

 <p style="text-align: center;">SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA County of Sacramento 720 Ninth Street, Room 102 Sacramento, CA 95814-1311</p>	<i>For Court Use Only</i>
PETITIONER/PLAINTIFF: Kelley O'Sullivan, Denis O'Sullivan, et al. RESPONDENT/DEFENDANT: Ghost Gunner Inc. et al.	
ORDER RE: DELAY IN SCHEDULING INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE	CASE NUMBER: 34-2021-00302934

The Court finds good cause to delay the scheduling of the initial Case Management Conference for this case given the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on court-wide operations. Among the affected operations is the Court's Case Management Program (CMP). The Court's CMP calendars have been and remain suspended until further notice. After the CMP Departments resume operations, the Court will schedule the initial Case Management Conference in this case and issue a Notice of Case Management Conference and Order to Appear.

The deadline for filing and service of the Case Management Conference Statements will be based upon the date for the initial Case Management Conference once it has been scheduled.

Parties shall continue to accomplish service of all parties named in the action.

Parties shall continue to ensure that all defendants and cross-defendants have answered, been dismissed, or had their defaults entered.

Plaintiff shall serve a copy of this order on any party to the complaint. The cross-complainant shall have the same obligation with respect to the cross-complaint

RICHARD K. SUEYOSHI

Dated: 6-17-21

Richard K. Sueyoshi, Judge of the Superior Court

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):
Robert J. Nelson (State Bar No. 2999217)
Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP
275 Battery Street, 29th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
TELEPHONE NO.: 415.956.1000 FAX NO. (Optional): 415.956.1008
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Kelley and Denis O'Sullivan

FOR COURT USE ONLY

FILED
Superior Court Of California,
Sacramento
06/17/2021
apenn
By _____, Deputy
Case Number:
34-2021-00302934

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Sacramento
STREET ADDRESS: 720 9th Street
MAILING ADDRESS: 720 9th Street
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Sacramento, CA 95814
BRANCH NAME: Civil

CASE NAME:
O'Sullivan v. Ghost Gunner Inc., et al.

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET
 Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000)
 Limited (Amount demanded is \$25,000)

Complex Case Designation
 Counter Joinder
Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)

CASE NUMBER:
JUDGE:
DEPT.:

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 (06) <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. Large number of separately represented parties
 - b. Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve
 - c. Substantial amount of documentary evidence
 - d. Large number of witnesses
 - e. Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
 - f. 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): 5
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: 6/17/21
Robert J. Nelson


(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.

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

SUMMONS

(CITACION JUDICIAL)

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

FILED
Superior Court Of California,
Sacramento
06/23/2021
apenn
By _____, Deputy
Case Number:
34-2021-00302934

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET; (Additional Parties Attachment form is attached)

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

KELLEY and DENIS O'SULLIVAN, in their Individual Capacity and KELLEY O'SULLIVAN as Administrator of the Estate of TARA O'SULLIVAN, Deceased

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Sup. Court of California- Sacramento
 720 9th Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814

CASE NUMBER: (Número del Caso):

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Robert J. Nelson LIEFF CABRASER, LLP, 275 Battery St. 29th Fl., San Francisco, CA 94111 (415)956-1000

DATE:

(Fecha)

JUN 23 2021

Clerk, by

(Secretario)

A. PENN

, Deputy

(Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. as an individual defendant.
2. as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3. on behalf of (specify):

under: <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.10 (corporation)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.60 (minor)
<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify):	
4. by personal delivery on (date):

SHORT TITLE: O'Sullivan, et al. v Ghost Gunner, Inc. et al.	CASE NUMBER:
--	--------------

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

- This form may be used as an attachment to any summons if space does not permit the listing of all parties on the summons.
 → If this attachment is used, insert the following statement in the plaintiff or defendant box on the summons: "Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

List additional parties (Check only one box. Use a separate page for each type of party.):

Plaintiff Defendant Cross-Complainant Cross-Defendant

BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP INC., d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM;

RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM;

GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM;

GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM;

JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM;

MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a 5DTACTICAL.COM;

TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80-LOWER.COM; AR-15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and 80LOWERJIG.COM;

JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a USPATRIOTARMORY.COM;

INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC., d/b/a AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM;

THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a THUNDERTACTICAL.COM;

POLYMER80, INC., d/b/a POLYMER80.COM and P80 TACTICAL;

JSD SUPPLY, d/b/a JSDSUPPLY.COM and 80PERCENTGUYS.COM;

JAMES MADISON TACTICAL LLC, d/b/a JAMESMADISONTACTICAL.COM;

WM. C. ANDERSON, INC., d/b/a ANDERSONMANUFACTURING.COM;

MATRIX ARMS, d/b/a MATRIXARMS.COM;

M-16 PARTS SUPPLY LLC, d/b/a M-16PARTS.COM; and

DOES 1-50,

Page _____ of _____

Page 1 of 1

SERVICE LIST

GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET
c/o Defense Distributed
1101 W 34th St. Ste 340
Austin, TX 78705

BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP INC., d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM
12272 Monarch St.
Garden Grove, CA 92841

RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM
c/o Alan Smith
13535 Pawnee Rd.
Apple Valley, CA 92308

GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM
c/o Kyle T. Martin
23470 Cambridge Rd.
Yorba Linda, CA 92887

GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM
c/o Seabreeze Corporate Services LLC
444 Seabreeze Blvd Suite 900
Daytona Beach, FL 32118

JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM
c/o Zackary Kasanjian-King
931 N. Parker St.
Orange, CA 92867

MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a 5DTACTICAL.COM
24 Asylum St.
Milford, MA 01757

TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80-LOWER.COM; AR-15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM;
and 80LOWERJIG.COM
11374 Falling Water Way
Fishers, IN, 46037

JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a USPATRIOTARMORY.COM
c/o James Tromblee
13631 Pawnee Rd, Ste 1
Apple Valley, CA 92308

INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC., d/b/a AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM
c/o Registered Agent Solutions, Inc.
300 W. Clarendon Ave. Ste 240
Phoenix, AZ 85013

THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a THUNDERTACTICAL.COM
501 Kingston Ave
Daytona Beach, FL 32114

POLYMER80, INC., d/b/a POLYMER80.COM and P80 TACTICAL
340 Freeport Blvd. #3, 4, 5
Sparks, NV, 89703

JSD SUPPLY, d/b/a JSDSUPPLY.COM and 80PERCENTGUYS.COM
c/o Jordan J. Vinroe
102 Patriot Lane
Butler, PA 16001

JAMES MADISON TACTICAL LLC, d/b/a JAMESMADISONTACTICAL.COM
c/o Amber Hanchette
1865 Bronco Lane
Richland, WA 99354-000

WM. C. ANDERSON, INC., d/b/a ANDERSONMANUFACTURING.COM
c/o Charles H. Anderson
1743 Anderson Blvd
Hebron, KY 41048

MATRIX ARMS, d/b/a MATRIXARMS.COM
75 Winter St.
Claremont, NH 03743

M-16 PARTS SUPPLY LLC, d/b/a M-16PARTS.COM
c/o Terry J Weisflog
155 NE 388th Ave
Old Town, FL 32680

DOES 1-50

BV FOX

1 Robert J. Nelson (State Bar No. 2999217)
2 Caitlin M. Nelson (State Bar No. 335601)
3 Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP
4 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
5 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
6 Telephone: 415.956.1000
7 Facsimile: 415.956.1008
8 rnelson@lchb.com
9 cnelson@lchb.com

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

Jonathan Lowy (*pro hac vice* pending)
Christa Nicols (*pro hac vice* pending)
Brady: United Against Gun Violence
840 First Street, NE Suite 400
Washington, DC 20002
Telephone: 202-370-8100
Facsimile: 202-898-8100
jlowy@bradyunited.org
cnicols@bradyunited.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

FILED
Superior Court of California,
Sacramento
05/17/2021
Deputy
Case Number:
34-2021-00302934

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

11 KELLEY and DENIS O’SULLIVAN, in
12 their Individual Capacity and KELLY
13 O’SULLIVAN as Administrator of the
14 Estate of TARA O’SULLIVAN, Deceased,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a
18 GHOSTGUNNER.NET;
19 BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING
20 GROUP INC., d/b/a
21 80PERCENTARMS.COM;
22 RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY,
23 d/b/a RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM;
24 GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a
25 GHOSTGUNS.COM;
26 GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID
27 DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM;
28 JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a
JTACTICAL.COM;
MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC,
d/b/a 5DTACTICAL.COM;
TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a
80-LOWER.COM; AR-
15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and
80LOWERJIG.COM;

COMPLAINT
(DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL)
CAUSES OF ACTION:
1. NEGLIGENCE
2. NEGLIGENCE PER SE
3. NEGLIGENT ENTRUSTMENT
4. PUBLIC NUISANCE
5. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTIONS 17200, ET SEQ. (UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL BUSINESS PRACTICES)

1 JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a
2 USPATRIOTARMORY.COM;
3 INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC., d/b/a
4 AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.
COM;
5 THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a
6 THUNDERTACTICAL.COM;
7 POLYMER80, INC., d/b/a
8 POLYMER80.COM and P80 TACTICAL;
9 JSD SUPPLY, d/b/a JSDSUPPLY.COM
10 and 80PERCENTGUYS.COM;
11 JAMES MADISON TACTICAL LLC,
12 d/b/a
13 JAMESMADISONTACTICAL.COM;
14 WM. C. ANDERSON, INC., d/b/a
15 ANDERSONMANUFACTURING.COM;
16 MATRIX ARMS, d/b/a
17 MATRIXARMS.COM;
18 M-16 PARTS SUPPLY LLC, d/b/a M-
19 16PARTS.COM; and
20 DOES 1-50,
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Defendants.

