# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DARRYL COTTON, PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT/PETITIONER

v.

LAWRENCE GERACI, DEFENDANT and RESPONDENT

AFTER an ORDER DISMISSING an APPEAL ON THE GROUND THAT IT IS TAKEN FROM A NON-APPEALABLE ORDER ENTERED ON SEPTEMBER 6, 2022 FOURTH DISTRICT, DIVISION ONE, Case NO. D080460

On APPEAL FROM
THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CENTRAL DIVISION
Case No. 37-2022-00000023-CU-MC-CTL
THE HONORABLE JAMES A. MANGIONE

### **PETITION FOR REVIEW**

DARRYL COTTON, PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT/PETITIONER IN PRO PER

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	2
ISSUE PRESENTED	3
NECESSITY FOR REVIEW	3
STATEMENT OF CASE AND FACTS	7
ARGUMENT	8
CONCLUSION	10

### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

## **Supreme Court Opinions**

Bostock v. Clayton Cty., (2020) 140 S. Ct. 1731	6
California State Opinions	
City Lincoln-Mercury Co. v. Lindsey (1959) 52 Cal.2d 267	4, 8
Colvig v. RKO Gen., (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 56	6
Doe v. Regents of University of California (2022) 80 Cal.App.5th 282	passim
Lewis & Queen v. N. M. Ball Sons (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 141	4, 8
OC Interior Servs., LLC v. Nationstar Mortg., LLC (2017) 7 Cal. App. 5th 1318	4, 8
Wong v. Tenneco (1985) 39 Cal.3d 126	8-10

#### **ISSUES PRESENTED**

- 1. Does the Court of Appeal have jurisdiction to entertain a nonstatutory appeal from the denial of a motion to vacate a judgment alleged to be void for enforcing an illegal contract rendered on the grounds the defense of illegality had been waived when the motion was filed in an independent action in equity and not in the original proceeding before the rendering judge?
- 2. Is there ever a time a Court of Appeal is presented with facts that establish illegal contracts are being enforced at the trial court level and can, for whatever reason, allow the continued criminal behavior to proceed?

#### **NECESSITY FOR REVIEW**

"A judgment that is void on the face of the record is subject to either direct or collateral attack at any time." (*OC Interior Servs., LLC v. Nationstar Mortg., LLC*, 7 Cal. App. 5th 1318, 1327 (2017) (*OC Interior*).) "[A] judgment that is valid on the face of the record must be challenged by direct attack, such as a motion in the original action, an appeal in the original action, or an *independent equitable action*." (*Id.* at 1328 (emphasis added).)

A judgment absolutely void may be attacked anywhere, directly or collaterally whenever it presents itself, either by parties or strangers. It is simply a nullity, and can be neither a basis nor evidence of any right whatever. A void judgment [or order] is, in legal effect, no judgment. By it no rights are divested. From it no rights can be obtained. Being *worthless* in itself, all proceedings founded upon it are *equally worthless*. It neither binds nor bars anyone.

(Id. at 1330 (cleaned up, emphasis added, brackets in original).)

A void order or judgment may be directly or collaterally attacked at any time. Even when relief is not available under a statute, the court retains inherent power to vacate void orders. The general rule is that nonstatutory motions to vacate are not appealable, but an exception applies when the appellant alleges that the underlying order or judgment is void. The justification for this exception is that if an order or judgment is void, an order denying a motion to vacate that order or judgment is also void and appealable because it gives effect to a void judgment.

Doe v. Regents of University of California (2022) 80 Cal.App.5th 282, 292 (citations omitted).

The plain language of *OC Interior* makes it clear that a void judgment is "worthless" and cannot serve to grant or bar any party any right. And it can be attacked directly or collaterally by anyone, anywhere. The plain language of *Doe* is that a nonstatutory appeal will lie from the denial of a motion to vacate a void judgment because an "order denying a motion to vacate that order or judgment is also void and appealable because it gives effect to a void judgment." (*Id.*) There is nothing complicated about this plain language and it makes sense. If an error happens, such as a trial judge enforcing an illegal contract and ratifying criminal activity, that judgment or order is "worthless" and must be vacated.

Here, petitioner Darryl Cotton alleges the original judgment is void for, *inter alia*, enforcing an illegal contract in violation of California's cannabis licensing statutes and numerous penal statutes. The rendering judge, Joel Wohlfeil, rendered the judgment on the grounds that Cotton had waived the defense of illegality and therefore an illegal contract can be turned into a lawful enforceable contract – this is not the law. (*See*, *e.g.*, *Lewis & Queen v. N. M. Ball Sons* (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 141, 147-48); *City Lincoln-Mercury Co. v. Lindsey* (1959) 52 Cal.2d 267, 274 ("A party to an illegal contract cannot ratify it, cannot be estopped from relying on the illegality, and *cannot waive his right* to urge that defense." (emphasis added).)

