

ORIGINAL

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP
11111 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90025
310.477.1700 phone • 310.477.1699 fax

9/1 Rafael on sketch

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP
BRIAN J. PANISH, State Bar No. 116060
panish@psblaw.com
KEVIN R. BOYLE, State Bar No. 192718
boyle@psblaw.com
PATRICK K. GUNNING, State Bar No. 280457
gunning@psblaw.com
11111 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: 310.477.1700
Facsimile: 310.477.1699

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

FILED
Los Angeles Superior Court

AUG 28 2013

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk
By SHAUNYA WESLEY Deputy

FSC: 02/11/2015 TRIAL: 03/02/2015 OSC: 08/29/2016

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT**

BC519842

Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1. Negligence (Wrongful Death)
2. Negligent Hiring/Retention/
Training/Supervision/Entrustment
3. Survival Action (Punitive Damages)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

GRISSEL DONATELLI, individually;
DOMINIC WILLIAM DONATELLI, by and
through his guardian ad litem GRISSEL
DONATELLI; AMANDA CAROLINA
DONATELLI, and the ESTATE OF
MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI, by and
through its personal representative WILLIAM
A. DONATELLI;

Plaintiffs,

v.

ORBIC AIR, LLC, a corporation; VAN NUYS
COPTERS, LLC, a corporation; EYEWORKS
USA, LLC, a corporation; BONGO, INC., a
corporation; DISCOVERY
COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, a corporation;
DISCOVERY TALENT SERVICES, LLC;
THE ESTATE OF DAVID GENE GIBBS,
individually; CROSSBOW, INC., a
corporation, RODIANN DONATELLI
COTTO, a nominal defendant, SOFIA
DONATELLI, a nominal defendant, and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

CIT/CASE: BC519842
LEH/DEF#:
RECEIPT #: CCH46596009
DATE PAID: 08/29/15 08:24 AM
PAYMENT: \$435.00
RECEIVED: 310
CHECK: \$435.00
CASH: \$0.00
CHANGE: \$0.00
CARD: \$0.00

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

This case arises from the wrongful death of MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI in a helicopter crash that occurred on February 10, 2013

1. This case arises from the wrongful death of MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI in a helicopter crash that occurred on February 10, 2013. Plaintiffs' Decedent was MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI.

THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff GRISEL DONATELLI was the wife of MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI.

3. DOMINIC WILLIAM DONATELLI is the son of MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI, and is represented in this action by GRISEL DONATELLI as guardian ad litem.

4. AMANDA CAROLINA DONATELLI is the daughter of MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI.

5. The ESTATE OF MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI is represented in this action by its personal representative WILLIAM A. DONATELLI.

6. Plaintiffs are informed that additional potential wrongful death heirs of Decedent DONATELLI may exist, named RODIANN DONATELLI COTTO and SOFIA DONATELLI. Upon information and belief, consent could not be obtained from these potential heirs to join in this action prior to filing of this lawsuit. Pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure* § 382, RODIANN DONATELLI COTTO and SOFIA DONATELLI are hereby named as nominal defendants.

7. Defendant ORBIC AIR, LLC ("ORBIC") was and is a limited liability company with its principal place of business at 16700 Roscoe Blvd., Van Nuys, County of Los Angeles, California at all times relevant.

8. Defendant VAN NUYS COPTERS, LLC ("VAN NUYS") was and is a limited liability company with its principal place of business in Van Nuys, County of Los Angeles, California at all times relevant.

9. Defendant EYEWORKS USA, LLC ("EYEWORKS") was and is a limited liability

1 company with its principal place of business located at 3650 Redondo Beach Ave., Redondo
2 Beach, California, 90278.

3 10. Defendant BONGO, LLC ("BONGO") was and is a limited liability company with
4 its principal place of business located at 3650 Redondo Beach Ave., Redondo Beach, California,
5 90278.

6 11. Defendant DISCOVERY COMMUNICATIONS, LLC ("DISCOVERY") was and
7 is a limited liability company that, at all times relevant herein, conducted business and maintained
8 contacts within Los Angeles County in the State of California.

9 12. Defendant DISCOVERY TALENT SERVICES, LLC ("DISCOVERY TALENT")
10 was and is a limited liability company that, at all times relevant herein, conducted business and
11 maintained contacts within Los Angeles County in the State of California.