COMPLAINT

1. COME NOW PLAINTIFFS KELLEY AND DENIS O’SULLIVAN, in their Individual Capacity and KELLY O’SULLIVAN as Administrator of the Estate of TARA O’SULLIVAN (“O’SULLIVAN” or “OFFICER O’SULLIVAN”), Deceased, by and through their attorneys of record (“PLAINTIFFS”), and allege the following against DEFENDANTS GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET; BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP INC., d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM; RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM; GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM; GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM; JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM; MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a

1 5DTACTICAL.COM; TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80-LOWER.COM, AR-
2 15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM, and 80LOWERJIG.COM; JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a
3 USPATRIOTARMORY.COM; INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC., d/b/a
4 AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM; THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a
5 THUNDERTACTICAL.COM; POLYMER80, INC., d/b/a POLYMER80.COM and P80
6 TACTICAL; JSD SUPPLY, d/b/a JSDSUPPLY.COM and 80PERCENTGUYS.COM; JAMES
7 MADISON TACTICAL LLC, d/b/a JAMESMADISONTACTICAL.COM; WM. C.
8 ANDERSON, INC., d/b/a ANDERSONMANUFACTURING.COM; MATRIX ARMS, d/b/a
9 MATRIXARMS.COM; M-16 PARTS SUPPLY LLC, d/b/a M-16PARTS.COM; and DOES 1–50
10 (“DEFENDANTS”).

11 **INTRODUCTION**

12 1. DEFENDANTS are companies that have chosen to intentionally undermine
13 federal and state firearms laws by designing, manufacturing, marketing, distributing and/or
14 selling kits and/or parts that are easily assembled by the purchaser into fully functional weapons,
15 including AR-15 style assault weapons, to consumers across the nation, including within the State
16 of California. DEFENDANTS have chosen to engage in this business primarily through online
17 sales that enable purchasers to acquire such weapons without a background check or any
18 interaction with an authorized Federal Firearms Licensee (“FFL”) and in violation of state laws
19 prohibiting assault weapons, including in the State of California.

20 2. The weapons assembled from DEFENDANTS’ kits and/or parts are termed “ghost
21 guns.” This name reflects the fact that such weapons generally lack a serial number, and are
22 difficult—if not impossible—for law enforcement to trace back to their manufacturer and/or
23 seller when recovered from a crime scene.

24 3. DEFENDANTS knew when they entered this business that they would be
25 supplying firearms to those who would not be allowed to purchase firearms from an FFL,
26 including criminals, violent persons, and other individuals whose possession of firearms pose an
27 unacceptably high threat of injury or death to members of the public.
28

1 4. DEFENDANTS further knew that selling these kits and/or parts violated state and
2 federal statutes regarding the registration, ownership, sale, and marketing of firearms.

3 5. DEFENDANTS failed to use reasonable safety measures that could have limited
4 the risk of their products falling into the hands of such dangerous individuals.

5 6. Instead, DEFENDANTS targeted their business toward precisely such individuals
6 by intentionally emphasizing features of their products that make them attractive to such
7 individuals as major selling points. For example, DEFENDANTS intentionally emphasized that
8 their products can be used to assemble untraceable weapons, and enable purchasers to evade
9 background checks and interaction with a FFL.

10 7. DEFENDANTS chose profits over people and public safety, and launched and
11 maintained their businesses in the unreasonably dangerous manner described herein.

12 8. Since DEFENDANTS launched their “ghost guns” businesses, they have learned
13 with certainty that their firearms are a massive and growing source of the crime guns that are
14 claiming innocent lives in California and elsewhere.

15 9. DEFENDANTS could have changed their business practices to employ reasonable
16 safety measures to minimize the damage their products cause. Instead, DEFENDANTS have
17 doubled down on their despicable, willful, wanton, and malicious conduct. By doing so,
18 DEFENDANTS have and are acting with a conscious disregard to a known and obvious risk that
19 threatens the life and safety of others.

20 10. Upon information and belief, all DEFENDANTS designed, advertised, marketed,
21 sold, distributed, and/or offered, one or more “ghost gun” kits and/or parts that could be easily
22 assembled into un-serialized high-powered “ghost gun” rifles.

23 11. PLAINTIFFS bring this suit because their beloved daughter TARA O’SULLIVAN
24 was killed as a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of DEFENDANTS’ despicable, willful,
25 wanton, and malicious conduct.

26 12. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS’ 26-year-old daughter, Sacramento Police Officer
27 TARA O’SULLIVAN, was killed while on duty by one or more “ghost guns” wielded by a
28 dangerous Sacramento resident, ADEL SAMBRANO RAMOS (“RAMOS”). RAMOS’ criminal

1 record for domestic violence and active warrant at the time of the shooting likely would have
2 barred him from legally purchasing a firearm in California, and his status as a California resident
3 would have barred him from legally purchasing an assault weapon. Nevertheless, one or more
4 DEFENDANTS sold “ghost gun” kits and/or parts to RAMOS prior to June 19, 2019, and
5 RAMOS used DEFENDANTS’ products to assemble at least three unserialized automatic
6 machine guns and three unserialized semi-automatic assault rifles.

7 13. On June 19, 2019, Sacramento Police, including OFFICER O’SULLIVAN,
8 responded to a domestic disturbance call at a residence in Sacramento, California. As OFFICER
9 O’SULLIVAN was helping a woman safely remove belongings from the residence, RAMOS
10 opened fire, hitting OFFICER O’SULLIVAN and forcing the other police officers to retreat. For
11 nearly an hour, shots continued to fall around OFFICER O’SULLIVAN as she lay injured at the
12 scene, awaiting rescue from her fellow police officers who were held at bay and unable to assist
13 her because of the ongoing and persistent “ghost gun” fire. OFFICER O’SULLIVAN, who had
14 long dreamed of serving the people of Sacramento as a peace officer, died later that evening, less
15 than one year after her graduation from the police academy.

16 14. DEFENDANTS, upon information and belief, continue to offer “ghost gun”
17 products to California residents using marketing strategies and business practices that are
18 identical or essentially the same as those used during and before OFFICER O’SULLIVAN’S
19 death in June 2019.

20 15. PLAINTIFFS now seek to hold DEFENDANTS accountable for their reckless
21 business practices, in the memory of their beloved daughter and to prevent further loss of life.

22 16. PLAINTIFFS will make all reasonable efforts through discovery and use of
23 experts to make a good faith determination as to which of DEFENDANTS’ “ghost gun” products
24 killed TARA O’SULLIVAN. However, if it is not possible to make such a determination,
25 PLAINTIFFS respectfully request that in the event that they prove that one or more
26 DEFENDANTS manufactured and/or sold the “ghost gun” kits and/or parts that killed TARA
27 O’SULLIVAN, but cannot prove which Defendants’ product(s) caused this harm, the court award
28 damages consistent with each DEFENDANT’S market share at the time of the shooting. On

1 information and belief, DEFENDANTS together comprise a substantial share of the national
2 “ghost gun” market.

3 17. PLAINTIFFS’ claims are timely brought. In response to the ongoing pandemic,
4 the Judicial Council of California issued Emergency Rule 9, which provides: “Notwithstanding
5 any other law, the statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days
6 are tolled from April 6, 2020, until October 1, 2020.” Each cause of action asserted by
7 PLAINTIFFS has a statute of limitation in excess of 180 days, such that all counts in this
8 Complaint are tolled for approximately six months pursuant to the Rule. Even without these
9 additional 180 days, this suit is brought within all applicable statutes of limitation.

10 **JURISDICTION**

11 18. This is a civil action for negligence, public nuisance, and violations of the
12 California Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*). This Court has
13 subject matter jurisdiction over this action as the amount of the claims exceeds \$25,000.00.

14 19. Venue is proper in this court because TARA O’SULLIVAN was killed by
15 RAMOS using DEFENDANTS’ products while she was on duty in Sacramento County,
16 California.

17 20. PLAINTIFFS seek an award of compensatory damages, as well as punitive
18 damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 3294, statutory damages pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof.
19 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, injunctive and declaratory relief, costs and expenses, and reasonable
20 attorney’s fees under Cal. Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

21 **PARTIES**

22 21. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFFS KELLEY AND DENIS
23 O’SULLIVAN were residents of Martinez, California. PLAINTIFFS are the surviving parents of
24 TARA O’SULLIVAN, deceased. PLAINTIFFS KELLEY AND DENIS O’SULLIVAN bring
25 this action in their individual capacity, and PLAINTIFF KELLEY O’SULLIVAN brings this
26 action as Administrator of the Estate of TARA O’SULLIVAN. TARA O’SULLIVAN lived in
27 Sacramento, California at the time of her death.
28

1 22. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT GHOST GUNNER INC. (“GHOST
2 GUNNER”), d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET, was a Texas corporation with its principal place of
3 business in Austin, Texas. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST GUNNER was engaged in the
4 business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms
5 parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles to consumers
6 across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California. GHOST GUNNER’s
7 registered agent is a Texas company named DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED. DEFENSE
8 DISTRIBUTED and GHOST GUNNER (“DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST GUNNER”)
9 should be viewed as interchangeable and inextricably linked for purposes of this Complaint.
10 Upon information and belief, the same individual, Cody Wilson, was involved with running both
11 entities. DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED’s website still links to GHOST GUNNER. *See*
12 <https://defdist.org/>.