So, among other things, Cotton filed a motion to vacate a void judgment in a direct attack via an independent action in equity. As the plain

language of *OC Interior* states is proper for a judgment whether void on its face or not. Judge James Mangione denied the motion to vacate finding the judgment is not void because Cotton "was not precluded" from raising the evidence and arguments of illegality before Judge Wohlfeil. In other words, that the defense of illegality can be waived. This is not the law either. If this was the law, the concept of void judgments would not exist and the law would allow the enforcement of illegal contracts so long as the original judge made a mistake. This is nonsensical.

Cotton appealed. The Court of Appeals dismissed Cotton's appeal. The Court of Appeals found that because apparently no one in the legal history of California has ever appealed the denial of a motion to vacate a void judgment filed in an independent action in equity, as opposed to filing the motion to vacate in the original action, that the appeal was not actually appealable. This makes no sense either. A judgment is either void or it is not.

Pursuant to the plain language of *Doe*, the denial of a motion to vacate a judgment absolutely void for enforcing an illegal contract is appealable as a nonstatutory appeal. There is no limiting language in *Doe*, or any other case dealing with void judgments, that allows a Court of Appeal to give effect to a void judgment that enforces criminal activity on the procedural grounds that Cotton was required to bring the motion to vacate before the original rendering judge (why would any party go before the same judge who already held the defense of illegality can be waived and whose granting of the motion would mean he has to overturn himself and state he made an egregious and judicially embarrassing mistake?). This is contrary to the plain language of *OC Interior* and *Doe*.

This Supreme Court should grant this petition for review because it represents two important questions of law. First, does a party have to file a motion to vacate a void judgment before the rendering judge in order to have

the right to a nonstatutory appeal? In other words, does a party lose this right, in contradiction of the plain language of case law of *Doe*, if they file a new complaint in equity to have the void judgment vacated as *OC Interior* states is an appropriate procedure for vacating a void judgment?

Second, is there *ever* a substantive or procedural reason pursuant to which a Court of Appeal may decline to entertain an appeal that alleges the trial court has and is enforcing criminal activity based on undisputed judicially noticeable facts? Does this not violate the "duty" of every Court to prevent illegal and criminal activity?

The answer should be "no" to both questions. There is no factual or legal basis to hold otherwise. That would be contrary to the very existence for which the *justice* system exists. In plain words, that would mean that Courts can ratify illegal/criminal activity indirectly by failing to adjudicate an appeal from an order that gives effect to a void judgment that ratifies criminal activity. Should an appellant make such allegations and the Court of Appeals find the facts and law do not establish same, then the proper remedy should be sanctions, not the refusal to entertain such serious allegations that undermine respect for the law and the judiciaries.

This case is a perfect example of the reasoning for why a nonstatutory right to appeal exists in the first place. If the trial court makes an error and enforces a judgment void for enforcing a criminally illegal contract in an issue that concerns the public (e.g., the issuance of cannabis licenses to parties prohibited from owning them for operating illegal cannabis dispensaries), the Court of Appeals has the jurisdiction, responsibility, and duty to rectify that error.

#### STATEMENT OF CASE AND FACTS

On January 3, 2022, Cotton filed the underlying complaint in equity and motion seeking to vacate the void judgment rendered by Judge Wohlfeil. On February 10, 2022, Geraci filed his opposition and did *not* argue that the defense of illegality could be waived or that his ownership of a cannabis permit or license is lawful. On February 28, 2022, the notice of ruling denying the motion to vacate was filed. Judge James Mangione's order denying the motion to vacate the judgment states:

Plaintiff was not precluded from presenting his illegality argument to the court. Plaintiff argues that the judgment is void because it is based on an illegal contract. However, he received the opportunity to present this argument in a fair, adversarial proceeding. Consequently, relief is not available pursuant to a direct attack against the judgment via independent action. Furthermore, the judgment is not void on its face such that it should be set aside pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure§ 473(d).

On February 28, 2022, Cotton appealed. On August 18, 2022, the Court of Appeal requested that Cotton address the appealability of the underlying denial of a motion to vacate the judgment Cotton alleges is void for enforcing an illegal contract when Cotton filed the motion to vacate in a direct attack via an independent action in equity and not in the original proceeding before Judge Wohlfeil. On August 23, 2022, Cotton replied that the plain language of *Doe* applies. Further, that the Court of Appeal has the "power and duty" to not enforce illegal contracts irrespective of how the evidence and arguments of illegality were presented to it.

