOUSTON, DODGE, McCLURE & NEY, Attorneys of Record for Plaintiffs.
- 2. The following causes of action, filed by Plaintiffs, against the above-entitled defendants, arose within the geo-

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1	graphical limits of the Eastern Division of the Alameda County
2	Superior Court:
3	a. Breach of Lease - Waste;
4	b. Waste - Treble Damages;
5	c. Breach of Lease - Failure to Maintain in Good
6	Condition;
7	d. Negligence;
8	e. Equitable Indemnity;
9	f. Breach of Lease - Liability Insurance;
10	g. Breach of Lease - Failure to Comply with Terms;
11	h. Declaratory relief;
12	i. Breach of Contract - Failure to Comply with Laws;
13	j. Violation of Law - Interference with Plaintiffs'
14	Ability to Obtain Relief from the State Water Resources Board;
15	k. Strict Liability in Tort: Ultra-Hazardous Activity;
16	1. Fraud;
17	m. Fraud - Intentional Misrepresentation;
18	n. Trespass;
19	o. Negligence Per Se;
20	p. Nuisance;
21	q. Statutory Contribution;
22	r. Negligent Misrepresentation;
23	s. Breach of Contract;
24	t. Unfair Business Practices;
25	u. Professional Negligence;
26	v. Fraud and Intentional Misrepresentation;
27	w. Negligent and Strict Product Liability.
28	3. The Complaint filed on behalf of Plaintiffs involves the

sale, purchase and maintenance of real property located at 7400 Amador Valley Boulevard, in the City of Dublin, County of Alameda, State of California. I am informed and believe that the Eastern Division of the Alameda County Superior Court serves the Livermore-Pleasanton-Dublin Judicial District.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 30th day of December, 1992, at Walnut Creek, California.

Denue Bullupa Surve

Denise Billups-Slone

SUPERIOR COURT STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
EXECUTIVE OFFICER
JURY COMMISSIONER AND
CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
1225 Fallon Street
Ookland, CA 94612

Phone: (510) 272-6040

CLERK OF THE COURT, ROOM 105 Phone: (510) 272-6755

### NOTICE OF CASE RULES

Special rules have been adopted by the Alameda County Superior Court to implement the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act of 1986 (Government Code Section 68600) which may apply to this case. These rules have been published as Chapter Four: ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL LITIGATION of the Alameda County Superior Court Local Court Rules and will be strictly enforced by the Court. All counsel will be expected to be familiar with them.

IT IS THE DUTY OF EACH PLAINTIFF (AND CROSS-COMPLAINANT) TO SERVE A COPY OF THIS NOTICE OF CASE RULES WITH THE COMPLAINT (AND CROSS-COMPLAINT).

The Alameda County Superior Court Local Rules are published by the San Francisco Banner/Daily Journal, the San Francisco Recorder and West Publishing Company.

202-21 (Revised 3/01/90)