13 23. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT BLACKHAWK
14 MANUFACTURING GROUP INC. (“BLACKHAWK”), d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM, was a
15 California domestic corporation, with its principal place of business in Garden Grove, California.
16 At all times pertinent hereto, BLACKHAWK was engaged in the business of designing,
17 marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble
18 “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including
19 to consumers within the State of California.

20 24. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANTS RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB
21 BEEZLEY have maintained addresses in Apple Valley, California and were doing business as
22 RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM. At all times pertinent hereto, RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM
23 has maintained a business address in Apple Valley, California. At all times pertinent hereto,
24 RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM was engaged in the business of designing, marketing,
25 distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost
26 guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to
27 consumers within the State of California.
28

1 25. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT GHOST AMERICA LLC (“GHOST
2 AMERICA”), d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM, was a California limited liability company with its
3 principal place of business in Yorba Linda, California. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST
4 AMERICA was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing
5 and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style
6 “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of
7 California.

8 26. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST FIREARMS LLC (“GHOST FIREARMS”),
9 d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM, was a limited liability company registered in
10 Florida with its principal place of business in Daytona Beach, Florida. At all times pertinent
11 hereto, GHOST FIREARMS was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing,
12 manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including
13 AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the
14 State of California.

15 27. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC.
16 (“JUGGERNAUT”), d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM, was a California corporation with its principal
17 place of business in Orange, California. At all times pertinent hereto, JUGGERNAUT was
18 engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits
19 and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to
20 consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

21 28. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS
22 LLC (“MFY TECHNICAL”), d/b/a 5DTACTICAL.COM, was a Massachusetts limited liability
23 company with its principal place of business in Westborough, Massachusetts. At all times
24 pertinent hereto, MFY TECHNICAL was engaged in the business of designing, marketing,
25 distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost
26 guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to
27 consumers within the State of California.

1 29. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC
2 (“TACTICAL GEAR HEADS”), d/b/a 80-LOWER.COM; AR-15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM;
3 and 80LOWERJIG.COM, was an Indiana limited liability company with its principal place of
4 business in Indianapolis, Indiana and/or in Fishers, Indiana. At all times pertinent hereto,
5 TACTICAL GEAR HEADS, via its various retail websites, was engaged in the business of
6 designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to
7 assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation,
8 including to consumers within the State of California.

9 30. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., has
10 maintained a mailing address in Apple Valley, California. Upon information and belief,
11 TROMBLEE began doing business as USPATRIOTARMORY.COM on April 25, 2014.
12 USPATRIOTARMORY.COM has maintained a business and mailing address in Apple Valley,
13 California. At all times pertinent hereto, USPATRIOTARMORY.COM was engaged in the business
14 of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used
15 to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the
16 nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

17 31. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC.
18 (“INDUSTRY ARMAMENT”), d/b/a AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM, was a
19 Delaware corporation with a principal place of business in Mesa, Arizona. At all times pertinent
20 hereto, INDUSTRY ARMAMENT was engaged in the business of designing, marketing,
21 distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost
22 guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to
23 consumers within the State of California.

24 32. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT THUNDER GUNS LLC
25 (“THUNDER GUNS”), d/b/a THUNDERTACTICAL.COM, was a limited liability company
26 registered in Florida with its principal place of business in Daytona Beach, Florida. At all times
27 pertinent hereto, THUNDER TACTICAL was engaged in the business of designing, marketing,
28 distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost

1 guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to
2 consumers within the State of California.

3 33. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT POLYMER80, INC.
4 (“POLYMER80”), d/b/a POLYMER80.COM and P80 TACTICAL, was a Nevada corporation
5 with its principal place of business in Dayton, Nevada. At all times pertinent hereto,
6 POLYMER80 was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing
7 and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style
8 “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of
9 California.

10 34. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT JSD SUPPLY (“JSD SUPPLY”),
11 d/b/a JSDSUPPLY.COM and 80PERCENTGUYS.COM, was a Pennsylvania corporation with its
12 principal place of business in Butler, Pennsylvania. At all times pertinent hereto, JSD SUPPLY
13 was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling
14 kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun”
15 rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

16 35. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT JAMES MADISON TACTICAL
17 LLC (“JAMES MADISON TACTICAL”), d/b/a JAMESMADISONTACTICAL.COM, was a
18 Washington corporation with its principal place of business in Richland, Washington. At all
19 times pertinent hereto, JAMES MADISON TACTICAL was engaged in the business of
20 designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to
21 assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation,
22 including to consumers within the State of California.

23 36. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT WM. C. ANDERSON, INC.,
24 (“ANDERSON MANUFACTURING”), d/b/a ANDERSONMANUFACTURING.COM, was a
25 Kentucky corporation with its principal place of business in Hebron, Kentucky. At all times
26 pertinent hereto, ANDERSON MANUFACTURING was engaged in the business of designing,
27 marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble
28

1 “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including
2 to consumers within the State of California.

3 37. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT MATRIX ARMS (“MATRIX
4 ARMS”), d/b/a MATRIXARMS.COM, was a New Hampshire corporation with its principal
5 place of business in Claremont, New Hampshire. At all times pertinent hereto, MATRIX ARMS
6 was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling
7 kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun”
8 rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

9 38. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT M-16 PARTS SUPPLY LLC (“M-16
10 PARTS”), d/b/a M-16PARTS.COM, was a Florida corporation with its principal place of
11 business in Old Town, Florida. At all times pertinent hereto, M-16 PARTS was engaged in the
12 business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling kits and/or firearms
13 parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers
14 across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

15 39. DEFENDANTS DOE ONE through DOE ONE HUNDRED (“DOE
16 DEFENDANTS”) are sued herein under fictitious names. PLAINTIFFS assert that DOE
17 DEFENDANTS are engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing
18 and/or selling kits and/or firearms parts used to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style
19 “ghost gun” rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of
20 California. PLAINTIFFS do not at this time know the true names or capacities of said DOE
21 DEFENDANTS, but pray that the same may be alleged herein should that information be
22 ascertained.

23 40. The true names or capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or
24 otherwise, of DEFENDANT DOES ONE through ONE HUNDRED, inclusive, are unknown to
25 PLAINTIFFS, who therefore sue said DEFENDANTS by such fictitious names. PLAINTIFFS
26 are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the DEFENDANTS designated herein as
27 a DOE is negligently, intentionally, or in some other manner, responsible for the events and
28

1 happenings herein referred to and negligently, intentionally, or in some other manner, caused
2 injury and damages proximately thereby to the PLAINTIFFS as herein alleged.

3 41. DEFENDANTS were all actively engaged in the business of designing, marketing,
4 distributing, manufacturing and/or selling these products to California residents leading up to and
5 during June of 2019, while emphasizing features of their products that made them particularly
6 attractive to dangerous actors like RAMOS.

7 42. All actions of DEFENDANTS were done with a conscious disregard and
8 deliberate disregard for the rights and safety of others, and in a willful and reckless manner
9 making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS'
10 conduct was despicable, willful, wanton, and malicious within the meaning of California Civil
11 Code § 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them in
12 the fullest extent allowed by law. DEFENDANTS acted in a conscious disregard for the rights
13 and safety of others, in a manner that shocks the conscience, and in a despicable manner
14 sufficient to warrant the imposition of punitive damages against each and every DEFENDANT
15 sued herein.

16 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

17 43. PLAINTIFFS incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint
18 as if fully set forth here and further allege as follows:

19 **I. The "Ghost Gun" Industry Knowingly and Negligently Arms Criminals and Other** 20 **Dangerous Persons Like Ramos, and Intentionally Circumvents California and** 21 **Federal Firearms Laws.**

22 44. Every year in America, firearms are used to commit over 500,000 crimes, and over
23 100,000 people are shot (40,000 or more fatally). This means that more than 100 people in
24 America are killed every day as a result of firearms use.

25 45. Federal and state laws recognize the grave risk posed by firearms in the wrong
26 person's hands, and, as a result, regulate and restrict their sale and possession in numerous ways.

27 46. Only FFLs may legally engage in the business of selling firearms. Felons,
28 domestic abusers, the dangerously mentally ill, and certain other categories of people deemed to
pose too great a danger to themselves or others are prohibited from possessing guns as a matter of

1 federal and California law. FFLs are required to conduct background checks on gun buyers to
2 prevent sales to such prohibited purchasers. Firearms sold by FFLs must include stamped serial
3 numbers, to enable accurate record keeping and aid law enforcement in tracing the gun to its
4 initial retail seller if it is later misused in a crime. Such tracing can help identify the chain of
5 possession and ultimate user of such a crime gun.

6 47. FFLs are also required to exercise common sense in protecting the public by
7 refusing firearms sales—even where a buyer passes a background check—if the buyer is
8 displaying disturbing or erratic behavior suggesting a significant psychological disturbance.
9 FFLs always retain discretion to refuse a firearms sale for any reason.

10 48. FFLs must carefully learn and comply with all federal laws, as well as the laws of
11 the state in which they reside and, for certain sales to residents of other states, the laws of those
12 states. Some states, including California, prohibit sales of military-style assault weapons like
13 AR-15 style rifles.