The Court of Appeal dismissed Cotton's case on September 6, 2022, on the grounds that Cotton "has provided no authority to support the proposition that an order denying a motion to set aside a judgment is appealable where the motion was filed in a collateral action. There is no appealable order or judgment in the instant case (*Cotton v. Geraci*, Case No. 37-2022-00000023), which appellant initiated to collaterally attack the judgment in the prior case (*Geraci v. Cotton*, Case No. 37-2017-00010073)." (Exhibit 1.) In other words, the absence of any judge in the

history of California failing to vacate a judgment that enforces an illegal contract on the grounds the defense of illegality had been waived is the basis for finding that I do not have the right to a nonstatutory right of appeal despite the plain language of *Doe*. Cotton submits no judge in the history of California has ever thought that it was possible that the defense of illegality can be waived and enforce an illegal contract and compensate a litigant for criminal acts taken. That violates the most settled principle of law – criminals can't effectuate their criminal schemes via the judiciary. (*Wong v. Tenneco* (1985) 39 Cal.3d 126, 135 ("*No principle of law is better settled than that a party to an illegal contract cannot come into a court of law and ask to have his illegal objects carried out.") (emphasis added).)* 

#### **ARGUMENT**

"The interpretation of a judgment, insofar as its meaning is concerned, is governed by the same rules which apply in ascertaining the meaning of any other writing." (*Colvig v. RKO Gen.*, 232 Cal. App. 2d 56, 65 (1965).) "It is the general rule that the language of a writing governs its interpretation, if the language is clear and explicit, and does not involve an absurdity." (*Id.*) In *Bostock*, the United States Supreme Court recently, powerfully and concisely, emphasized the need for judges to follow the plain language of the law, which here would apply to the *Doe* language that constitutes *case law*: "This Court has explained many times over many years that, when the meaning of the statute's terms is plain, our job is at an end. The people are entitled to rely on the law as written, without fearing that courts might disregard its plain terms based on some extratextual consideration." (*Bostock v. Clayton Cty.*, 140 S. Ct. 1731, 1749 (2020) (emphasis added); *id.* at 1737.)

Here, the plain language of *Doe* establishes Cotton's right to a nonstatutory appeal when he alleges the underlying judgment is void for enforcing an illegal contract. (*See Doe*, 80 Cal.App.5th at 292.) Cotton has limited legal research capability, but he assumes that the law understands that 'the absence of proof

is not proof of absence.' The fact that no one in the history of California's jurisprudence has ever appealed the denial of a motion to vacate a void judgment filed in an independent action in equity to have the void judgment vacated does not mean that the plain language of *Doe* should be ignored. And *OC Interior* makes it clear that a void judgment is "worthless." The plain language of *Doe* applies, as well as the underlying reasoning. As well as the reasoning of *Wong* - criminals should not be able in any situation to have their illegal contracts and violations of law performed thereunder judicially ratified - even if only by delay of the declaration of their illegal acts.

Cotton's research has failed to discover a *single* case in which a judge, like Judge Wohlfeil, had held the defense of illegality can be waived and ordered that a litigant be compensated for damages and costs incurred in pursuit of the performance of an illegal contract – this is contrary to the most basic principle of law as set forth in *Wong*. (*Wong*, 39 Cal.3d at 135.) And that is because that is not the law; the defense of illegality cannot be waived. (*See*, *e.g.*, *Lewis & Queen*, 48 Cal. 2d at 147-48); *City Lincoln-Mercury Co.*, 52 Cal.2d at 274.) Neither has any judge who was presented the facts and law, as Judge Mangione was, ratified, validated, and given effect to a judgment that enforces an illegal contract on the grounds the defense of illegality can and had been waived and turn an illegal contract into a lawful contract in violation of numerous penal statutes and public policies. (*See id.*)

The Court of Appeals has the "power" and "duty" to correct the trial courts' errors when they enforces and validate a judgment void for enforcing an illegal contract rendered on the grounds the defense of illegality, based on the violations of penal statutes and public policies, has been waived. (*See id.*) To hold otherwise means criminal activity *can* be judicially ratified and criminal actors *can* be allowed time to take steps to unlawfully mitigate their

legal and financial liability, or avoid it altogether, by, *inter alia*, destroying evidence and intimidating witnesses.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It has been over 5 ½ years since Cotton has been attempting to expose the illegal actions taken here. Illegal acts that are being ratified in at least 11 actions before the state and federal courts. (See Exhibit 2.) However, Cotton understands the issue before this Court is the procedural issue of whether Cotton can appeal the denial of his motion to vacate in what is according to the Court of Appeals a matter of first impression. However, should this Court desire additional briefing on the substantive issue of illegality, Cotton would be happy to address any questions and concerns this Court may have in deciding whether to grant this petition for review.

DATED: October 16, 2022

Darryl Cotton

Pro Se litigant

#### WORD COUNT CERTIFICATION

This brief contains 13-point font in Times New Roman typeface, and contains 2,519 words as counted by Microsoft Word, the word processing software used to generate this petition.

