R. MICHAEL LIEBERMAN (SBN 120831) **ELECTRONICALLY** 1 LAW OFFICES OF R. MICHAEL LIEBERMAN FILED 1398 POST STREET Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94109 07/19/2024 3 TELEPHONE: (415) 929-3197 Clerk of the Court FAX: (415) 929-3476 **BY: JAMES XIONG** 4 **Deputy Clerk** Attorneys for Plaintiffs 5 **IOVAN THOMAS** 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT - STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - UNLIMITED JURISDICTION 9 JOVAN THOMAS, an individual; NO. CGC-24-616608 10 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR 11 INVASION OF PRIVACY BY PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE VS 12 INVASION OF PRIVACY BY PUBLICITY CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO. PLACING PERSON IN FALSE LIGHT IN 13 a Municipal Corporation; OFFICE OF PUBLIC EYE, BREACH OF IMPLIED 14 THE SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND ATTORNEY, a Municipal Entity of Form FAIR DEALING. DEFAMATION. 15 Unknown: SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT VIOLATION LABOR OF CODE ATTORNEY **BROOKE** IENKINS. SECTION 1050. NEGLIGENCE, 16 individual; RICHARD NG, an individual: INTENTIONAL OR RECKLESS 17 RANDY OUEZADA, an individual: and INFLICTION OF SEVERE EMOTIONAL DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, DISTRESS, FRAUD AND **DECEIT** 18 (INTENTIONAL OR RECKLESS OR 19 Defendants. NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION OR SUPPRESSION OF FACT), FRAUD AND 20 DECEIT (PROMISE MADE WITHOUT INTENTION TO PERFORM). 21 INTENTIONAL OR RECKLESS 22 NEGLIGENT INTERFERENCE WITH PROTECTED PROPERTY INTERESTS. 23 **ECONOMIC** RELATIONSHIPS, CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS AND 24 **PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC** 25 ADVANTAGE. CONSPIRACY AND DECLARATORY RELIEF 26 27 [JURY TRIAL DEMANDED] 28 - 1 -COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR INVASION OF PRIVACY

Plaintiff JOVAN THOMAS brings this civil action against the above-named defendants, and each of them, demands trial by jury and complains and alleges as follows:

#### THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff JOVAN THOMAS ("THOMAS") is an individual whose residence and principal place of business is in the State of California.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all material times defendant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ("CCSF"), is a municipal corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the State of California in San Francisco County.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all material times defendant OFFICE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT ATTORNEY ("SFDA"), is a municipal entity of form unknown organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the State of California in San Francisco County.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all material times defendant BROOKE JENKINS ("JENKINS") is an individual who was employed as the San Francisco District Attorney and employed by defendants CCSF and SFDA who works and resides in the State of California in San Francisco County.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all material times defendant RANDY QUEZADA ("QUEZADA") is an individual who was employed as the San Francisco District Attorney and employed by defendants CCSF and SFDA who works and resides in the State of California in San Francisco County.

- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all material times defendant RICHARD NG ("NG") is an individual who was employed as the San Francisco District Attorney and employed by defendants CCSF and SFDA who works and resides in the State of California in San Francisco County.
- 7. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of the individuals sued herein as DOES ("DOES") 1 through 50, inclusive. Plaintiff, therefore, sues these defendants by these fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of these fictitiously named defendants are responsible in some manner for the acts, omissions and occurrences herein alleged and that plaintiff's losses as herein alleged were proximately caused by such acts, omissions and occurrences. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named defendants when ascertained.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all material times, DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, control defendant SFDA and exercise substantial authority in devising and implementing personnel policies at defendant SFDA. Any reference to defendant SFDA in this Complaint includes DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, as well.
- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all material times, DOES 11 through 29, inclusive, were employed by defendants CCSF and SFDA.
- 10. At all material times, defendants acted by and through their officers, agents and employees, including the defendants fictitiously named herein, each of whom was acting within the purpose and scope of his or her agency or employment and whose acts, omissions and conduct alleged herein were known to, authorized by and ratified by defendants.

- 11. At all material times, defendants, and each of them, acted as the agents of one another in the acts, omissions and occurrences herein alleged.
- 12. The acts, omissions, conduct, contracts, promises and violations of the law herein alleged were done, made, performed or to be performed in substantial part in the County of San Francisco, State of California.