14 49. DEFENDANTS sought, and continue to seek, to undermine and circumvent these
15 federal and state public safety laws.

16 50. DEFENDANTS are not FFLs. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANTS
17 knew, and continue to know, that law-abiding persons who desire firearms can and do obtain
18 firearms through FFLs.

19 51. DEFENDANTS are companies and entities that chose, at all times pertinent
20 hereto, to manufacture and/or sell unserialized, unfinished firearms parts (such as frames and
21 receivers) or firearms assembly kits that can be used to produce “ghost guns,” including AR-15
22 style assault “ghost gun rifles.”

23 52. Much of DEFENDANTS’ business involves online sales, and DEFENDANTS, at
24 all times pertinent hereto, marketed, advertised, targeted and/or sold their products to individuals
25 across the country, including in California.

26 53. DEFENDANTS, at all times pertinent hereto, manufactured and/or sold “ghost
27 gun” parts that require minimal additional milling before they can be easily combined with other
28

1 largely unregulated gun parts—often included in DEFENDANTS’ assembly kits—to form a fully
2 functioning “ghost gun.”

3 54. One common “ghost gun” part sold by DEFENDANTS is an 80% receiver, which
4 is designed to fall just outside of the federal definition of a “firearm” so as to evade federally
5 required background checks and other regulations applicable to “firearms.”

6 55. The process of converting such parts into a “ghost gun,” whether it be a semi-
7 automatic handgun or an AR-15 style assault rifle, involves just a few steps. DEFENDANTS’
8 kits and/or firearms parts can be used to create a fully functional “ghost gun” in as little as a few
9 minutes without the consumer possessing any specialized skill or abilities.

10 56. DEFENDANTS thus enable anyone, including individuals prohibited from
11 possessing any firearms or individuals prohibited from possessing assault weapons by virtue of
12 state law, to build “ghost guns,” including but not limited to assault weapons.

13 57. Once assembled, “ghost guns” are just as deadly and dangerous as traditional
14 firearms.

15 58. DEFENDANTS purposefully chose and continue to choose not to stamp serial
16 numbers on these or other parts included in their firearms assembly kits. This means that the
17 “ghost guns” produced from DEFENDANTS’ products cannot be traced back to the initial
18 manufacturer and/or seller, making it harder to identify the chain of possession and ultimate user
19 of a gun recovered from a crime scene. This makes DEFENDANTS’ products even more
20 dangerous to the public.

21 59. Because DEFENDANTS’ products were and continue to be readily available
22 online for purchase without a background check, they are especially attractive to criminals,
23 domestic abusers, and other dangerous individuals who would otherwise be prevented from
24 purchasing a firearm due to their inability to pass a background check.

25 60. Similarly, because DEFENDANTS’ products were and continue to be capable of
26 purchase without any interaction between the buyer and a FFL, these products are also attractive
27 and accessible to individuals with dangerous psychological or behavioral issues who know or
28 who fear they may not be able to pass muster at a responsible FFL.

1 61. As a special agent in charge of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and
2 Explosives' ("ATF") Los Angeles field division told reporters in 2018, "Criminals are making
3 their own weapons because they cannot buy them legally . . . or they are paying other people to
4 make those guns for them to get around the gun laws."¹ Gun violence prevention advocates have
5 continued to sound the alarm regarding the proliferation of these products and the grave public
6 safety risk that they pose, particularly in vulnerable communities.²

7 62. DEFENDANTS were and still are aware that the proliferation of "ghost guns"
8 poses a serious public safety risk. Nevertheless, DEFENDANTS intentionally targeted and
9 continue to target precisely the criminals and other dangerous parties described above.

10 63. In their marketing and advertising, DEFENDANTS affirmatively emphasize as a
11 major selling point the untraceable nature of "ghost guns" due to the absence of a serial number.
12 DEFENDANTS also affirmatively emphasize as major selling points the fact that their products
13 can be purchased without a background check or interaction with a FFL.

14 64. DEFENDANTS' marketing to the criminal market includes but is not limited to
15 the following examples:

16 a. RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM emphasizes the untraceable nature of its
17 products. See <https://www.rbtacticaltooling.com/> ("Building the lower receiver, [sic] yourself
18 legally prevents the requirement of a government traceable serial number. The lack of a serial
19 number on your lower receiver prevents a tyrannical state government from knowing you even
20 have it. If they don't know you have it, they can't take it!")

21 b. BLACKHAWK's webpage for AR-15 80% lower receivers states: "If
22 you've been looking at building an AR-15 rifle, but you don't want to deal with the hassle of an
23 FFL, or you want a project to complete at home, then you've been looking for an 80% AR-15
24 lower receiver. Because it's not a completed firearm, an AR-15 80 lower can ship directly to your
25 _____

26 ¹ Richard Winton, L.A. *Gangs stockpile untraceable 'ghost guns' that members make themselves*,
27 Los Angeles Times, July 6, 2018, available at <https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-la-gangsters-homemade-guns-20180706-story.html>.

28 ² See Abene Clayton, *Ordered online, assembled at home: the deadly toll of California's 'ghost guns'*,
The Guardian, May 18, 2021, available at <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/may/18/california-ghost-guns-deadly-toll>.

1 doorstep, and requires no background check provided that you finish the last 20% out yourself.”

2 See <https://www.80percentarms.com/ar-15-80-lower-receivers/>.

3 c. INDUSTRY ARMAMENT’s website states, on a page listing an AR-15
4 receiver for sale, that “[t]he purchase of this component does not constitute the purchase of a
5 firearm and as such does not require a FFL for transfer.” See
6 <https://americanweaponscomponents.com/product/poly80-g150-p2-ar-15-receiver-kit>.

7 d. Until April 2021, a Q & A section on one of TACTICAL GEAR HEAD’s
8 retail websites stated: “An AR-15 built using an 80% lower [receiver] will have no serialization
9 or paperwork attached to it by default. Therefore, it is typically impossible to determine the
10 firearm’s origin or history.” See [https://web.archive.org/web/20201021221553/https://www.80-](https://web.archive.org/web/20201021221553/https://www.80-lower.com/faqs/)
11 [lower.com/faqs/](https://web.archive.org/web/20201021221553/https://www.80-lower.com/faqs/). The site further emphasized that a purchaser need not interact with a FFL to
12 acquire its kits and/or firearms parts and make a “ghost gun” AR-15 style rifle. See
13 [https://web.archive.org/web/20201112010134/https://www.80-lower.com/products/ar-15-build-](https://web.archive.org/web/20201112010134/https://www.80-lower.com/products/ar-15-build-kit-5-56mm-nato-16-melonite-barrel-classic-a2-handguard-w-80-lower-1-7-twist/)
14 [kit-5-56mm-nato-16-melonite-barrel-classic-a2-handguard-w-80-lower-1-7-twist/](https://web.archive.org/web/20201112010134/https://www.80-lower.com/products/ar-15-build-kit-5-56mm-nato-16-melonite-barrel-classic-a2-handguard-w-80-lower-1-7-twist/).

15 e. M-16 PARTS’ web page for an AR-15 compatible 80% lower receiver
16 makes clear to purchasers that it requires little work to finish, and yet is not a “firearm” requiring
17 the purchaser to go through a FFL: “80 percent complete - No FFL required, these are not lower
18 receivers but are 80% complete until the following are completed. . . . [detailing 5 simple steps
19 and how to carry them out].” See [https://www.m-16parts.com/contents/en-us/p136_80-percent-](https://www.m-16parts.com/contents/en-us/p136_80-percent-lower-receiver.html)
20 [lower-receiver.html](https://www.m-16parts.com/contents/en-us/p136_80-percent-lower-receiver.html).

21 65. The above examples are illustrative rather than exhaustive. Upon information and
22 belief, they are also identical to or essentially the same as DEFENDANTS’ marketing tactics for
23 “ghost gun” kits and/or parts that can be assembled into AR-15 style “ghost gun” assault style
24 rifles during the relevant time period.

25 66. Sales of “ghost gun” kits and/or parts have increased significantly in recent years.
26 Not surprisingly, the use of “ghost guns” in crimes has also increased exponentially.

27 67. According to the ATF, as many as 30 percent of all guns now recovered at
28 California crime scenes are untraceable “ghost guns.”

1 68. “Ghost guns”—and, in particular, AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles—have been used
2 in many incidents of violence in California. For example:

3 a. In June 2013, John Zawahri went on a shooting spree with a “ghost gun”
4 and killed five people in Santa Monica, California. Zawahri, who had a documented history of
5 mental illness, was a prohibited purchaser and the “ghost gun” he used was an AR-15 style rifle.

6 b. In July 2014, gunmen in Stockton, California used an AK-47-style “ghost
7 gun” in an attempted bank robbery, where three people were held hostage.

8 c. In July 2015, Scott Bertics shot and killed a woman with whom he was
9 romantically involved, and then used a second gun to kill himself in Walnut Creek, California.
10 Both guns used were “ghost guns.”

11 d. In November 2017, Kevin Neal went on a shooting spree across Tehama
12 County, California, using AR-15 style “ghost guns” that left five people dead and eighteen
13 injured.

14 e. In August 2019, a convicted felon used an AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifle to
15 kill California Highway Patrol officer Andre Moye and wound two of his colleagues during a
16 freeway shootout in Riverside, California.

17 69. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS were aware of one or all of these
18 and other incidents involving the unlawful use of “ghost guns.”