DATED: October 16, 2022

Darryl Cotton

Pro Se litigant

By:

# EXHIBIT-1

#### COURT OF APPEAL - STATE OF CALIFORNIA

#### FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

**DIVISION ONE** 

Court of Appeal Fourth Appellate District

FILED ELECTRONICALLY

09/06/2022

Kevin J. Lane, Clerk By: Alissa Galvez

DARRYL COTTON, Plaintiff and Appellant, v.

٧.

LAWRENCE GERACI, Defendant and Respondent.

D080460

San Diego County Super. Ct. No. 37-2022-00000023-CU-MC-CTL

#### THE COURT:

Appellant filed a letter brief in response to this court's August 18, 2022 order. Appellant argues, as he did in his opening brief, that the order denying appellant's ex parte application to set aside the judgment in the prior case (*Geraci v. Cotton*, Case No. 37-2017-00010073) is appealable because while nonstatutory motions to vacate are not appealable, "an exception applies when the appellant alleges that the underlying order or judgment is void." (*Doe v. Regents of University of California* (2022) 80 Cal.App.5th 282, 289 (*Doe*).) In *Doe*, however, the party who sought to vacate the judgment filed her motion in the same action in which the judgment was entered. (See *id.* at p. 289.)

Appellant argues *Doe* does not limit the appeals of orders denying motions to vacate a void judgment to those motions filed only in the original action, because "a void order or judgment may be directly or collaterally attacked at any time." However, appellant has provided no authority to support the proposition that an order denying a motion to set aside a judgment is appealable where the motion was filed in a collateral action. There is no appealable order or judgment in the instant case (*Cotton v. Geraci*, Case No. 37-2022-00000023), which appellant initiated to collaterally attack the judgment in the prior case (*Geraci v. Cotton*, Case No. 37-2017-00010073).

The matter having been considered by Presiding Justice McConnell and Associate Justices Huffman and Aaron, the appeal is DISMISSED on the ground that it is taken from a nonappealable order.

**MCCONNELL** 

**Presiding Justice** 

KEVIN J. LANE, Clerk of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, State of California, does hereby Certify that the preceding is a true and correct copy of the Original of this document/order/opinion filed in this Court, as shown by the records of my office.

WITNESS, my hand and the Seal of this Court.



cc: All Parties

# EXHIBIT-2

#### STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF COTTON RELATED CASES

A total of 11 related actions were filed in San Diego – 7 were filed in the San Diego County Superior Court, and 4 were filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

#### SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

#### **State Related Cases**

A total of 7 related cases were filed in this court, and an appeal was taken from one of these cases. The Register of Actions entries for these 7 cases total 3,860.

#### **Judges**

Four different judges presided over the 7 related cases:

- The Hon. Eddie Sturgeon (3 cases)
- The Hon. Joel R. Wohlfeil (1 case)
- The Hon. Ronald F. Frazier (1 case)
- The Hon. James A. Mangione (2 cases)

#### **Parties**

A total of 69 parties were named in these related cases – 10 Plaintiffs and 59 Defendants/Cross-Defendants

- Plaintiffs Out of the 10 Plaintiffs, 1 was a Plaintiff in 3 cases, 1 was a Plaintiff in 2 cases, and the remaining 8 each were Plaintiffs in 1 case.
- Defendants/Cross-Defendants Out of the 59 Defendants/Cross-Defendants, 4 were Defendants/Cross-Defendants in 3 cases, 16 were Defendants/Cross-Defendants in 2 cases, and the remaining 39 each were Defendants/Cross-Defendants in 1 case.

#### **Additional Parties**

There were 5 additional parties which include:

- 2 Real Parties in Interest
- 1 Intervenor
- 1 Appellant Intervenor
- 1 Appellate Respondent

#### **Counsel for the Parties**

- Plaintiffs' Counsel Out of the 10 Plaintiffs, 1 Plaintiff was self-represented in 4 cases, and 11 were represented by attorneys from 8 firms, with 1 firm representing 3 Plaintiffs and 3 firms each representing 2 Plaintiffs.
- Defendants'/Cross-Defendants' Counsel The 59 Defendants/Cross-Defendants were represented by 24 attorneys from 16 firms, 1 firm representing 9 Defendants/Cross-Defendants, 1 firm representing 6 Defendants/Cross-Defendants, 2 firms representing 5 Defendants/Cross-Defendants, 1 firm representing 4 Defendants/Cross-Defendants, and 3 firms representing 3 Defendants/Cross-Defendants.
- Counsel for 2 Real Parties in Interest 1 firm/attorney
- Counsel for Intervenor 1 firm/attorney
- Appellant Intervenor –1 firm/attorney
- Appellate Respondent 1 firm/attorney

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### **Federal Related Cases**

A total of 4 related cases were filed in this court. The Docket entries for these 7 cases total 268.