#### THE FACTS

- 13. Plaintiff is a fifty-six-year-old African American man.
- 14. In or about March of 2015, plaintiff was hired by defendants CCSF and SFDA as a Victim Witness Advocate.
- 15. Plaintiff's work for defendants CCSF and SFDA as Victim Witness Advocate was excellent and acknowledged to be excellent by defendants.
- 16. On or about January 26, 2024, plaintiff, who is straight, was texting with a straight, male, long-time personal friend and fraternity brother who was in New Zealand to bury his father. Hoping to cheer up his friend, who was distraught and grieving the death of his father, plaintiff intended to text his friend a jokey question of the sort that that plaintiff had sent his friend on occasion in the past in order to cheer him up namely, "what color are your panties?" Plaintiff's text to his friend was a whimsical question that was part of plaintiff's standard jocular repertoire with his friend. In the context of their long-time friendship, plaintiff's flip question had no sexual, off-color, obscene, misogynistic or sexist meaning or intent. Rather, it was a goofy, non-sequitur by one long-time friend to another friend intended to try to divert and cheer him up while he was going through a difficult and upsetting experience. Plaintiff's text was not an actual inquiry about

the color of his friend's panties, as plaintiff was aware that his friend was a straight male who did not wear panties. It was a silly joke intended to cheer up his friend.

- 17. Unfortunately, just as plaintiff was about to send his playful text to his friend, plaintiff received an email from defendant JENKINS. Defendant Jenkins' email was a calendar invitation to an anti-discrimination meeting relating to the 1998 torture and murder of Matthew Shepard sent to the entire staff of defendant SFDA.
- 18. Instead of texting his playful question to his friend, plaintiff accidentally emailed it ("plaintiff's Email") to defendant JENKINS. More unfortunate still, plaintiff pressed "reply all," so that plaintiff's Email was sent, not just to defendant JENKINS, but to the entire staff of defendant SFDA.
- 19. Plaintiff immediately told the staff at defendant SFDA and defendant JENKINS that had received plaintiff's Email that he had intended to text his lighthearted question to a grieving male friend and, instead, accidentally emailed it in response to defendant JENKINS' email that he had just received. Plaintiff immediately apologized for his mistake.
- 20. It was immediately obvious to defendant JENKINS and everyone else at defendant SFDA who had received plaintiff's Email: that plaintiff had sent it inadvertently; that he had not intended to email his boss, the District Attorney, asking her what color panties she was wearing; that plaintiff's Email was not sexual, off-color, obscene, misogynistic, workplace harassment or sexist in meaning or intent. Absolutely no one who received plaintiff's Email could reasonably have believed that plaintiff had actually inquired of his boss, the District Attorney of San Francisco, what color panties she was wearing, either seriously or as a joke, much less in an email sent to the entire staff at defendant SFDA. This is particularly the case given the sensitive nature of the work that plaintiff did at defendant SFDA.

- 21. Defendant JENKINS immediately informed everyone at defendant SFDA who had received plaintiff's Email that plaintiff's Email was to remain confidential within defendant SFDA and ordered that no one disclose plaintiff's Email to anyone.
- 22. Immediately after plaintiff accidentally sent his email, Chief Assistant District Attorney Ana Gonzalez sent an email to the staff at defendant SFDA informing them that the matter was being handled by the administration and ordering the staff to delete plaintiff's Email and not share it.
- 23. Later in the day on January 26, 2024, plaintiff was told by defendant RICHARD NG ("NG"), Director of Human Resources at defendant SFDA, that plaintiff was being laid off by defendants CCSF and SFDA, though not terminated for cause. Defendant NG told plaintiff that there would be no disciplinary action attached to plaintiff's lay-off and that plaintiff would be entitled to re-apply for work for defendants CCSF and SFDA. Defendant NG thereafter sent plaintiff documentation of plaintiff's lay-off that confirmed that plaintiff had been laid off, not terminated for cause. Later that day, plaintiff received paperwork from defendant NG saying that he had been laid off rather than terminated for cause.
- 24. On January 26, 2024, plaintiff received an email from defendant JENKINS telling him he was being "released from [his] exempt appointment as an 8129 Victim/ Witness Investigator I with the San Francisco District Attorney's Office."
- 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, after his termination, defendants, including, but not limited to defendant JENKINS, made false, fraudulent, malicious and humiliating statements about plaintiff to the press and others.

- 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, within minutes of plaintiff's Email, defendants contacted members of the press and told them about plaintiff's Email.
- 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants also told members of the press that plaintiff had a history of workplace sexual harassment at the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, referring to a lawsuit filed by Jane Doe a number of years earlier.
- 28. What followed was a deluge of print and electronic press and other postings and commentary about plaintiff's Email ("the Press Response") and the Jane Doe case.
- 29. In response to the Press Response, defendants did not explain to the press that plaintiff's Email was a wacky email that plaintiff intended to send to a friend that was accidentally sent to defendants.
- 30. Rather, defendants told the press that "[Plaintiff's] misogynistic behavior violates [defendant SFDA's] code of conduct and [plaintiff] has been terminated. The District Attorney's Office is committed to maintaining a professional office environment where all staff members are treated with dignity and respect and not subject to harassment or a hostile work environment."
- 31. Nor did defendants explain to the press that the Jane Doe case was meritless and that there was no evidence that plaintiff had engaged in sexual harassment in the workplace or elsewhere in connection with Jane Doe or any other person.