19 70. AR-15 style rifles are prohibited assault weapons under California law. *See* Cal.
20 Pen. Code § 30510(a)(5) (assault weapons include semiautomatic rifles within the “Colt AR-15
21 series”); § 30510(f) (“As used in this section, ‘series’ includes all other models that are only
22 variations, with minor differences, of those models listed in subdivision (a), regardless of the
23 manufacturer.”); § 30605(a) (criminalizing possession of an assault weapon).

24 71. Federal law requires all FFLs—even those outside of a purchaser’s state—to
25 comply with the laws of a purchaser’s state when selling long guns like AR-15 style rifles. *See*
26 18 U.S.C. § 922(b)(3).

27 72. “Ghost gun” kits and/or parts enable dangerous people in California like RAMOS
28 to obtain such banned weapons.

1 73. In September 2020, then-California Attorney General Xavier Becerra filed a
2 lawsuit demanding that ATF correct its interpretation of what qualifies as a firearm to make
3 “ghost guns” subject to the same regulations as other firearms. In a press release, Becerra stated:
4 “Ghost guns are untraceable weapons that have been used in mass shootings throughout the
5 country and right here in California—from Santa Monica in 2013, to Tehama County in 2017,
6 and at Saugus High School just last year. We can’t afford to wait for another tragedy to happen
7 before we take action. It’s time for ATF to prioritize the safety of our communities by calling
8 these products what they are: firearms, and regulating them accordingly.”³

9 74. In April 2021, the Biden administration called on the Department of Justice to
10 issue a proposed rule to stop the proliferation of ghost guns. The White House commented: “We
11 are experiencing a growing problem: criminals are buying kits containing nearly all of the
12 components and directions for finishing a firearm within as little as 30 minutes and using these
13 firearms to commit crimes. When these firearms turn up at crime scenes, they often cannot be
14 traced by law enforcement due to the lack of a serial number.”⁴ Upon issuing the proposed rule,
15 which would modernize the definition of “framer or receiver” to close the regulatory loophole
16 that “ghost guns” exploit, the Department noted that law enforcement recovered more than
17 23,000 unserialized firearms from potential crime scenes between 2016 and 2020.⁵

18 75. DEFENDANTS could have taken steps to avoid supplying individuals in
19 California with prohibited assault weapons and/or violating various federal firearms laws. Below
20 is a non-exhaustive list of feasible steps that a reasonable and law-abiding company would have
21 taken to avoid undermining California law and/or federal law:
22

23 ³ *Attorney General Becerra and Giffords Law Center Lead Lawsuit Demanding the Trump*
24 *Administration Address the Threat of Unregulated Ghost Guns*, Press Release, September 29,
25 2020, available at <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-becerra-and-giffords-law-center-lead-lawsuit-demanding-trump>.

26 ⁴ *Biden-Harris Administration Announces Initial Actions to Address the Gun Violence Public*
27 *Health Epidemic*, Press Release, April 7, 2021, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/07/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-announces-initial-actions-to-address-the-gun-violence-public-health-epidemic/>.

28 ⁵ *Justice Department Proposes New Regulation to Update Firearm Definitions*, Press Release,
May 7, 2021, available at <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-proposes-new-regulation-update-firearm-definitions>.

1 a. DEFENDANTS could have blocked Internet Protocol (“IP”) so that
2 Internet users located in California could not access their websites and/or the portions of their
3 websites listing products enabling the assembly of AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles;

4 b. DEFENDANTS could have refused to ship such products to California
5 because possession of assault weapons is illegal in California;

6 c. DEFENDANTS could have required that their products only be transferred
7 through a sale carried out by a FFL;

8 d. DEFENDANTS could have required that only individuals who could
9 legally purchase and possess firearms could purchase their products; and

10 e. DEFENDANTS could have included serial numbers on their products.

11 76. Upon information and belief, none of the DEFENDANTS took these, or any other
12 reasonable safety precautions, to prevent dangerous California residents from violating California
13 and/or federal law and endangering the safety of others with “ghost guns” made from
14 DEFENDANTS’ products.

15 77. Instead, upon information and belief, all of the DEFENDANTS intentionally
16 targeted California consumers to increase sales.

17 78. For example, Cody Wilson of DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST GUNNER
18 stated that he aimed to undermine gun violence prevention legislation, and in particular,
19 California’s regulatory regime. Wilson, shortly after the Tehama attack in 2017, confirmed that
20 much of DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST GUNNER’s business comes from California.

21 79. Similarly, on its website, BLACKHAWK specifically emphasizes that “it is 100%
22 legal for you to purchase, complete, and own an 80% firearm in the Golden State.” *See*
23 <https://www.80percentarms.com/pages/faq.html>.

24 80. Upon information and belief, these and other DEFENDANTS were all
25 intentionally designing, advertising, manufacturing, marketing and/or selling ghost gun kits
26 and/or firearms parts designed and intended to be assembled into AR-15 style rifles to California
27 consumers like RAMOS.
28

1 81. As noted above, DEFENDANTS also purposefully emphasized features of their
2 products they knew to be particularly attractive to criminals and dangerous parties like RAMOS,
3 such as their untraceable nature and the absence of a background check or interaction with a FFL.

4 82. DEFENDANTS knew that “ghost guns” are frequently used by criminals and
5 dangerous individuals and have continued to gain additional knowledge confirming this.

6 83. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS have, nevertheless, failed to change
7 their reckless and unlawful business practices.

8 **II. “Ghost Guns” Were Used to Harm PLAINTIFFS and OFFICER O’SULLIVAN.**

9 84. On June 19, 2019, 26-year-old Sacramento Police Officer TARA O’SULLIVAN
10 was fatally shot in the line of duty by RAMOS while she was responding to a domestic
11 disturbance call at a residence in Sacramento, California. OFFICER O’SULLIVAN was helping
12 a woman remove belongings from the residence when RAMOS opened fire. Because RAMOS
13 continued to shoot at police after OFFICER O’SULLIVAN was hit, it took approximately forty
14 minutes for OFFICER O’SULLIVAN to be removed from the scene. During this time, OFFICER
15 O’SULLIVAN was in great pain, distress, and fear for her life, as gunfire continued to surround
16 her while she awaited rescue. After being shot a second time, OFFICER O’SULLIVAN
17 succumbed to her injuries. Nearly eight hours after the attack began, RAMOS surrendered and
18 was taken into custody.

19 85. Photos released by the Sacramento Police Department show that RAMOS had
20 barricaded the front door to the residence, indicating that the attack was likely premeditated.
21 RAMOS had also strategically placed four firearms, including two AR-15 style “ghost gun”
22 semiautomatic rifles built on unfinished 80% lower receivers, throughout the residence. RAMOS
23 fired all four firearms at officers during the course of the attack.

24 86. Following the attack, law enforcement seized a substantial amount of “ghost gun”
25 equipment from the residence, indicating that RAMOS was manufacturing “ghost guns” in his
26 garage as an unofficial business at the time of the attack.

27 87. Prior to the shooting, RAMOS would likely not have been able to legally purchase
28 a firearm. RAMOS had prior arrests for domestic violence, driving under the influence, and

1 misdemeanor battery, and an active warrant for battery at the time of the shooting. RAMOS had
2 also been subject to domestic violence restraining orders in 2004 and 2007, under which he was
3 required to transfer firearms in his possession to law enforcement.

4 88. Further, upon information and belief, RAMOS could not have legally acquired an
5 AR-15 style rifle like those utilized in the attack from a FFL either inside or outside of California,
6 because of his status as a California resident and California's ban on the possession of assault
7 weapons.

8 89. Upon information and belief, at the time of the shooting, RAMOS' "ghost guns"
9 lacked any identifying serial numbers.

10 90. It is unknown how and where RAMOS acquired the "ghost gun" kits and/or parts
11 used to assemble the weapons used in the attack. Given DEFENDANTS' actions, it may be
12 impossible to determine the exact manufacturer(s) and/or seller(s) of the "ghost gun" kits and/or
13 parts RAMOS used to assemble the AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles used in the attack.

14 91. The above discussion is not intended to be an exhaustive listing of the reasons why
15 RAMOS could not have purchased a serialized, fully assembled AR-15 style rifle from a FFL.
16 Various other California or federal firearms restrictions may also have blocked such a sale,
17 including RAMOS' exhibiting erratic or otherwise suspicious behavior at the time of an
18 attempted purchase.

19 92. RAMOS was only able to acquire his arsenal of weapons through the negligence
20 of DEFENDANTS. Had DEFENDANTS complied with the law and relevant standards of care,
21 RAMOS would not have been able to use "ghost guns" to murder TARA O'SULLIVAN and
22 harm PLAINTIFFS.

23 **III. DEFENDANTS Are Substantial Players in the "Ghost Gun" Industry, A Market**
24 **Involving Fungible, Dangerous Goods.**

25 93. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS were all intentionally making,
26 marketing, and/or selling "ghost gun" kits and/or parts designed and intended to be assembled
27 into AR-15 style rifles in California leading up to and at the time of RAMOS' purchase of the
28 relevant "ghost gun" kits and/or parts.

1 94. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS also all purposefully targeted
2 dangerous persons who had no or limited access to these weapons by virtue of disqualifying
3 records, mental illness, and/or relevant legal restrictions.

4 95. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in the aggregate, were responsible
5 for manufacturing and/or selling a substantial percentage of all “ghost gun” kits and/or parts
6 enabling assembly of AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles which entered California leading up to and
7 during June 2019.