#### **District and Magistrate Judges**

Eight different judges presided over the 4 related cases:

- The Hon. Gonzalo P. Curiel (2 cases)
- The Hon. Cynthia A. Bashant (2 cases)
- The Hon. Todd W. Robinson (2 cases)
- The Hon. Jinsook Ohta (2 cases)
- The Hon. Janis L. Sammartino
- The Hon. Jinsook Ohta
- The Hon Cathy Ann Bencivengo
- The Hon. William V. Gallo

#### **Parties**

A total of 45 parties were named in these cases – 7 Plaintiffs and 38 Defendants/Cross-Defendants.

- Plaintiffs Out of the 7 named Plaintiffs, 1 Plaintiff was self-represented in 2 cases, and one was a Plaintiff in 2 cases, and the remaining 5 each were Plaintiffs in 1 case.
- Defendants/Cross-Defendants Out of the 38 named Defendants/Cross-Defendants in these cases, 2 were Defendants/Cross-Defendants in 5 cases, 1 was a Defendant/Cross-Defendant in 4 cases, 5 were Defendants/Cross-Defendants in 3 cases, 2 were Defendants/Cross-Defendants in 2 cases, and the remaining 28 each were Defendants/Cross-Defendants in 1 case.

#### **Additional Parties**

There was 1 Real Party in Interest in 1 case.

#### **Counsel for the Parties**

- Plaintiffs' Counsel Out of the 7 Plaintiffs, 2 Plaintiffs each were self-represented in 2 cases, 3 Plaintiffs were represented by the same firm, and the remaining 2 Plaintiffs also were represented by the same firm.
- Defendants'/Cross-Defendants' Counsel The 38 Defendants/Cross-Defendants were represented by 20 attorneys from 12 firms, 2 firms each representing 4 Defendants/Cross-Defendants, and 3 each firms representing 3 Defendants/Cross-Defendants.
- Counsel for Real Party in Interest 1 attorney from DOJ/Office of the US Attorney.

# Cotton Cases 1 -7 and Razuki Cases 1 - 5: Summary of Actions, Judges, Parties and Counsel

#### Cotton Case 1

Cotton v. Geraci, et al. – Case No. 37-2017-00010073-CU-BC-CTL (Total Docket Entries as of 07/29/20: 727)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff's Counsel	Defendants/Cross Defendants	Defense Counsel
Wohlfeil	Darryl Cotton	Pro Per	Lawrence aka "Larry" Larry Geraci	Gina M. Austin, Arden Anderson – Austin Legal Group
		David Demian – Finch Thornton & Baird	Rebecca Berry (Cross Defendant)	Julia Dalzell – Pettit, Kohn, Ingrassia & Lutz PC
		Adam Witt – Finch Thornton & Baird		Michael Weinstein – Ferris & Britton
		Jason Thornton – Finch Thornton & Baird		Elyssa Kulas - Ferris & Britton
		Rishi Bhatt – Finch Thornton & Baird		Scott Toothacre - Ferris & Britton
		Evan Schube – Tiffany & Bosco		Megan Lees
		Jacob Austin – Law Offices		
		Andrew Flores – Law Offices		
		JoEllen Baskett – Law Offices		

#### Cotton Case 2

Cotton v. City of San Diego, et al. - Case No. 37-2017-00037675-CU-WM-CTL (Total Docket Entries as of 11/06/18: 109)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff's Counsel	Defendants/Cross-Defendants	Defense Counsel
Sturgeon	Darryl Cotton	David Demian – Finch Thornton & Baird	City of San Diego	San Diego Office of the City Attorney - Mara Elliott, George Schaefer, M. Travis Phelps, Jana Will
		Rishi Bhatt – Finch Thornton & Baird	Rebecca Berry - Real Party in Interest	Michael Weinstein – Ferris & Britton
		Adam Witt – Finch Thornton & Baird	Larry Geraci – Real Party in Interest	Michael Weinstein - Ferris & Britton
		Jason Thornton – Finch Thornton & Baird		