32. Rather, plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants told or implied to the press that plaintiff's Email and the Jane Doe case were all part of an ongoing history of workplace sexual harassment and misogyny by plaintiff, all of which was the reason that defendants terminated plaintiff's employment.

- 33. On or about February 2, 2024, plaintiff received paperwork from defendant NG saying that he had been terminated for cause, directly contradicting defendant NG's prior written and oral representations to plaintiff.
- 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants changed his termination paperwork to state that plaintiff was terminated for cause rather than laid off in order to validate the false statements outlined above that defendants had made to the press about plaintiff, his employment and the reason he was terminated.
- 35. Defendants continued to maintain their false narrative about plaintiff in response to plaintiff's claim for unemployment benefits.
- 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants planned to and have maintained their false narrative about plaintiff in response to inquiries about plaintiff from potential future employers.
- 37. Defendant's conduct was a tortious violation of plaintiff's rights and privacy, constituted defamation and caused plaintiff tremendous economic damages and emotional distress.
- 38. On or about March 6, 2024, plaintiff filed a Claim ("plaintiff's Claim") against defendants CCSF, SFDA, JENKINS, NG, QUEZADA and other employees and agents of the foregoing regarding the termination of plaintiff and the

1	45. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the damage allegations,										
2	below, as though fully set forth herein.										
3	***										
4	II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION										
5	INVASION OF PRIVACY BY PUBLICITY PLACING PERSON										
6	IN FALSE LIGHT IN PUBLIC EYE										
7	(By plaintiff against all defendants)										
8											
9	46. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained i										
0	the Paragraphs, above, as though fully set forth herein.										
1											
2	47. On or about January 26, 2024, and continuing to date, defendants, knowingly and without plaintiff's prior valid consent, invaded plaintiff's right to										
3											
4	privacy by the above-described disclosures.										
5	48. The disclosures by defendants created publicity in the sense of a										
6	48. The disclosures by defendants created publicity in the sense of a public disclosure to a large number of people.										
7											
8	49. The publicity created by defendants placed plaintiffs in a false light in										
9	the public eye in that the disclosures contained false statements and inaccuracies										
20	which incorrectly portrayed plaintiff (a) as having intentionally asked defendant										
21	JENKINS "what color are your panties?", (b) as misogynistic, (c) as sexist, (d) as										
22	having engaged in repeated workplace sexual harassment and (e) as creating a										
23	hostile workplace environment.										
24	50. The publicity appared by defendants was effective and chiestianship to										
25	50. The publicity created by defendants was offensive and objectionable to plaintiff and to a reasonable person of ordinary sensibilities in that it made plaintiff the object of obloquy and ridicule.										
26											
27											
28											
	- 10 -										

63. The statements set forth above were published with express and implied malice on the part of all defendants and each of them with design and intent to injure plaintiff in his good name, reputation and employment. Such defendants' express and implied malice supports plaintiff's demand for punitive damages, below, for defendants' defamation.

64. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the damage allegations contained in the Paragraphs below as though fully set forth herein.

V.

# FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE SECTION 1050 (By plaintiff against all defendants)

65. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in the Paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

66. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the foregoing conduct violated California Labor Code §1050 in that defendants, and each of them, individually and through their officers, directors, partners, agents and/or employees acting at least in part within the scope of their employment, prevented and/or attempted to prevent plaintiff from obtaining subsequent employment by the misrepresentations set forth above. In fact, plaintiff was at all material times, a hard-working, competent, diligent employee who (a) had not intentionally asked defendant JENKINS "what color are your panties?," (b) had not engaged in misogynistic behavior, (c) had not engaged in sexist behavior, (d) had not engaged in repeated workplace sexual harassment and (e) had not created a hostile workplace environment. Plaintiff, thus, is entitled to treble his damages proximately caused by defendants' misrepresentations, pursuant to California Labor Code Section 1054.

77. Defendants were in a position of power over plaintiff, with the potential to abuse that power. Plaintiff was in a vulnerable position because of his relative lack of power, because of his reliance on defendants' assurances and forbearance of the possibility of becoming employed elsewhere, because he had placed his trust in defendants, because he depended on his employment for his self-esteem and sense of belonging, because he relied upon his employment as a source of income for his support, and because of the great disparity in bargaining power between plaintiff and his employer. Defendants were aware of plaintiff's vulnerability and the reasons for it.