8 96. Upon information and belief, there is a substantial probability that one or more of
9 the DEFENDANTS sold RAMOS one or more “ghost gun” kits and/or parts used to assemble the
10 AR-15 style rifles used in the attack, either online or via some other medium, with full knowledge
11 that (1) RAMOS was a resident of California, (2) that California prohibits the possession of AR-
12 15 style rifles, and (3) AR-15 style rifles have frequently been used in mass shootings.

13 97. Upon information and belief, there is a substantial probability that one or more of
14 the DEFENDANTS shipped one or more “ghost gun” kits and/or parts used to assemble the
15 weapons used in the OFFICER O’SULLIVAN attack to RAMOS’ California residence.

16 98. “Ghost gun” kits and/or parts that can be used to assemble unserialized AR-15
17 style rifles are fungible products. Such kits and/or firearms parts share the same core
18 characteristics and present an equivalent risk of danger to members of the public like
19 PLAINTIFFS and OFFICER O’SULLIVAN. These products provide dangerous persons like
20 RAMOS the ability to possess untraceable assault weapons without going through a FFL.

21 99. Had one or more DEFENDANTS complied with the law and relevant standards of
22 care, RAMOS would never have obtained access to their inherently dangerous products.

23 100. Without access to DEFENDANTS’ products, RAMOS could not have assembled
24 his “ghost guns” and could not have used them to harm PLAINTIFFS and OFFICER
25 O’SULLIVAN.

26 101. RAMOS’ misuse of these assembled products was particularly foreseeable to
27 DEFENDANTS because RAMOS fell within the group of dangerous persons specifically targeted
28 by DEFENDANTS.

1 **COUNT I: NEGLIGENCE (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

2 102. PLAINTIFFS incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint
3 as if fully set forth here and further allege as follows:

4 103. A seller of “ghost gun” kits and/or parts —particularly kits and/or firearms parts
5 intended to be assembled into highly dangerous AR-15 style weapons commonly used in criminal
6 activity—owes a standard of care to the general public when selling such items.

7 104. This standard of care imposes a duty to take all reasonable and practical safety
8 precautions to prevent dangerous and irresponsible individuals like RAMOS from gaining access
9 to “ghost gun” kits and/or parts designed and intended for assembly into AR-15 style rifles.

10 105. Such safety precautions would include, but are not limited to: carefully learning
11 and continually checking relevant state and federal firearms laws regarding assault weapons;
12 never shipping to states where the possession of an AR-15 style weapon created from one of
13 DEFENDANTS’ kits and/or firearms parts would be deemed illegal; and blocking Internet users
14 whose IP addresses indicate that they are located in such states. Additionally, a responsible seller
15 of such products would take steps to verify that only individuals legally permitted to possess
16 firearms and not displaying signs of significant psychological disturbance were buying its
17 products, such as by requiring all transactions to go through a FFL in the buyer’s home state.

18 106. Upon information and belief, none of these DEFENDANTS had, at the time
19 RAMOS purchased the relevant product(s) from the DEFENDANT(s), taken these or other
20 reasonable safety precautions which would have blocked RAMOS’ purchase of the relevant
21 products.

22 107. DEFENDANTS’ violation of the above standards of care proximately caused
23 PLAINTIFFS’ harm by granting RAMOS access to highly lethal weapons he could not have
24 legally acquired.

25 108. Had RAMOS been denied access to the kits and/or firearms parts used to make his
26 two AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, he could not have used these weapons to harm PLAINTIFFS.

27 109. As a direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and
28 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous

1 weapons, TARA O’SULLIVAN was fatally injured, and endured great pain and suffering before
2 succumbing to her injuries.

3 110. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and
4 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal, and
5 dangerous weapons, TARA O’SULLIVAN suffered damage to her clothing and other personal
6 property at the scene of the crime.

7 111. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and
8 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous
9 weapons, TARA O’SULLIVAN required critical emergency medical care prior to her death, and
10 incurred expenses for such care.

11 112. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and
12 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous
13 weapons, PLAINTIFFS incurred funeral and burial expenses for their beloved daughter, TARA
14 O’SULLIVAN.

15 113. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned
16 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal
17 and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS lost future contributions and the value of the personal
18 services of their beloved daughter, TARA O’SULLIVAN.

19 114. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned
20 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal
21 and dangerous weapons,, PLAINTIFFS have suffered, and will continue to suffer, great anguish
22 for the preventable, tragic killing of their daughter, TARA O’SULLIVAN.

23 115. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned
24 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal
25 and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS were compelled to retain legal counsel to protect their
26 rights.

27 116. DEFENDANTS’ negligence, as set forth above, was a direct and substantial factor
28 in causing PLAINTIFFS’ harm.

1 117. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS’
2 conduct was done with a willful and conscious disregard for the rights and safety of others,
3 including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner making the infliction of grievous
4 bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS’ conduct was despicable, willful,
5 wanton, and malicious within the meaning of California Civil Code § 3294, so as to warrant the
6 imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them to the fullest extent allowed by law.

7 118. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that each
8 DEFENDANT sells the type of AR-15 “ghost gun” product(s) that killed TARA O’SULLIVAN.
9 Accordingly, PLAINTIFFS demand damages from each DEFENDANT that is unable to prove
10 that they did not manufacture or sell the specific “ghost gun” product(s) which killed TARA
11 O’SULLIVAN, in an amount consistent with each DEFENDANT’s market share at the time of
12 the shooting.

13 **COUNT II: NEGLIGENCE PER SE FOR VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA AND/OR**
14 **FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

15 119. PLAINTIFFS incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint
16 as if fully set forth here and further allege as follows:

17 120. RAMOS’ purchase of “ghost gun” kits and/or parts and the use of them to
18 assemble AR-15 style rifles violated California’s assault weapons ban. *See* Cal. Pen. Code
19 § 30510(a)(5) (assault weapons include semiautomatic rifles within the “Colt AR-15 series”);
20 § 30510(f) (“As used in this section, ‘series’ includes all other models that are only variations,
21 with minor differences, of those models listed in subdivision (a), regardless of the
22 manufacturer.”); § 30605(a) (criminalizing possession of an assault weapon).

23 121. DEFENDANTS are manufacturers and/or sellers of “ghost gun” kits and/or parts
24 that intentionally targeted, and continue to target, the California market and ship “ghost gun” kits
25 and/or parts designed for assembly into AR-15 style rifles to California consumers like RAMOS.
26 DEFENDANTS did and continue to do so, with the knowledge and intention that those
27 consumers will use these products to assemble weapons prohibited under California law.
28

1 122. DEFENDANTS are therefore responsible to PLAINTIFFS as knowing
2 accomplices, for their consumers' direct violations of, at minimum, California's ban on the
3 possession of assault weapons. *See* Cal. Pen. Code § 31 (anyone who "aid[s] and abet[s]" in the
4 commission of an offense is a principal); § 971 ("all persons concerned in the commission of a
5 crime, who by the operation of other provisions of this code are principals therein, shall hereafter
6 be prosecuted, tried and punished as principals"); § 27(a)(1) (California has jurisdiction over
7 crimes where at least part of the offense takes place within the state).

8 123. DEFENDANTS may also be responsible, either directly or as an accomplice, for
9 violation one or more additional state or federal firearms laws, including, but not limited to,
10 various provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968 and/or the National Firearms Act. For
11 example, the Gun Control Act prohibits licensed firearms dealers from selling firearms to
12 consumers where the consumers' purchase or possession of such firearm violates state law, 18
13 U.S.C. § 922(b)(2), prohibits licensed firearms dealers from selling machineguns to members of
14 the general public who have not undergone the required registration process, 18 U.S.C. §
15 922(b)(4), and prohibits anyone without a license from engaging in the business of importing,
16 manufacturing, or dealing in firearms, 18 U.S.C. § 922(a)(1)(A). *See also* 26 U.S.C.A. § 5845
17 (defining "machinegun" as "any weapon which shoots, is designed to shoot, or can be readily
18 restored to shoot, automatically more than one shot, without manual reloading, by a single
19 function of the trigger").

20 124. In addition to these laws explicitly referencing firearms, DEFENDANTS also
21 violated California statutes prohibiting unfair, immoral and reckless business practices and the
22 creation and maintenance of public nuisances, as discussed further below. *See* Cal. Bus. & Prof
23 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3479, 3480.

24 125. Whichever DEFENDANT or DEFENDANTS are responsible, either directly or as
25 an accomplice, for selling RAMOS one or more "ghost gun" kits and/or parts in violation of one
26 or more statutes including, at minimum, California's assault weapons ban, breached the standard
27 of care imposed by statute.
28

1 126. This violation proximately caused PLAINTIFFS' harm by providing RAMOS
2 access to highly lethal weapons that he could not have legally acquired in California.

3 127. Had RAMOS been denied access to the "ghost gun" kits and/or parts used to make
4 his two AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles, he could not have used these weapons to harm
5 PLAINTIFFS.

6 128. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of and foreseeable result of the
7 actions and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal,
8 and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS suffered damages as described above in paragraphs 109–
9 18.

10 129. DEFENDANTS' negligence, as set forth above, was a substantial factor in causing
11 PLAINTIFFS' harm.

12 130. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS'
13 conduct was done with a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the rights and safety of
14 others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner making the infliction of
15 grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS' conduct was despicable,
16 willful, wanton, and malicious within the meaning of California Civil Code § 3294, so as to
17 warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent
18 allowed by law.