12 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendant THE
13 ESTATE OF DAVID GENE GIBBS has been opened in the County of Los Angeles, State of
14 California, where David G. Gibbs was a resident. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon
15 allege, that Defendant DOE 1 is the duly named personal representative of THE ESTATE OF
16 DAVID GENE GIBBS ("Gibbs"), Plaintiff further alleges on information and belief that a hearing
17 to appoint an executor has not yet occurred in the Los Angeles Superior Court, but that Plaintiffs
18 have prepared a Creditor's Claim pursuant to the Probate Code and have caused or will cause it to
19 be duly served upon his or her legal representative.

20 14. Defendant CROSSBOW HELICOPTERS, INC. (hereinafter "CROSSBOW") was
21 and is a corporation with its principal place of business in Valencia, California. At all relevant
22 times herein, DAVID GENE GIBBS was an owner, operator, shareholder, and principal of
23 CROSSBOW.

24 15. The true names and capacities, whether individual, plural, corporate, partnership,
25 associate, or otherwise, of DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs who
26 therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. The full extent of the facts linking such
27 fictitiously sued Defendants is unknown to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and
28

1 thereon allege, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE was, and is, negligent, or
2 in some other actionable manner, responsible for the events and happenings hereinafter referred to,
3 and thereby negligently, or in some other actionable manner, legally and proximately caused the
4 hereinafter described injuries and damages to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs will hereafter seek leave of the
5 Court to amend this Complaint to show the Defendants' true names and capacities after the same
6 have been ascertained.

7 16. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that at all times herein
8 alleged, each of the aforesaid Defendants, including DOES 1 through 100, was the agent, servant,
9 partner, aider and abettor, co-conspirator and joint venturer of the other herein and were at all
10 times operating and acting within the purpose and scope of said agency, service, employment,
11 partnership, conspiracy and joint venture and rendered substantial assistance and encouragement
12 to the other Defendants, knowing that their conduct constituted a breach of duty owed to Plaintiffs.

13 17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that there exists, and at all
14 times herein alleged, there existed, a unity of interest in ownership between each of the aforesaid
15 Defendants, including DOES 1 through 100, such that any individuality and separateness between
16 these Defendants has ceased and these Defendants each are the alter-ego of the others and exerted
17 control over those Defendants. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of each these
18 Defendants as an entity distinct from the others will permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and
19 would sanction fraud and would promote injustice.

20 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

21 18. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and based thereon allege that on or before
22 February 1, 2013, Defendants CROSSBOW and GIBBS submitted a "Plan of Activities" to the
23 Van Nuys Flight Standards District Office, to engage in filming activity, using the subject Bell
24 206B helicopter bearing registration number N59518 (hereinafter the "Helicopter") on February 9,
25 2013, and to engage in landing and take-off evolution at a secured site in Acton, California.

26 19. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and based thereon allege that on or before
27 February 8, 2013, defendants EYEWORKS, BONGO, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT,
28

1 BONGO LLC, and DOES 51 through 100 contracted with Defendants ORBIC, VAN NUYS,
2 GIBBS, CROSSBOW, and DOES 2 through 50 to provide helicopter services for the production
3 of a reality television show being produced by them.

4 20. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and based thereon allege that ORBIC and VAN
5 NUYS contracted with CROSSBOW and GIBBS, to supply pilot services and other technical
6 skills for the production.

7 21. On February 10, 2013, Plaintiffs' decedent, MICHAEL DONATELLI, was a
8 passenger in the Helicopter operated, used, and supplied by GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN
9 NUYS, and DOES 1 through 50.

10 22. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that on February 10, 2013 at
11 approximately 3:30 a.m., Decedent DONATELLI was a passenger in the Helicopter for the
12 purpose of filming for a television series, along with a camera operator, at or near Polsa Rosa
13 Ranch; 5700 Soledad Canyon Road; Acton, County of Los Angeles, California. The flight called
14 for operating the helicopter at low altitudes, over hilly terrain, with low lighting, poor visibility,
15 and in frost conditions.

16 23. The Helicopter was piloted at all relevant times by Defendant DAVID GENE
17 GIBBS.

18 24. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that at all relevant times
19 Defendant GIBBS was acting as an employee and agent for Defendants ORBIC, CROSSBOW,
20 VAN NUYS, and DOES 1 through 50.

