

FERRIS & BRITTON
A Professional Corporation
Michael R. Weinstein (SBN 106464)
Scott H. Toothacre (SBN 146530)
501 West Broadway, Suite 1450
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 233-3131
Fax: (619) 232-9316
mweinstein@ferrisbritton.com
stoothacre@ferrisbritton.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
LARRY GERACI

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CENTRAL DIVISION

LARRY GERACI, an individual,
Plaintiff,

v.

DARRYL COTTON, an individual; and
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,
Defendants.

Case No. 37-2017-00010073-CU-BC-CTL

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. BREACH OF CONTRACT;**
- 2. BREACH OF THE COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING;**
- 3. SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE; and**
- 4. DECLARATORY RELIEF.**

Plaintiff, LARRY GERACI, alleges as follows:

1. Plaintiff, LARRY GERACI ("GERACI"), is, and at all times mentioned was, an individual residing within the County of San Diego, State of California.

2. Defendant, DARRYL COTTON ("COTTON"), is, and at all times mentioned was, an individual residing within the County of San Diego, State of California.

3. The real estate purchase and sale agreement entered into between Plaintiff GERACI and Defendant COTTON that is the subject of this action was entered into in San Diego County, California, and concerns real property located at 6176 Federal Blvd., City of San Diego, San Diego County, California (the "PROPERTY").

4. Currently, and at all times since approximately 1998, Defendant COTTON owned the PROPERTY.

5. Plaintiff GERACI does not know the true names or capacities of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20 and therefore sue such defendants by their fictitious names. Plaintiff is

1 informed and believe and based thereon allege that each of the fictitiously-named defendants is in some
2 way and manner responsible for the wrongful acts and occurrences herein alleged, and that damages as
3 herein alleged were proximately caused by their conduct. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend
4 this complaint to state the true names and/or capacities of such fictitiously-named defendants when the
5 same are ascertained.

6 6. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that at all times mentioned herein, each and
7 every defendant was the agent, employee, joint venture, partner, principal, predecessor, or successor in
8 interest and/or the alter ego of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the acts herein alleged,
9 were acting, whether individually or through their duly authorized agents and/or representatives, within
10 the scope and course of said agencies, service, employment, joint ventures, partnerships, corporate
11 structures and/or associations, whether actual or ostensible, with the express and/or implied knowledge,
12 permission, and consent of the remaining defendants, and each of them, and that said defendants
13 ratified and approved the acts of all of the other defendants.

14 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

15 7. On November 2, 2016, Plaintiff GERACI and Defendant COTTON entered into a
16 written agreement for the purchase and sale of the PROPERTY on the terms and conditions stated
17 therein. A true and correct copy of said written agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

18 8. On or about November 2, 2016, GERACI paid to COTTON \$10,000.00 good faith
19 earnest money to be applied to the sales price of \$800,000.00 and to remain in effect until the license,
20 known as a Conditional Use Permit or CUP is approved, all in accordance with the terms and
21 conditions of the written agreement.

22 9. Based upon and in reliance on the written agreement, Plaintiff GERACI has engaged
23 and continues to engage in efforts to obtain a CUP for a medical marijuana dispensary at the
24 PROPERTY, as contemplated by the parties and their written agreement. The CUP process is a long,
25 time-consuming process, which can take many months if not years to navigate. Plaintiff GERACI's
26 efforts include, but have not been limited to, hiring a consultant to coordinate the CUP efforts as well as
27 hiring an architect. Plaintiff GERACI estimates he has incurred expenses to date of more than
28 \$300,000.00 on the CUP process, all in reliance on the written agreement for the purchase and sale of

1 the PROPERTY to him by Defendant COTTON.

2 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **(For Breach of Contract against Defendant COTTON and DOES 1-5)**

4 10. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained in
5 paragraphs 1 through 9 above.