#### Cotton 3

Cotton v. Geraci, et al. - Case No. 18CV0325-GPC-MDD (Total Docket Entries as of 05/20/22: 116)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff's Counsel	Defendants/Cross-Defendants	Defense Counsel
Curiel	Darryl Cotton	Pro Per	Lawrence aka "Larry" Larry Geraci	James Crosby – Law Offices
Bashant		Law Office of Jacob Austin	Rebecca Berry	James Crosby – Law Offices
Robinson			Gina Austin	Douglas Pettit; Julia Dalzell; Michelle Bains – Pettit, Kohn, Ingrassia, Lutz & Dolin
Ohta			Austin Legal Group	Douglas Pettit; Julia Dalzell; Michelle Bains – Pettit, Kohn, Ingrassia, Lutz & Dolin
			Michael Weinstein	James Kjar, Jon Schwalbach, Gregory Emdee – Kjar, McKenna & Stockalper
			Scott Toothacre	James Kjar, Jon Schwalbach, Gregory Emdee – Kjar, McKenna & Stockalper
			Ferris & Britton, APC	James Kjar, Jon Schwalbach, Gregory Emdee– Kjar, McKenna & Stockalper
			City of San Diego	M. Travis Phelps – Deputy City Attorney
			David Demian	Corinne Bertsche – Lewis & Brisbois
			Cynthia Bashant	Carmela Duke – San Diego Superior Court
			Joel Wohlfieil	Carmela Duke – San Diego Superior Court
			Jessica McElfresh	Laura Stewart – Walsh McKean Furcolo LLP
			US DOJ/Office of US Atty - Interested Party	Katherine Parker – DOJ-OUSA

Cotton 4

Cotton and Hurtado v. Geraci, et al – Case No. 18CV027510GPC-MDD (Total Docket Entries as of 05/14/19: 33)

Judge	Plaintiffs	Plaintiffs' Counsel	Defendants/Cross-Defendants	Defense Counsel
Curiel	Darryl Cotton	Law Office of Jacob Austin	Lawrence aka "Larry" Larry Geraci	Law Office of James Crosby
	Joe Hurtado	Law Office of Jacob Austin	Rebecca Berry	Law Office of James Crosby
			Austin Legal Group	Douglas Pettit: Julia Dalzell – Pettit, Kohn Ingrassia, Lutz & Dolin
			Ferris & Britton APC	Eric R. Deitz, Tatiana Dupuy – Gordon & Reese
			Michael Weinstein	Tatiana Dupuy – Gordon & Rees
			Scott Toothacre	Tatiana Dupuy – Gordon & Rees
			Finch Thornton & Baird	Kenneth Feldman, Tim J. Vanden Heuvel – Lewis & Brisbois
			David Demian	Kenneth Feldman, Tim J. Vanden Heuvel – Lewis & Brisbois
			Adam Witt	Kenneth Feldman, Tim J. Vanden Heuvel – Lewis & Brisbois

# Cotton 5 Flores, et al. v. Geraci, et al. – Case No. 20CV0656-JLS-LL (Total Docket Entries as of 06/21/22: 42)

Judge	Plaintiffs	Plaintiffs' Counsel	Defendants/Cross-Defendants	Defense Counsel
Sammartino	Andrew Flores	Pro Per	Gina M. Austin	
Bashant	Amy Sherlock	Law Office of Andrew Flores	Austin Legal Group	
Sabraw	T.S. (Minor)	Law Office of Andrew Flores	Joel R. Wohlfeil	Carmela Duke – Superior Court of California
Robinson	S.S. (Minor)	Law Office of Andrew Flores	Lawrence (aka Larry) Geraci	
Ohta			Tax & Liability Financial Center, Inc.	
			Rebecca Berry	
			Jessica McElfresh	
			Salam Razuki	
			Ninus Malan	
			Michael Robert Weinstein	Gregory B. Emdee, Jon R. Schwalbach – Kjar, McKenna & Stackalper Gregory B. Emdee, Jon R. Schwalbach – Kjar, McKenna & Stackalper
			Scott Toothacre	Gregory B. Emdee, Jon R. Schwalbach – Kjar, McKenna & Stackalper
			Elyssa Kulas	Gregory B. Emdee, Jon R. Schwalbach – Kjar, McKenna & Stackalper
			Rachel M. Prendergast	
			Ferris & Britton APC	Gregory B. Emdee, Jon R. Schwalbach – Kjar, McKenna & Stackalper
			David S. Demian	
			Adam C. Witt	
			Rishi S. Bhatt	V
			Finch Thornton & Baird LLP	<u> </u>
			James D. Crosby	
			Abhay Schweitzer	
			James (aka Jim) Bartell	Ŧ
			Bartell & Associates	<u>.</u>
			Matthew William Shapiro	Ţ
			Matthew W. Shapiro APC	
			Natalie Trang-My Nguyen	
			Aaron Magagna	
			A-M Industries	

#### Cotton 5 - CONTINUED

Judge	Plaintiffs	Plaintiff's Counsel	Defendants-Cross-Defendants	Defendants'-Cross-Defendants' Counsel
			Bradford Harcourt	
			Alan Claybon	
			Shawn Miller	
			Logan Stellmacher	
			Eulenthias Duane Alexander	
			Bianca Martinez	
			City of San Diego	
			2018FMO, LLC	
			Firouzeh Tirandazi	
			Stephen G. Cline	

#### Cotton 6

Cotton v. Geraci, et al. - Case No. 37-2022-00000023-CU-MC-CTL (Total Docket Entries as of 07/29/22: 80)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Mangione	Darryl Cotton	Pro Per	Lawrence AKA "Larry" Larry Geraci	Law Office of James Crosby
				Michael Weinstein – Ferris & Britton