21 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that after takeoff, and while
22 the Helicopter maneuvering at approximately 60 miles per hour, the Helicopter suddenly pitched
23 down and crashed into the ground. The impact caused injuries to MICHAEL WILLIAM
24 DONATELLI and the camera operator which, after a period of time, were fatal to MICHAEL
25 WILLIAM DONATELLI.

26 26. The filming and production of the television series, as well as the hiring, retention,
27 supervision, training, and entrustment of persons, businesses, employees and independent
28

contractors for accomplishing tasks related to the television series in question, including the piloting of helicopters, was controlled by and was the responsibility of Defendants EYEWORX, BONGO, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, at all times relevant herein.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligence – Wrongful Death Against Defendants GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 1 through 50)

27. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every prior allegation this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

28. On and before February 10, 2013, Defendant GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, and DOES 1 through 50; owed a duty to exercise reasonable care for the safety of passengers aboard the Helicopter, including Plaintiffs' decedent MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI.

29. Defendant GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 1 through 50 acted negligently, recklessly, unlawfully, and/or with conscious disregard for the safety of others in one or more of the following respects:

- a. Failed to maintain proper, safe, and/or adequate control over the Helicopter;
- b. Failed to act reasonably in the ownership of the Helicopter;
- c. Failed to undertake and perform the appropriate and necessary actions to accomplish a safe flight;
- d. Failed to abort the flight given the adverse weather, visibility, and landing zone, and other conditions;
- e. Failed to adequately maintain the Helicopter;
- f. Allowed and/or caused the aircraft to crash into the ground; and
- g. Otherwise acting negligently, recklessly, unlawfully, and/or with conscious disregard for the safety of others.

30. The negligence, recklessness, unlawful acts, and/or conscious disregard of the

1 safety of others of GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, and DOES 1 through 50 was a substantial
2 factor in causing the death of Decedent DONATELLI.

3 31. As a legal, direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness, and/or
4 violation of the law, by the Defendants, and each of them, including DOES 1 through 50,
5 inclusive, Plaintiffs have sustained damages resulting from the loss of love, affection, society,
6 service, comfort, support, right of support, expectations of future support, and counseling,
7 companionship, solace and mental support, as well as other benefits and assistance, of the
8 decedent, all to their general damage in a sum in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court,
9 which will be stated according to proof, in accordance with Section 425.10 of the California *Code*
10 *of Civil Procedure*.

11 32. As a legal, direct and proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, and each
12 of them, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, Plaintiffs will be deprived of the financial
13 support and assistance of the decedent, the exact amount of such losses to be stated according to
14 proof, pursuant to Section 425.10 of the California *Code of Civil Procedure*.

15 33. As a legal, direct and proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, and each
16 of them, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, Plaintiffs have incurred funeral and burial
17 expenses in an amount to be stated according to proof, pursuant to Section 425.10 of the
18 California *Code of Civil Procedure*.

19 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

20 (Negligent Hiring/Retention/Training/Supervision/Entrustment Against
21 Defendants ORBIC, CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS, EYEWORKS, BONGO, DISCOVERY,
22 DISCOVERY TALENT and DOES 2 through 100)
23

24 34. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every prior
25 allegation this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

26 35. On and before February 10, 2013, Defendants ORBIC, CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS,
27 EYEWORKS, BONGO, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, and DOES 2 through 100, owed
28

1 a duty to protect foreseeable persons, including Decedent MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI,
2 against an unreasonable risk of physical harm.

3 36. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants ORBIC, CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS,
4 and DOES 2 through 50, and each of them, owed a duty of care to the public, including Decedent
5 DONATELLI, in the hiring, retention, training, supervision of their agents, employees, servants,
6 and/or independent contractors, to whom they assigned, authorized, allowed, or entrusted the
7 operation of helicopters, that they do so in a reasonable manner and within the laws of the state of
8 California.

9 37. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that at all times
10 mentioned herein, Defendants ORBIC, CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50, and
11 each of them, were negligent in the hiring, retention, training, and supervision of Defendants
12 GIBBS, in that Defendants ORBIC and DOES 2 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, knew or
13 should have known that Defendant GIBBS was unfit for specific tasks to be performed, namely
14 the general safe operation of a helicopter.

15 38. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that at all times
16 mentioned herein, Defendants ORBIC, CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50,
17 inclusive, and each of them, were further negligent by failing to provide any or sufficient training
18 or supervision to GIBBS for performance/duties which included operating helicopters.