19 131. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that each
20 DEFENDANT sells the type of AR-15 compatible "ghost gun" product(s) that killed TARA
21 O'SULLIVAN. Accordingly, PLAINTIFFS demand damages from each DEFENDANT who is
22 unable to prove that it did not manufacture or sell the specific "ghost gun" product(s) which killed
23 OFFICER O'SULLIVAN, in an amount consistent with each DEFENDANT's market share at the
24 time of the shooting.

25 **COUNT III: NEGLIGENT ENTRUSTMENT (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

26 132. PLAINTIFFS incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint
27 as if fully set forth here and further allege as follows:
28

1 133. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS purposefully targeted residents of
2 states like California with strict gun violence prevention regimes, like California, who were
3 seeking to bypass the laws of their home state.

4 134. By targeting and supplying dangerous individuals already showing contempt for
5 the rule of law and disrespect towards the safety rules accepted by their communities,
6 DEFENDANTS were purposefully selling to a class of purchasers who were inherently showing a
7 high likelihood of misusing their “ghost gun” kits and/or parts in a dangerous manner that would
8 cause harm to third parties like PLAINTIFFS.

9 135. Whichever DEFENDANT or DEFENDANTS sold or shipped one or more “ghost
10 gun” kits and/or parts capable of and intended to be assembled into AR-15 style rifles prohibited
11 by California law to RAMOS, despite knowing that he was a California resident and that
12 California prohibits such weapons were, thus, negligently entrusting these one or more items.

13 136. Additionally or alternatively, by marketing and selling “ghost gun” product(s) to
14 consumers that DEFENDANTS knew sought to avoid interaction with FFLs and compliance with
15 relevant federal and state firearm regulations, DEFENDANTS negligently entrusted their
16 product(s).

17 137. This violation of relevant standards of care proximately caused PLAINTIFFS’
18 harm by granting RAMOS access to highly lethal weapons that he could not have legally acquired
19 in California.

20 138. Had RAMOS been denied access to the “ghost gun” kits and/or parts he used to
21 assemble his two AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, he could not have used these weapons to harm
22 PLAINTIFFS.

23 139. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of and foreseeable result of the
24 actions and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted RAMOS access to highly lethal, illegal,
25 and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS suffered damages as described above in paragraphs 109–
26 18.

27 140. DEFENDANTS’ negligent entrustment of the dangerous instrumentalities, as set
28 forth above, was a substantial factor in causing PLAINTIFFS’ harm.

1 141. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS'
2 conduct was done with a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the rights and safety of
3 others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner making the infliction of
4 grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS' conduct was despicable,
5 willful, wanton, and malicious within the meaning of California Civil Code § 3294, so as to
6 warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent
7 allowed by law.

8 142. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that each
9 DEFENDANT sells the type of AR-15 compatible "ghost gun" product(s) that killed TARA
10 O'SULLIVAN. Accordingly, PLAINTIFFS demand damages from each DEFENDANT who is
11 unable to prove that it did not manufacture or sell the specific "ghost gun" product(s) which killed
12 TARA O'SULLIVAN, in an amount consistent with each DEFENDANT's market share at the
13 time of the shooting.

14 **COUNT IV: PUBLIC NUISANCE (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

15 143. PLAINTIFFS incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint
16 as if fully set forth here and further allege as follows:

17 144. In addition to using DEFENDANTS' product(s) to kill OFFICER O'SULLIVAN,
18 law enforcement believe that RAMOS may have been manufacturing other "ghost guns" in his
19 garage as an unofficial business at the time of the attack.

20 145. By negligently, recklessly, and/or intentionally selling vast quantities of "ghost
21 gun" kits and/or parts enabling the assembly of AR-15 style rifles to buyers in California in
22 violation of, at a minimum, California law, DEFENDANTS have negligently and/or knowingly
23 participated in creating and maintaining an unreasonable interference with the rights held in
24 common by the general public. This constitutes a public nuisance under California law, including
25 California Civil Code §§ 3479 and 3480.

26 146. Without limitation, the acts of DEFENDANTS as alleged herein caused, created,
27 and continue to maintain a substantial and unreasonable interference with the public's health,
28 safety, convenience, comfort, peace, and use of public property and/or private property. These

1 activities are injurious to health and offensive to the senses so as to interfere with the comfortable
2 enjoyment of life or property in an entire community or neighborhood. Numerous members of
3 the public are threatened, killed, injured, or are victims of criminal acts as a result of “ghost gun”
4 kits and/or parts sold by DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS’ acts and omissions as alleged herein
5 cause a substantial and unreasonable increase in the number of members of the general public
6 who are threatened, killed, and injured by “ghost guns.”

7 147. The acts and omissions of DEFENDANTS, as alleged herein, substantially and
8 unreasonably interfere with the public’s use of public facilities, including the use of public
9 highways and walkways. Public highways and walkways are made substantially and
10 unreasonably unsafe because of the presence of ghost guns intentionally, negligently and
11 unlawfully supplied by DEFENDANTS.

12 148. DEFENDANTS’ acts and omissions as alleged herein substantially and
13 unreasonably (a) increase the number of “ghost guns” in and on public facilities, including on
14 public highways and walkways; (b) increase the degree to which unlawful possessors in and on
15 public facilities, including on highways and walkways, are illegally armed with weapons; and (c)
16 allow for banned assault weapons to be present in California, including on public highways and
17 walkways.

18 149. DEFENDANTS’ acts and omissions as alleged herein cause substantial and
19 unreasonable interferences with the public’s health, safety, convenience, comfort, and peace in
20 numerous other ways, including: (a) increasing the number of unlawful possessors of weapons
21 who use these weapons to commit violent crimes against innocent members of the general public;
22 (b) increasing the number and severity of property crimes committed by those in possession of
23 “ghost guns” against innocent members of the general public; (c) increasing the number and
24 severity of incidents in which those in possession of “ghost guns” disturb the peace by being
25 disorderly; and (d) increasing the amount of society’s resources that are diverted toward dealing
26 with the problems associated with the possession of “ghost guns.”

27 150. DEFENDANTS know or have reason to know that the acts and omissions alleged
28 herein caused substantial and unreasonable interferences with the public’s health, safety,

1 convenience, comfort, peace, and use of public facilities. DEFENDANTS' acts and omissions as
2 alleged herein were undertaken with negligent and/or intentional disregard of the rights of the
3 general public. DEFENDANTS knew that they could have taken precautions as outlined above
4 that would have eliminated or minimized the injuries to the general public. Instead, they chose
5 not to take those precautions and, in fact, actively exacerbated these risks with the irresponsible
6 marketing campaign described herein in order to maximize their profits.

7 151. DEFENDANTS' interference with the public's health, safety, convenience,
8 comfort, peace, and use of public facilities is unreasonable, unlawful, substantial, significant,
9 continuing, and long-lasting. This interference, is annoying, offensive, and disturbing to an
10 ordinary person. The interference is not insubstantial or fleeting, and involves deaths and serious
11 injuries suffered by many people and a severe disruption of public health, peace, order, and
12 safety.

13 152. The manner in which DEFENDANTS make, sell, and market their products has no
14 social utility. Even if it did, the seriousness of DEFENDANTS' interference with the rights of
15 the public and harm DEFENDANTS cause far outweighs any social utility associated with
16 DEFENDANTS' conduct.

17 153. DEFENDANTS' unlawful, negligent and/or intentional creation and maintenance
18 of the public nuisance directly and proximately caused significant harm, including serious
19 physical injury and associated harm to PLAINTIFFS that is different from the harm suffered by
20 other members of the public, including loss of enjoyment of life, as well as damages set forth in
21 paragraphs 109–118 above, all to their detriment in an amount to be determined at a trial of this
22 matter.

23 154. PLAINTIFFS have not, at any time, consented to DEFENDANTS' conduct.

24 155. At all times herein mentioned, DEFENDANTS had notice and knowledge that
25 their actions created a public nuisance.

26 156. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS'
27 conduct was in conscious and deliberate disregard for the rights and safety of others, including
28 PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner making the infliction of grievous bodily

1 injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS’ conduct was despicable, willful, wanton,
2 and malicious within the meaning of California Civil Code § 3294, so as to warrant the
3 imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law.

4 157. PLAINTIFFS also seek appropriate injunctive relief in order to abate the nuisance
5 that DEFENDANTS have created by causing the proliferation of “ghost guns” and the
6 corresponding public safety crisis in the California.

7 158. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that each
8 DEFENDANT sells the type of AR-15 compatible “ghost gun” product(s) that killed TARA
9 O’SULLIVAN. Accordingly, PLAINTIFFS demand damages from each DEFENDANT who is
10 unable to prove that it did not manufacture or sell the specific “ghost gun” product(s) which killed
11 TARA O’SULLIVAN, in an amount consistent with each DEFENDANT’s market share at the
12 time of the shooting.

13 **COUNT V: VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTIONS 17200,**
14 ***ET SEQ.* (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**
(Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices)

15 159. PLAINTIFFS incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint
16 as if fully set forth here and further allege as follows:

17 160. DEFENDANTS, in the course of their retail business of selling “ghost guns,”
18 engaged in business acts or practices that were unlawful, unfair, deceptive, or misleading, and
19 which therefore violated Bus. & Prof Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

20 161. By selling to RAMOS—a dangerous individual likely prohibited from purchasing
21 and possessing firearms—“ghost gun” kits and/or parts for prohibited assault-style weapons in
22 violation of state and/or federal law, DEFENDANTS engaged in business practices that were
23 unlawful, immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.