6 11. Defendant COTTON has anticipatorily breached the contract by stating that he will not
7 perform the written agreement according to its terms. Among other things, COTTON has stated that,
8 contrary to the written terms, the parties agreed to a down payment or earnest money in the amount of
9 \$50,000.00 and that he will not perform unless GERACI makes a further down payment. COTTON
10 has also stated that, contrary to the written terms, he is entitled to a 10% ownership interest in the
11 PROPERTY and that he will not perform unless GERACI transfers to him a 10% ownership interest.
12 COTTON has also threatened to contact the City of San Diego to sabotage the CUP process by
13 withdrawing his acknowledgment that GERACI has a right to possession or control of the PROPERTY
14 if GERACI will not accede to his additional terms and conditions and, on March 21, 2017, COTTON
15 made good on his threat when he contacted the City of San Diego and attempted to withdraw the CUP
16 application.

17 12. As result of Defendant COTTON's anticipatory breach, Plaintiff GERACI will suffer
18 damages in an amount according to proof or, alternatively, for return of all sums expended by GERACI
19 in reliance on the agreement, including but not limited to the estimated \$300,000.00 or more expended
20 to date on the CUP process for the PROPERTY.

21 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **(For Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing**

23 **against Defendant COTTON and DOES 1-5)**

24 13. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained in
25 paragraphs 1 through 12 above.

26 14. Each contract has implied in it a covenant of good faith and fair dealing that neither
27 party will undertake actions that, even if not a material breach, will deprive the other of the benefits of
28 the agreement. By having threatened to contact the City of San Diego to sabotage the CUP process by

1 withdrawing his acknowledgment that Plaintiff GERACI has a right to possession or control of the
2 PROPERTY if GERACI will not accede to his additional terms and conditions, Defendant COTTON
3 has breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

4 15. As result of Defendant COTTON's breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair
5 dealing, Plaintiff GERACI will suffer damages in an amount according to proof or, alternatively, for
6 return of all sums expended by GERACI in reliance on the agreement, including but not limited to the
7 estimated \$300,000.00 or more expended to date on the CUP process for the PROPERTY.

8 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(For Specific Performance against Defendants COTTON and DOES 1-5)**

10 16. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained in
11 paragraphs 1 through 15 above.

12 17. The aforementioned written agreement for the sale of the PROPERTY is a valid and
13 binding contract between Plaintiff GERACI and Defendant COTTON.

14 18. The aforementioned written agreement for the sale of the PROPERTY states the terms
15 and conditions of the agreement with sufficient fullness and clarity so that the agreement is susceptible
16 to specific performance.

17 19. The aforementioned written agreement for the purchase and sale of the PROPERTY is a
18 writing that satisfies the statute of frauds.

19 20. The aforementioned written agreement for the purchase and sale of the PROPERTY is
20 fair and equitable and is supported by adequate consideration.

21 21. Plaintiff GERACI has duly performed all of his obligations for which performance has
22 been required to date under the agreement. GERACI is ready and willing to perform his remaining
23 obligations under the agreement, namely: a) to continue with his good faith efforts to obtain a CUP for
24 a medical marijuana dispensary; and b) if he obtains CUP approval for a medical marijuana dispensary
25 thus satisfying that condition precedent, then to pay the remaining \$790,000.00 balance of the purchase
26 price.

27 22. Defendant COTTON is able to specifically perform his obligations under the contract,
28 namely: a) to not enter into any other contracts to sell or otherwise encumber the PROPERTY; and b) if

1 Plaintiff GERACI obtains CUP approval for a medical marijuana dispensary thus satisfying that
2 condition precedent, then to deliver title to the PROPERTY to GERACI or his assignee in exchange for
3 receipt of payment from GERACI or assignee of the remaining \$790,000.00 balance of the purchase
4 price.

5 23. Plaintiff GERACI has demanded that Defendant COTTON refrain from taking actions
6 that interfere with GERACI's attempt to obtain approval of a CUP for a medical marijuana dispensary
7 and to specifically perform the contract upon satisfaction of the condition that such approval is in fact
8 obtained.