19 39. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT,
20 EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 51 through 100, and each of them, owed a duty of care to the
21 public, including Decedent DONATELLI, in the hiring, retention, training, supervision of their
22 agents, employees, servants, and/or independent contractors, to whom they assigned, authorized,
23 allowed, or entrusted the operation of helicopters, that they do so in a reasonable manner and
24 within the laws of the state of California.

25 40. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that at all times
26 mentioned herein, Defendants DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO,
27 and DOES 51 through 100, and each of them, were negligent in the hiring, retention, training, and
28

1 supervision of Defendants GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50,
2 in that Defendants DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES
3 51 through 100, inclusive, and each of them, knew or should have known that Defendants GIBBS,
4 CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50 were unfit for specific tasks to be
5 performed, namely the general safe operation of a helicopter.

6 41. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that at all times
7 mentioned herein, Defendants DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO,
8 and DOES 51 through 100, inclusive, and each of them, were further negligent by failing to
9 provide any or sufficient training or supervision for performance/duties which included operating
10 helicopters.

11 42. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege Defendants ORBIC,
12 CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO,
13 and DOES 2 through 100, and each of them, owned and/or controlled the helicopter operated by
14 Defendant GIBBS.

15 43. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege Defendants ORBIC,
16 CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO,
17 and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, knew, or should have known, that GIBBS was
18 incompetent or unfit to operate the Helicopter.

19 44. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege Defendants ORBIC,
20 CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO,
21 and DOES 2 through 100, and each of them, nonetheless permitted GIBBS to operate the
22 Helicopter.

23 45. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege the incompetence or
24 unfitness of GIBBS to operate a helicopter was a substantial factor in causing harm to Decedent
25 DONATELLI.

26 46. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that at all times
27 mentioned herein, Defendants ORBIC, CROSSBOW, VAN NUYS, EYEWORKS, BONGO,
28

1 DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, and DOES 2 through 100, and each of their
2 aforementioned negligent hiring, retention, training, supervision, and entrustment were each a
3 legal and proximate cause of the subject helicopter crash, causing the injuries and damages
4 complained of herein.

5 47. As a legal, direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness, and/or
6 violation of the law, by the Defendants, and each of them, including DOES 2 through 100,
7 inclusive, Plaintiffs have sustained damages resulting from the loss of love, affection, society,
8 service, comfort, support, right of support, expectations of future support, and counseling,
9 companionship, solace and mental support, as well as other benefits and assistance, of the
10 decedent, all to their general damage in a sum in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court,
11 which will be stated according to proof, in accordance with Section 425.10 of the California *Code*
12 *of Civil Procedure*.

13 48. As a legal, direct and proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, and each
14 of them, including DOES 2 through 100, inclusive, Plaintiffs will be deprived of the financial
15 support and assistance of the decedent, the exact amount of such losses to be stated according to
16 proof, pursuant to Section 425.10 of the California *Code of Civil Procedure*.

17 49. As a legal, direct and proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, and each
18 of them, including DOES 2 through 100, inclusive, Plaintiffs have incurred funeral and burial
19 expenses in an amount to be stated according to proof, pursuant to Section 425.10 of the
20 California *Code of Civil Procedure*.

21 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

22 (Survival Action Against All Defendants)

23 50. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each and every prior
24 allegation this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

25 51. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege the aforementioned
26 subject incident that gave rise to this lawsuit caused Decedent DONATELLI to suffer traumatic
27
28

injury, as well as damage to his personal clothing and articles (property damage).

52. As a legal, direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Decedent DONATELLI was injured in his person by the helicopter crash and survived for a period of time after the initial impact and/or initial injury.

53. Decedent DONATELLI sustained severe injuries to his body that ultimately resulted in death, and therefore THE ESTATE OF MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI seeks all damages accruing to the decedent in a survival action, pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure § 377.34. All of said damages combine to a sum in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, including any penalties, punitive or exemplary damages that the Decedent would have been entitled to had she lived, with the exception of pain, suffering, disfigurement, which will be stated according to proof, pursuant to Section 425.10 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

54. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants GIBBS, ORBIC, and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, acted with "malice" in that they engaged in conduct either constituting (1) willful and wanton misconduct, or (2) despicable conduct in conscious disregard of the safety of the Decedent and the public, thereby entitling THE ESTATE OF MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI to an award of punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3294.

55. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, acted with "malice," by conduct that included, but is not limited to the following:

- a. Knowingly, intentionally and with a conscious and reckless disregard for the safety of others, failing to maintain proper, safe, and/or adequate control over the Helicopter;
- b. Knowingly, intentionally and with a conscious and reckless disregard for the safety of others, failing to maintain sufficient altitude after departing the landing zone to avoid obstruction;
- c. Knowingly, intentionally and with a conscious and reckless disregard for the safety

1 of others, failing to undertake and perform the appropriate procedures necessary to
2 accomplish a safe flight;

3 d. Knowingly, intentionally and with a conscious and reckless disregard for the safety
4 of others, failing to abort the flight given the adverse weather, visibility, and terrain
5 conditions;

6 e. Knowingly, intentionally and with a conscious and reckless disregard for the safety
7 of others, allowing the aircraft to crash into the ground; and

8 f. Were otherwise willful and wanton in their actions.

9 56. For the purposes of helicopter flights, such as this one, GIBBS acted as a managing
10 agent for CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50, by exercising substantial
11 control over corporate policies regarding such flights. In addition, other officers, directors, or
12 managing agents, whose identities are unknown to the Plaintiffs at this time, performed,
13 contributed to, authorized, and/or ratified the above-described acts.

14 57. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants
15 CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50, inclusive, acted with "malice," by
16 conduct that included, but is not limited to the following:

17 a. Knowingly, intentionally, willfully, and/or with a conscious disregard for the safety
18 of others, failing to maintain proper, safe, and/or adequate control over the Helicopter;

19 b. Having advance knowledge that GIBBS was unfit to operate the Helicopter,
20 particularly for a flight intended to include serious dangers of a crash including low-
21 altitude flight, hilly terrain, and low lighting conditions at 3:30 a.m.

22 c. Specifically, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, CROSSBOW, and DOES 2 through 50 knew,
23 and/or should have known given even a cursory investigation, that GIBBS had a past
24 safety record including multiple FAA suspensions of his pilot's license and prior incidents
25 of injury-producing helicopter crashes prior to the subject incident that rendered him
26 unqualified to fly the flight plan scheduled during the subject incident.

27 d. Despite this, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, CROSSBOW, and DOES 2 through 50, and
28

each of them, employed, hired, and/or retained GIBBS to operate the Helicopter in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others.

e. ORBIC, VAN NUYS, CROSSBOW, and DOES 2 through 50, and each of them, also had corporate policies, or engaged in a failure to enforce corporate policies, that resulted in the employment, hiring, and/or retention of unqualified and unsafe pilots, including GIBBS, during the subject incident and during other incidents which have included crashes producing injury and death.

f. ORBIC, VAN NUYS, CROSSBOW, and DOES 2 through 50, and each of them, also approved, authorized, or otherwise directed an unsafe, dangerous flight plan without ensuring adequate safety precautions were taken, in conscious disregard of the safety of others, during the subject incident and during other incidents which have included crashes producing injury and death.

58. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 51 through 100, inclusive, acted with "malice" by conduct that included, but is not limited to the following:

a. Knowingly, intentionally and with a conscious and reckless disregard for the safety of others, failing to maintain proper, safe, and/or adequate control over the Helicopter;

b. Having advance knowledge that GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50 were unfit to operate the Helicopter, particularly for a flight intended to include significant dangers of a crash including low-altitude flight, hilly terrain and low lighting conditions at 3:30 a.m.

c. Specifically, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 51 through 100 knew, and/or should have known given even a cursory investigation, that GIBBS had a past safety record including multiple FAA suspensions of his pilot's license and prior incidents of injury-producing helicopter crashes prior to the subject incident that rendered him unqualified to fly the flight plan scheduled during the subject incident.

d. Despite this, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 51 through 100, and each of them, employed, hired, and/or retained GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50, to operate the Helicopter in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others.

e. DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 51 through 100 also had corporate policies, or engaged in a failure to enforce corporate policies, that resulted in the employment, hiring, and/or retention of unqualified and unsafe pilots and aviation companies, including GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, and DOES 2 through 50, during the subject incident and during other incidents which have included crashes producing injury and death.

f. DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 51 through 100, and each of them, also approved, authorized, or otherwise directed an unsafe, dangerous flight plan without ensuring adequate safety precautions were taken, in conscious disregard of the safety of others, during the subject incident and during other incidents which have included crashes producing injury and death.

g. DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 51 through 100, and each of them, also have had an extensive history of knowingly failing to provide adequate safety measures for the filming of reality television series such as this one. These safety problems were the result of cost-cutting measures aimed at increasing profits as a result of the conscious disregard of the additional, unacceptable safety risks imposed. These safety problems have resulted in injuries and death in the filming of such television series, and have continued to do so following the death of Decedent Donatelli.