- 78. On or about January 26, 2024, and continuing to date, defendants performed the acts, omissions and statement described above.
- 79. Defendants' acts, omissions and statements were not a personnel management decision made by qualified, serious or conscientious owners or managers. Defendants' acts, omissions and statement were wildly improper, baseless, mean-spirited and flip.
- 80. Defendants' acts, omissions and statements and the manner in which they were done were outrageous. Further, after nearly ten (10) years of loyal and dedicated service to defendants CCSF and SFCA, defendants acted in a fraudulent, false and sham manner. Defendants intentionally tried to humiliate and degrade plaintiff so that he would not complain about their acts, omissions and statements, leaving plaintiff without his employment and without the income, sense of self-worth and security which he derived from his employment and which defendants knew that he derived from his employment.
- 81. Acting (a) outrageously and with the intention of inflicting severe emotional distress on plaintiff or (b) recklessly, defendants performed the acts, omissions or conduct alleged herein.

	82.	Plai	ntiff suffered	severe emot	tional dist	ress, suffe	ring	g and anguish	i as a		
legal	result	of	defendants'	outrageous	conduct,	reacting	to	defendants'	acts		
omissions and statement with humiliation, embarrassment, anger, disappointmen											
and worry, all of which is substantial and enduring.											

- 83. Defendants, and each of them, did the things alleged herein, (a) knowing the information specified in the paragraphs, above; (b) knowing that they had the above-described duties to plaintiff; (c) without conducting any reasonable investigation concerning their obligations to plaintiff; (d) without good and sufficient cause; (e) for extraneous reasons; (f) for the purpose of frustrating plaintiff's enjoyment of plaintiff's rights; (g) knowing that defendants were in a superior position, both financially and because plaintiff was especially vulnerable; and (h) knowing that their acts and omissions would impose upon plaintiff grievous financial, bodily and mental harm, pain and anguish.
- 84. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the damage allegations below as though fully set forth herein.

#### VIII.

#### EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## FRAUD AND DECEIT (INTENTIONAL OR RECKLESS OR NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION OR SUPPRESSION OF FACT)

(By plaintiff against all defendants)

- 85. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the allegations above as though fully set forth herein.
- 86. On or about January 26, 2024, defendants represented to plaintiff (a) that plaintiff's Email would be kept confidential within defendant SFDA; (b) that

plaintiff's Email would not be disclosed or shared to anyone outside of defendant SFDA; (c) that plaintiff's Email would be deleted by everyone at defendant SFDA who had received it; (d) that as a result of his having inadvertently sent plaintiff's Email, plaintiff was being laid off by defendants CCSF and SFDA and not terminated for cause; and (e) that plaintiff was eligible to re-apply for work with defendants CCSF and SFDA ("Defendants' Representations").

- 87. Defendants' Representations regarded facts that materially affected plaintiff's employment with defendants CCSF and SFDA and how plaintiff responded to the termination of his employment and induced plaintiff, and justifiably so.
- 88. At all material times, Defendants' Representations were and defendants knew, should have known or had no reasonable grounds for not knowing that Defendants' Representations were (a) false and (b) made with the intent and for the purpose of inducing plaintiff respond as he did to the termination of his employment.
- 89. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon allege that the actual facts were that, at the time Defendants' Representations were made, Defendants' Representations were false. Defendants suppressed the actual facts.
- 90. At all material times, plaintiff believed Defendants' Representations to be true.
- 91. At all material times, defendants knew or should have known plaintiff believed Defendants' Representations to be true.

#### TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## INTENTIONAL OR RECKLESS OR NEGLIGENT INTERFERENCE WITH PROTECTED PROPERTY INTERESTS, ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIPS, CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS AND PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE

(By plaintiff against all defendants)

105. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations above as though fully set forth herein.

106. At all material times and in performing the acts, omissions and conduct alleged herein, defendants knew or should have known that plaintiff had numerous contractual and other economic relationships arising as a result of plaintiff's profession, trade or business.

107. Defendants willfully, wantonly, maliciously, oppressively and fraudulently acted and omitted to act as alleged above. By the foregoing acts and omissions, defendants intentionally or recklessly or negligently interfered with the above-mentioned contractual and other economic relationships between plaintiff and such third parties and with such protected property interest. Defendants did so with the intent to cause plaintiff grievous financial, bodily and mental damages, harm, pain and anguish. Defendants' acts were intended to and did directly affect plaintiff's profession, trade or business. It was foreseeable that the acts complained of would injure plaintiff. Plaintiff have clearly suffered injury. There was a direct or close connection between defendants' conduct and the injury suffered. There is a high degree of moral blame to defendants' conduct. Public policy supports the finding of a duty of care in this case.

108. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the damage allegations below as though fully set forth herein.

### ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION CONSPIRACY

(By plaintiff against all defendants)

- 109. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in the Paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 110. Commencing on or about January 26, 2024, defendants, and each of them, knowingly and willfully conspired and agreed among themselves to damage plaintiff emotionally and financially by committing the above-alleged acts constituting the above-mentioned causes of action ("Defendants' Conspiracy").
- 111. Pursuant to Defendants' Conspiracy, and in furtherance thereof, defendants acted as herein alleged.
- 112. As a proximate result of defendants' wrongful acts and omissions herein alleged pursuant to Defendants' Conspiracy, defendants, knowing of and participating in Defendants' Conspiracy herein alleged, did wrongfully act as herein alleged.
- 113. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the damage allegations, below, as though fully set forth herein.

7

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

### TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION DECLARATORY RELIEF

(By Plaintiff Against all Defendants)

- 114. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in the Paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 115. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendants concerning their respective rights and duties.
- 116. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of their rights and duties and a declaration as to which parties' contentions are correct.
- 117. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain his rights and duties.
- 118. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the damage allegations below as though fully set forth herein.

#### **DAMAGES**

119. As a direct and proximate result of the acts, omissions and conduct of defendants, and each of them, herein alleged, plaintiff has sustained substantial compensable losses, including, but not limited to: losses in earnings, bonuses, deferred compensation and other employment benefits; injuries to plaintiff's protected property interests; general damage to plaintiff's reputation; loss due to stigma; injury to plaintiff's property, business, trade, profession and occupation; the expenses plaintiff has incurred mitigating the conduct of defendants, and each of them; losses incurred seeking substitute employment and loss of earnings,

deferred compensation and other employment benefits; the attorneys' fees and other litigation expenses plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur in prosecuting this action; interest on the amount of losses incurred in earnings, deferred compensation and other employee benefits; the interest on borrowed money; the value of plaintiff's time in prosecuting this action; the travel expenses plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur in prosecuting this action; other economic losses; other incidental expenses; and other special and general damages. Plaintiff's substantial compensable losses are in amounts not fully ascertained, but are within the jurisdiction of this Court. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the exact amount of these damages has been ascertained, or on proof thereof.

- 120. As a direct and proximate result of the acts, omissions and conduct of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, embarrassment, mortification, indignity and humiliation and severe physical, mental and emotional distress and discomfort and irreparable injury to his business reputation, all to his detriment and damage in amounts not fully ascertained but within the jurisdiction of this Court, and for which plaintiff has been forced to seek personal, medical and related care and treatment and plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, expenses therefor. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the exact amount of these damages has been ascertained, or on proof thereof.
- 121. Plaintiff is entitled to treble his damages proximately caused by defendants' misrepresentations, pursuant to California Labor Code §1054.
- 122. Defendants, and each of them, did the things alleged herein, (a) knowing that the conduct they required of plaintiff was unlawful; (c) without conducting any reasonable investigation concerning their obligations; (d) without good and sufficient cause; (e) knowing that defendants were in a superior position,

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

2627

28

both financially and because plaintiff was especially vulnerable; (f) in the case of the individual defendants, pursuant to a joint design, scheme and conspiracy to injure plaintiff; and (g) knowing that their conduct would impose upon plaintiff grievous financial, bodily and mental harm, pain and anguish. Nevertheless, acting fraudulently, oppressively, maliciously and outrageously towards plaintiff, with conscious disregard for his known rights and with the intention of wrongfully interfering with his prospective economic advantage and property interests and of intentionally causing, or willfully disregarding the probability of causing, unjust and cruel hardship to him, defendants, and each of them, committed the acts and omissions herein alleged. In so doing, defendants, and each of them, intended to and did vex, injure and annoy plaintiff. After plaintiff has had the opportunity to inspect defendants' net worth, plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint to ask that defendants, and each of them, pay plaintiff punitive and exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to ensure that defendants, and each of them, will be deterred from similar conduct and as an example to deter others from disregarding the rights of similar plaintiffs.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

- A. That the Court adjudge and decree the rights, duties and liabilities of the parties;
- B. That the Court adjudge and decree that defendants, and each of them, pay plaintiff compensatory damages according to proof;
- C. That the Court adjudge and decree that defendants, and each of them, pay plaintiff special and general damages, according to proof;