9 24. Defendant COTTON has indicated that he has or will interfere with Plaintiff GERACI's
10 attempt to obtain approval of a CUP for a medical marijuana dispensary and that COTTON does not
11 intend to satisfy his obligations under the written agreement to deliver title to the PROPERTY upon
12 satisfaction of the condition that GERACI obtain approval of a CUP for a medical marijuana
13 dispensary and tender the remaining balance of the purchase price.

14 25. The aforementioned written agreement for the purchase and sale of the PROPERTY
15 constitutes a contract for the sale of real property and, thus, Plaintiff GERACI's lack of a plain, speedy,
16 and adequate legal remedy is presumed.

17 26. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff GERACI is entitled to an order and judgment thereon
18 specifically enforcing the written agreement for the purchase and sale of the PROPERTY from
19 Defendant COTTON to GERACI or his assignee in accordance with its terms and conditions.

20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **(For Declaratory Relief against Defendants COTTON and DOES 1-5)**

22 27. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained in
23 paragraphs 1 through 14 above.

24 28. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Defendant COTTON, on the
25 one hand, and Plaintiff GERACI, on the other hand, in that COTTON contends that the written
26 agreement contains terms and condition that conflict with or are in addition to the terms stated in the
27 written agreement. GERACI disputes those conflicting or additional contract terms.

1 29. Plaintiff GERACI desires a judicial determination of the terms and conditions of the
2 written agreement as well as of the rights, duties, and obligations of Plaintiff GERACI and defendants
3 thereunder in connection with the purchase and sale of the PROPERTY by COTTON to GERACI or
4 his assignee. Such a declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time so that each party may
5 ascertain their rights, duties, and obligations thereunder.

6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants as follows:

7 **On the First and Second Causes of Action:**

8 1. For compensatory damages in an amount in excess of \$300,000.00 according to proof at
9 trial.

10 **On the Third Cause of Action:**

11 2. For specific performance of the written agreement for the purchase and sale of the
12 PROPERTY according to its terms and conditions; and

13 3. If specific performance cannot be granted, then damages in an amount in excess of
14 \$300,000.00 according to proof at trial.

15 **On the Fourth Cause of Action:**

16 4. For declaratory relief in the form of a judicial determination of the terms and conditions
17 of the written agreement and the duties, rights and obligations of each party under the written
18 agreement.

19 **On all Causes of Action:**

20 5. For temporary and permanent injunctive relief as follows: that Defendants, and each of
21 them, and each of their respective directors, officers, representatives, agents, employees, attorneys, and
22 all persons acting in concert with or participating with them, directly or indirectly, be enjoined and
23 restrained from taking any action that interferes with Plaintiff GERACI' efforts to obtain approval of a
24 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a medical marijuana dispensary at the PROPERTY;

25 6. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

7. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: March 21, 2017

FERRIS & BRITTON,
A Professional Corporation

By: Michael R. Weinstein
Michael R. Weinstein
Scott H. Toothacre

Attorneys for Plaintiff
LARRY GERACI

EXHIBIT A

11/02/2016


Agreement between Larry Geraci or assignee and Darryl Cotton:

Darryl Cotton has agreed to sell the property located at 6176 Federal Blvd, CA for a sum of \$800,000.00 to Larry Geraci or assignee on the approval of a Marijuana Dispensary. (CUP for a dispensary)

Ten Thousand dollars (cash) has been given in good faith earnest money to be applied to the sales price of \$800,000.00 and to remain in effect until license is approved. Darryl Cotton has agreed to not enter into any other contacts on this property.



Larry Geraci



Darryl Cotton

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California

County of San Diego

On November 2, 2016 before me, Jessica Newell Notary Public
(insert name and title of the officer)

personally appeared Darryl Cotton and Larry Geraqi,
who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are
subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in
his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the
person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.



Signature

Jessica Newell

(Seal)