59. Defendants GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 2 through 100, inclusive, and each of them, had prior knowledge of the dangers and risks of serious injury or death that such misconduct would and did create to members of the public, such as Decedent DONATELLI. Despite such knowledge, Defendants continued to engage in such misconduct. Said misconduct

1 by Defendants, in knowingly or recklessly creating said substantial risk and high probability of
2 injury or death to members of the public, was oppressive, despicable, highly reprehensible and
3 done in the conscious disregard for the rights and safety of the public, including Decedent
4 DONATELLI.

5 60. The above-mentioned acts and omissions were authorized and/or ratified by
6 managerial employees of Defendants CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, DISCOVERY,
7 DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 2 through 100, inclusive, and each
8 of them, and were carried out with the consent of their officers, directors, and/or managing agents.

9 61. Because the acts and/or omissions of Defendants GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC,
10 VAN NUYS, DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 2
11 through 100, inclusive, were committed in a malicious, unlawful, and/or unreasonable manner, as
12 fully set forth above, causing injury and damage to Decedent DONATELLI, and done with a
13 conscious disregard of the rights and safety of Decedent DONATELLI, Plaintiffs request the
14 assessment of punitive damages against Defendants GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS,
15 DISCOVERY, DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 2 through 100,
16 inclusive, in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them.

17
18 **PRAYER FOR DAMAGES**

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as
20 follows:

21 1. For general damages suffered by Plaintiffs including but not limited to loss of love,
22 affection, care, society, service, comfort, support, right to support, companionship, solace or moral
23 support, expectations of future support and counseling, other benefits and assistance of Decedent
24 MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI, which will be stated according to proof, and beyond the
25 jurisdictional minimum of this Court; in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court and which will
26 be established according to proof at trial;

27 2. For economic damages suffered by Plaintiffs including but not limited to loss of
28

1 earnings and loss of financial support from Decedent MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI,
2 property damage to THE ESTATE OF MICHAEL WILLIAM DONATELLI, according to proof;

3 3. For prejudgment interest, according to proof;

4 4. For punitive damages asserted by THE ESTATE OF MICHAEL WILLIAM
5 DONATELLI against Defendants GIBBS, CROSSBOW, ORBIC, VAN NUYS, DISCOVERY,
6 DISCOVERY TALENT, EYEWORKS, BONGO, and DOES 1 through 100, according to proof;

7 5. For applicable costs and fees;

8 6. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

9
10 DATED: August 21, 2013

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP

11
12
13 By: 

Brian J. Panish

Kevin R. Boyle

Patrick K. Gunning

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs hereby request trial by jury for all causes of action and forms of relief requested.

DATED: August 27, 2013

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP

By: _____

Brian J. Panish

Kevin R. Boyle

Patrick K. Gunning

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP

11111 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 700

Los Angeles, California 90025

310.477.1700 phone • 310.477.1699 fax

8/27/2013

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Patrick K. Gunning, SBN 280457 Panish Shea & Boyle, LLP 11111 Santa Monica Boulevard Suite 700 Los Angeles, CA 90025 TELEPHONE NO.: 310.477.1700 FAX NO.: 310.477.1699 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs		FOR COURT USE ONLY FILED Los Angeles Superior Court AUG 28 2013 John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk By <u>SHAUNYA WESLEY</u> Deputy	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. HILL STREET MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: LOS ANGELES, CA 90012 BRANCH NAME: CENTRAL		CASE NUMBER: DC519842 JUDGE: DEPT:	
CASE NAME: Grisel Donatelli, et al. vs. Orbic Air, LLC, et al.			
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000) <input type="checkbox"/> Limited (Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)		Complex Case Designation <input type="checkbox"/> Counter <input type="checkbox"/> Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	