24 162. By supplying dangerous persons capable of misusing DEFENDANTS’ “ghost
25 gun” kits and/or parts in a manner that would cause serious or deadly harm to third parties like
26 PLAINTIFFS, DEFENDANTS engaged in business practices that were unlawful, immoral,
27 unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.
28

1 2. For special damages for TARA O’SULLIVAN, for the loss of clothing and
2 personal property damaged during the homicide, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and
3 severally, in a sum according to proof;

4 3. For special damages for TARA O’SULLIVAN, for medical expenses incurred
5 prior to her death, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in a sum according to proof;

6 4. For special damages for PLAINTIFFS, for funeral and burial expenses for TARA
7 O’SULLIVAN, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in a sum according to proof;

8 5. For special damages for PLAINTIFFS, for future contributions and value of
9 personal services as to TARA O’SULLIVAN, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally,
10 in a sum according to proof;

11 6. For punitive damages for PLAINTIFFS, against each DEFENDANT, in an amount
12 appropriate to punish each DEFENDANT and deter others from engaging in similar misconduct;

13 7. For an Order, pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17203, that each
14 DEFENDANT be permanently enjoined from committing any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent acts
15 of unfair competition in Violation of Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*;

16 8. For further appropriate injunctive relief against each DEFENDANT, including but
17 not limited to implementation of responsible business practices to protect public safety and to
18 abate the public nuisance created by their “ghost gun” products.;

19 9. For prejudgment interest, as allowed by law;

20 10. For attorney’s fees and costs of this suit pursuant to Cal. Code of Civil Procedure
21 § 1021.5; and

22 11. For such other and further relief as this Court deems equitable or appropriate.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: June 17, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

2
3 

4 Robert J. Nelson (State Bar No. 132797)
5 Caitlin M. Nelson (State Bar No. 335601)
6 Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP
7 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
8 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
9 Telephone: 415.956.1000
10 Facsimile: 415.956.1008
11 rnelson@lchb.com
12 cnelson@lchb.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13 /s/ Jonathan Lowy

14 Jonathan Lowy (*pro hac vice* pending)
15 Christa Nicols (*pro hac vice* pending)
16 Brady: United Against Gun Violence
17 840 First Street, NE Suite 400
18 Washington, DC 20002
19 Telephone: 202-370-8100
20 Facsimile: 202-898-8100
21 jlowy@bradyunited.org
22 cnicols@bradyunited.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

23
24
25
26
27
28



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, 95814
916-874-5522
WWW.SACCOURT.CA.GOV

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION INFORMATION PACKAGE

Recognizing that many civil disputes can be resolved without the time and expense of traditional civil litigation, the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento (Sacramento County Superior Court), strongly encourages parties in civil cases to explore and pursue the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution.

What is Alternative Dispute Resolution?

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is the general term applied to a wide variety of dispute resolution processes which are alternatives to lawsuits. Types of ADR processes include:

- Arbitration
- Mediation
- Settlement Conferences
- Private judging
- Neutral evaluation
- Mini-trials
- Negotiation and *hybrids* of these processes

All ADR processes offer a partial or complete alternative to traditional court litigation for resolving disputes. At the present time, the Sacramento County Superior Court offers Mediation and Arbitration.

What are the advantages of using ADR?

ADR can have a number of advantages over traditional court litigation.

- * **ADR can save time.** Even in a complex case, a dispute can be resolved through ADR in a matter of months or weeks, while a lawsuit can take years.
- * **ADR can save money.** By producing earlier settlements, ADR can save parties and courts money that might otherwise be spent on litigation costs (attorneys fees and court expenses.)
- * **ADR provides more participation.** Parties have more opportunity with ADR to express their own interests and concerns, while litigation focuses exclusively on the parties' legal rights and responsibilities.
- * **ADR provides more control and flexibility.** Parties can choose the ADR process most appropriate for their particular situation and that will best serve their particular needs.
- * **ADR can reduce stress and provide greater satisfaction.** ADR encourages cooperation and communication, while discouraging the adversarial atmosphere found in litigation. Surveys of disputants who have gone through ADR have found that satisfaction with ADR is generally high, especially among those with extensive ADR experience.

Arbitration and Mediation

Although there are many different types of ADR processes, the types most commonly used to resolve disputes in California state courts are Arbitration and Mediation. The Sacramento County Superior Court currently offers pre-screened panelists with experience and training in each of the following areas.

Arbitration. An Arbitrator hears evidence presented by the parties, makes legal rulings, determines facts and makes an Arbitration award. Arbitration awards may be entered as judgments in accordance with the agreement of the parties or, where there is no agreement, in accordance with California statutes. Arbitration can be binding if the parties so agree in writing. If there is no such agreement, either party can reject the Arbitration award and request a trial.



Mediation. Mediation is a voluntary, informal, confidential process in which the Mediator, a neutral third party, facilitates settlement negotiations. The Mediator improves communication by and among the parties, helps parties clarify facts, identify legal issues, explore options and arrive at a mutually acceptable resolution of the dispute.

Litigants are encouraged to use an ADR process as early in the case as circumstances permit. All appropriate cases will be reviewed for referral to ADR at the Case Management Conference(CMC).

ADR Procedures for the Sacramento County Superior Court

Upon filing a complaint or cross-complaint, the plaintiff/cross-complainant must acquire this information package from the Court's Website, <http://www.saccourt.ca.gov>, or the Superior Court Clerk. Plaintiff is required to include the ADR Information Package when he or she serves the Complaint on the Defendant.

The court's ADR Panel List is available on-line at <http://www.saccourt.ca.gov> or may be obtained at the Civil Filing Counter at the Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse, 720 Ninth Street, Room 101, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Mediation.

All parties to the dispute may voluntarily agree to submit the case to a neutral Mediator, either through a court-appointment or through a private arrangement. The parties may choose either of the following Mediation choices:

Private Mediation. Parties to a civil action agree to mediate their dispute with a Mediator of their choice without court assistance. The cost of Mediation must be borne by the parties equally unless the parties agree otherwise. Parties will be charged an amount as set by the Mediator (refer to the ADR Panel List for current rates).

Court Mediation. Upon stipulation of the parties, a Mediator and alternate Mediator will be selected from the court-approved list of neutrals (ADR Panel List). The court will confirm the selected Mediator and notice parties by mail.

The Mediator is then responsible for contacting the parties to confirm a date, time, and place for Mediation. Mediators on the court's approved ADR Panel List have agreed to provide up to three (3) hours of pro-bono Mediation. In the event the Mediation extends beyond 3 hours and parties determine it would be beneficial to continue the Mediation process; the parties will independently be responsible for compensating the Mediator in an amount as set by the Mediator.

UNLIMITED CIVIL CASES

- A *Stipulation and Order to Mediation – Unlimited Civil Cases*, Form CVE-MED-179 (*see attached*) may be filed with the court at any time up to 15 calendar days prior to the Case Management Conference.
- If the parties do not stipulate to Mediation prior to their CMC, they may indicate their willingness to stipulate to Mediation at the CMC. In that event, parties must submit a *Stipulation and Order to Mediation – Unlimited Civil Cases* within 14 calendar days after their CMC.
- A *Mediation Statement* must be filed with the *Case Management Statement*.

LIMITED CIVIL CASES

- Parties may select and conduct voluntary Private Mediation without notification to the Court.
- Parties may stipulate to court mediation by filing a *Stipulation and Order to Arbitration/Mediation - Limited Civil Cases* form (CVE-203) at any time after the filing of the Limited Civil Case Status Memorandum form (CVE-202). This form is located on the court's website at <http://www.saccourt.ca.gov>. A *Stipulation and Order to Arbitration/Mediation – Limited Civil Cases* MUST be filed concurrently or subsequent to a Limited Civil Case Status Memorandum.



Arbitration

UNLIMITED CIVIL CASES

- Plaintiff may elect, the parties may stipulate, or the judge may Order the case to Arbitration. Parties will be asked to select an Arbitrator and three alternate Arbitrators from the court's ADR Panel List. The court will send a Notice of Appointment and an appropriate Order to Arbitration to all parties.
- Arbitrations are conducted pursuant to California Rules of Court, rules 3.810 through 3.830, and Local Rules Chapter 2, Part 5. Unless otherwise stipulated, an Award of Arbitrator is not binding upon the parties provided that they file a timely Request for Trial De Novo pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.826. Upon the filing of a timely Request for Trial De Novo, the case will proceed to a Trial-Setting Conference. If no timely Request for Trial De Novo is filed, judgment based upon the Award of Arbitrator will be entered pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.827.

LIMITED CIVIL CASES

Arbitration may occur in a limited civil case under the following circumstances:

- When all parties stipulate to arbitration pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1141.12. A stipulation for arbitration shall be filed using the Court's local form, Stipulation and Order to Arbitration/Mediation – Limited Civil Cases form (CV/E-203). A Stipulation and Order to Arbitration/Mediation – Limited Civil Cases MUST be filed concurrently or subsequent to a Limited Civil Case Status Memorandum form (CV/E-202).
- When plaintiff elects to refer the case to judicial arbitration. A written election by the plaintiff to submit an action or proceeding to arbitration shall be filed using the Court's local form, Limited Civil Case Status Memorandum form (CV/E-202).

Additional Information

For additional information regarding the Court's ADR program, please go to the Court's website <http://www.saccourt.ca.gov>.