#### Cotton 7

Sherlock, et al. v. Geraci, et al – Case No. 37-2021-00050889-CU-AT-CTL (Total Docket Entries as of 08/18/22: 97)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Mangione	Andrew Flores	Pro Per	Lawrence aka "Larry" Larry Geraci	Law Office of James Crosby
	Amy Sherlock	Law Office of Andrew Flores	Rebecca Berry	Michael Weinstein – Ferris & Britton
	T.S. (a Minor)	Law Office of Andrew Flores	Stephen Lake	Steven Wilson Blake – Blake Law Firm
	S.S. (a Minor)	Law Office of Andrew Flores	Jessica McElfresh	Laura E. Stewart – Walsh McKean Furcolo LLP
	Christopher Williams	Law Office of Andrew Flores	Finch Thornton & Baird LLP	Je
			Salam Razuki	ue ue
			Abhay Schweitzer	
			Ninus Malan	n,
			James Bartell	<u> </u>
			Bartell & Kwiatkowski (formerly Bartell & Associates)	, and the second
			Natalie Trang-My Nguyen	
			Bradford Harcourt	he
			Logan Miller	) t
			Eulenthias Duane Alexander	P
			Gina Austin	Douglas A. Pettit, Matthew C. Smith, Kayla R. Sealey – Pettit, Kohn, Ingrassia, Lutz & Dolin 🗂
			Austin Legal Group APC	Douglas A. Pettit, Matthew C. Smith, Kayla R. Sealey – Pettit, Kohn, Ingrassia, Lutz & Dolin 🕏
			Aaron Magagna	ei.
			Allied Spectrum Inc	
			Prodigious Collectives LLC	Ĭ.

Razuki 1

SDPCC & Harcourt v. Razuki, et al. – Case No. 37-2017-00020661-CU-CO-CTL (Total Docket Entries as of 08/08/22: 512)

Judge	Plaintiffs	Plaintiffs' Counsel	Defendants/Cross Defendants	Defense Counsel
Sturgeon	San Diego Patients Cooperative Corp. Inc	Alan Claybon, Mark Collier - Messner Reeves LLP	Razuki Investments LLC	David K. Demergian – Fitzmaurice, Demergian & Gagnon
	Amy Sherlock (Appellant)	Andrew Flores – Law Offices	Salam Razuki	Steven A. Elia – Elia Law Firm, Douglas Jaffe – Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
	Bradford Harcourt	Alan Claybon, Mark Collier – Messner Reeves LLP	Keith Henderson	Douglas Jaffe – Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			American Lending and Holdings LLC	David K. Demergian – Fitzmaurice, Demergian & Gagnon
			Balboa Ave. Cooperative	
			California Cannabis Group	Gina M. Austin; Ethan T. Boyer; Tamara M. Leetham – Austin Legal
				Group APC, Olga Y. Bryan – Ames Karanjia LLP
			Ninus Malan	David K. Demergian – Fitzmaurice, Demergian & Gagnon
			San Diego United Holdings Group LLC	David K. Demergian – Fitzmaurice, Demergian & Gagnon

Razuki 2

Salam Razuki v. Ninus Malan, et al. – Case No. 37-2018-00034229-CU-BC-CTL (Total Docket Entries as of 08/16/22: 2,258)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff's Counsel	Defendants/Cross Defendants	Defense Counsel
Sturgeon	Salam Razuki	Law Office of John W. Zryd	Ninus Malan	David K. Demergian - Fitamaurice & Demergian; James R. Lance, Genevieve M. Ruch – Noonan
				Lance Boyer & Banach LLP
			SH Westpoint Investments Group LLC	Steven A. Elia; Garret F. Groom; James Joseph – Elia Law Firm; Maura Griffin - Aljabi Law Firm
			Super 5 Consulting Group LLC	Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			Sunrise Property Investments LLC	Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			Stonecrest Plaza LLC	James Joseph – Elia Law Firm APC
			SoCal Building Ventures LLC	Paul A. Beck - Law Offices of Paul A. Beck APC
			Amy Sherlock (Appellant, Intervenor)	Andrew Flores – Law Offices
			SD United Holding Group LLC	Gina M. Austin-Austin Legal Group; Steven W. Galuppo; Daniel Watts- G10 Law; Louis A. Lance -
				Noonan Lance Boyer & Banach LLP
			SD Private Investments LLC	James Joseph – Elia Law Firm APC
			SD Building Ventures LLC	Paul A. Beck - Law Offices of Paul A. Beck APC
			SH Westpoint Group LLC	James Joseph – Elia Law Firm APC
			Roselle Properties LLC	Charles F. Goria - Goria & Weber
			Heidi Rising	$ar{S}$
			Sarah Razuki	Steven A. Elia - Elia Law Firm APC; Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			Matthew Razuki	Steven A. Elia - Elia Law Firm APC; Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			Marvin Razuki	Steven A. Elia - Elia Law Firm APC; Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			Razuki Investments LLC	James Joseph − Elia Law Firm APC 🛨
			RM Property Holders LLC	Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			Monarch Management Consulting Inc	Gina M. Austin – Austin Legal Group; Steven W. Blake – Blake Law Firm; James R. Lance; Genevieve
				M. Ruch – Noonan Lance Boyer & Banach LLP
			Mira Este Properties LLC	Charles F. Goria - Goria & Weber
			Melrose Place Inc	James Joseph – Elia Law Firm APC
			Lemon Grove Plaza LP	James Joseph – Elia Law Firm APC