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

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

Auto Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Auto (22) <input type="checkbox"/> Uninsured motorist (46) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Asbestos (04) <input type="checkbox"/> Product liability (24) <input type="checkbox"/> Medical malpractice (45) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other PI/PD/WD (23) Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Business tort/unfair business practice (07) <input type="checkbox"/> Civil rights (08) <input type="checkbox"/> Defamation (13) <input type="checkbox"/> Fraud (16) <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property (19) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional negligence (25) <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful termination (36) <input type="checkbox"/> Other employment (15)	Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Breach of contract/warranty (05) <input type="checkbox"/> Rule 3.740 collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Other collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage (18) <input type="checkbox"/> Other contract (37) Real Property <input type="checkbox"/> Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14) <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful eviction (33) <input type="checkbox"/> Other real property (26) Unlawful Detainer <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (31) <input type="checkbox"/> Residential (32) <input type="checkbox"/> Drugs (38) Judicial Review <input type="checkbox"/> Asset forfeiture (05) <input type="checkbox"/> Petition re: arbitration award (11) <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of mandate (02) <input type="checkbox"/> Other judicial review (39)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403) <input type="checkbox"/> Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) <input type="checkbox"/> Construction defect (10) <input type="checkbox"/> Mass tort (40) <input type="checkbox"/> Securities litigation (28) <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/Toxic tort (30) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41) Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of judgment (20) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint <input type="checkbox"/> RICO (27) <input type="checkbox"/> Other complaint (not specified above) (42) Miscellaneous Civil Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership and corporate governance (21) <input type="checkbox"/> Other petition (not specified above) (43)
---	--	---

2. This case ☐ is ☒ is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:
- | | |
|--|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of separately represented parties | d. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of witnesses |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve | e. <input type="checkbox"/> Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court |
| c. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial amount of documentary evidence | f. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial postjudgment 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): Three (3)

5. This case ☐ is ☒ is not a class action suit.

6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)

Date: August 27, 2013

Patrick K. Gunning, SBN 280457

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY

NOTICE

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

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

CM-010

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the **primary** cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

Auto Tort

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

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

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

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business Practice (07)
Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) *(not civil harassment)* (08)
Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13)
Fraud (16)
Intellectual Property (19)
Professional Negligence (25)
Legal Malpractice
Other Professional Malpractice *(not medical or legal)*
Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)
Employment
Wrongful Termination (36)
Other Employment (15)

Contract

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

Real Property

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

Unlawful Detainer

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

Judicial Review

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

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400–3.403)

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

Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20)
Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)
Confession of Judgment *(non-domestic relations)*
Sister State Judgment
Administrative Agency Award *(not unpaid taxes)*
Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes
Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

RICO (27)
Other Complaint *(not specified above)* (42)
Declaratory Relief Only
Injunctive Relief Only *(non-harassment)*
Mechanics Lien
Other Commercial Complaint Case *(non-tort/non-complex)*
Other Civil Complaint *(non-tort/non-complex)*

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

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

ORIGINAL

SHORT TITLE: Grisel Donatelli, et al. vs. Orbic Air, LLC, et al.

CASE NUMBER

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

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

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

JURY TRIAL? ☒ YES CLASS ACTION? ☐ YES LIMITED CASE? ☐ YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 15 ☐ HOURS/ ☒ DAYS

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

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

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

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

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

- Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district.
- May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).
- Location where cause of action arose.
- Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.
- Location where performance required or defendant resides.
- Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.
- Location where petitioner resides.
- Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
- Location where one or more of the parties reside.
- Location of Labor Commissioner Office.

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

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	<input type="checkbox"/> A6070 Asbestos Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
	Product Liability (24)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons <input type="checkbox"/> A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	<input type="checkbox"/> A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) <input type="checkbox"/> A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)	1., 4. 1., 4.
		<input type="checkbox"/> A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 3. 1. (4)

SHORT TITLE: Grisel Donatelli, et al. vs. Orbic Air, LLC, et al.

CASE NUMBER

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

SHORT TITLE: Grisel Donatelli, et al. vs. Orbic Air, LLC, et al.

CASE NUMBER

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

SHORT TITLE: Grisel Donatelli, et al. vs. Orbic Air, LLC, et al.

CASE NUMBER

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

REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.		ADDRESS: 5700 Soledad Canyon Road	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 7. <input type="checkbox"/> 8. <input type="checkbox"/> 9. <input type="checkbox"/> 10.			
CITY: Acton	STATE: CA	ZIP CODE:	

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

Dated: August 27, 2013

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

Patrick K. Gunning

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

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