nent re

#### Razuki 2 (CONTINUED)

Judge	Plaintiff	Counsel	Defendants/Cross-Defendants	Defense Counsel
			Adam Knopf	
			Chris Hakim	Charles F. Goria - Goria & Weber; Gregory D. Hagen - Greg Hagen Law
			Goldn Bloom Ventures Inc	Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			G10 Galuppo Law (Interventor)	Daniel Watts – G10 Law
			Matthew Freeman	
			Flip Management LLC	James R. Lance; Genevieve M. Ruch - Noonan, Lance, Boyer & Banach LLP
			Far West Management LLC	
			Michael Essary (Appeal Respondent)	Richardson Craig Griswold - Griswold Law APC
			El Cajon Investments Group	James Joseph - Jurewitz Law Group
			Devilish Delights Inc	Gina M. Austin – Austin Legal Group; Steven W. Blake – Blake Law Firm; James R. Lance, Genevieve M. Ruch – Noonan Lance Boyer & Banach LLP
			California Cannabis Group	Gina M. Austin – Austin Legal Group; Steven W. Blake – Blake Law Firm; James R. Lance, Genevieve M. Ruch – Noonan Lance Boyer & Banach LLP
			Balboa Ave Cooperative	Gina M. Austin – Austin Legal Group; Steven W. Blake – Blake Law Firm; James R. Lance, Genevieve M. Ruch – Noonan Lance Boyer & Banach LLP
			Alexis Bridgewater	
			American Lending & Holdings LLC	David K. Demergian – Fitzmaurice & Demergian; James R. Lance; Genevieve M. Ruch – Noonan Lance Boyer & Banach LLP
			Alternative Health Cooperative Inc	Law Office of Douglas Jaffe

#### Razuki 3 United States v. Salam Razuki, et al. - Case No. 18-mj-05915 (Terminated) - Reopened under 18-cr-05260 (Total Docket Entries as of 06/30/22: 77)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defense Counsel			
Gallo	United States of America	Derek Timothy Ko - USDOJ	Salam Razuki	Dana M. Grimes, Thomas J. Warwick Jr., Jay Temple – Grimes & Warwick; Antonia F. Yoon - Kegel, Tobin & Truce 🛨			
Bencivengo		Fred A. Shepard - USDOJ	Sylvia Gonzales	Brian P. Funk – Law Office of Brian P. Funk			
		Shital Thakkar - USDOJ	Elizabeth Juarez	Allen Robert Bloom – Law Office of Allen Bloom			
Razuki 4  Ninus Malan v. Salam Rakuki, et al. – Case No 27-2019-00041260 (Total Docket Entries as of 08/05/22: 77)							
Judge F	Plaintiff P	Plaintiff's Counsel	Defendants/Cross Defendants	Defense Counsel			

#### Razuki 4

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff's Counsel	Defendants/Cross Defendants	Defense Counsel
Frazier	Ninus Malan	John Gomez: Jessica Sizemore – Gomez Law	Salam Razuki	
			Marvin Razuki	
			Sarah Razuki	
			Matthew Razuki	7
			Razuki Investments	<b>7</b>
			SH Westpoint Group LLC	d
			San Diego Private Investments LLC	
			Sunrise Property Investments LLC	Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			Super 5 Consulting Group LLC	Douglas Jaffe – Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
		_	·	

#### Razuki 4 (Continued)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendants/Cross Defendants	Defense Counsel
			3407 E Street LLC	Douglas Jaffe - Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			Alternative Health Sunrise Inc	Douglas Jaffe - Law Office of Douglas Jaffe
			El Cajon Investments Group LLC	
			Goldn Bloom Ventures Inc	Douglas Jaffe - Law Office of Douglas Jaffe Law
			Sylvia Gonzales	
			Elizabeth Juarex	Michael Egenthal
			Lemon Grove Plaza LP	
			Melrose Place Inc	
			RM Property Holdings LLC	Douglas Jaffe - Law Office of Douglas Jaffe