

COURT OF APPEAL – STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION ONE

DARRYL COTTON,
Plaintiff and Appellant

v.

LAWRENCE GERACI,
Defendant and Respondent.

DO80460

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

RE: Response to this Court’s 08/18/2022 request that Appellant address the appealability of the underlying denial of a motion to vacate a judgment that is void for enforcing an illegal contract when the motion was filed in an action in equity to have the void judgment set aside and not in the original proceeding (the Motion).

Dear Justice Judith McConnell:

I am submitting this response to your request to address the legal authority for this Court to assert jurisdiction to adjudicate my appeal of the denial of the Motion. The request by this Court references *statutory* grounds for the appeal. However, Appellant is seeking a *nonstatutory* appeal.

Factual Background. California Business & Professions Code § 26057, formerly § 19323, bars the ownership of a cannabis license by a party sanctioned for “unlicensed commercial cannabis activities” for three years from the date of their last sanction. In June 2015, Lawrence Geraci was last sanctioned for operating an illegal dispensary. In November 2016, I and Geraci reached an agreement for the sale of my real property (the “Property”) to Geraci that was subject to a single condition precedent – the approval by the City of San Diego of Geraci’s application for a cannabis Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) to operate a dispensary at the Property. Geraci filed for a CUP application at the Property in the name of his receptionist, Rebecca Berry. She falsely attested that she was the sole proposed owner of the CUP applied for. This violated numerous statutes, including Penal Code § 115 that makes it a felony to submit documents to a government agency with false statements. In March 2017, Geraci filed suit alleging breach of contract and seeking to force the sale of the Property to him (“Cotton I”). In August 2019, judgment was entered against me. In October 2019, Judge Joel Wohlfeil, presiding over Cotton I, denied my motion for new trial seeking to have the judgment set aside on the grounds it enforced

document received by the CA 4th District Court of Appeal Division 1.

an illegal contract. He found that I had waived the defense of illegality. I had not and it cannot be waived. (*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).) In February 2022, Judge James Mangione denied the underlying Motion finding that I “was not precluded” and “received an opportunity” to raise the issue of illegality before Judge Wohlfeil and therefore the judgment is not void. That was error. There is nothing I, Geraci, any third party or the Courts can do that can make Geraci’s ownership of a dispensary lawful in direct contradiction of BPC § 26057.¹ Also, his submission of a CUP application in the name of Berry violated Penal Code § 115 – a criminal felony violation. Therefore, the Cotton I judgment is void for enforcing an illegal contract and will always be void because the courts cannot grant relief in direct violation of the law and by judicial decree turn an illegal contract into a lawful contract.

Jurisdiction. The appeal set forth the following authority for this Court’s jurisdiction: “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). I believe there are at least two reasons why this Court should assert jurisdiction.

First, the language of a judgment governs its interpretation if the language is clear and explicit and involves no absurdity. (*Colvig v. RKO General, Inc.* (1965) 232 Cal.App.2d 56, 65.) The plain language of *Doe* provides the reasoning for a nonstatutory appeal from the denial of an order or judgment that gives effect to a void judgment, which is that it gives effect to a void judgment. The language in *Doe* does **not** limit the ability of a nonstatutory appeal to an order denying a motion filed **only** in the original action. The language clearly states

¹ See *Hunter v. Superior Court of Riverside County* (1939) 36 Cal.App.2d 100, 113 (“The legality or illegality of the judgment must be determined by the terms and provisions of section 1673 of the Civil Code. If the judgment comes within the inhibition of that section then it is to that extent void. ***There is nothing which the parties to the action could do which would in any way add to its validity.*** the contracts upon which the judgment is based are to that extent void, they cannot be ratified either by right, by conduct or by stipulation.”) (emphasis added).

that a void judgment may be attacked directly or “*collaterally*” at any time. Here, the order denying the Motion gives effect to a void judgment. The plain language of *Doe* governs and this Court has the “inherent power,” i.e., jurisdiction, to adjudicate the issue of illegality and reverse an order giving effect to a void judgment that enforces an illegal contract. A finding that this Court lacks jurisdiction requires that this Court interpret the language in a manner that contradicts the plain language of *Doe* because *Doe* allows an appeal from the denial of a motion in a *collateral* attack *before* judgment is entered. By definition, a collateral attack is not made in the original action and an appeal is allowed before entry of judgment. *As is exactly the case here.*

Further, to interpret the language in a manner that results in this Court declining to assert jurisdiction would lead to an absurd result. This Court would have jurisdiction to determine whether a judgment is enforcing an illegal contract had I filed the Motion in front of Judge Wohlfeil but it would not because I filed an action in equity that was randomly assigned to Judge Mangione? In other words, this Court would stop illegality based on the *exact* same facts and law if set forth in front of one judge but not another? That is on its face absurd.

Respectfully, in the absence of authority that contradicts the plain language of *Doe*, the plain language should govern. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a Facebook post I made in which I asked a group of 685 members, including many attorneys, for help finding case law to support my position or that contradicts it. None has been provided either way. The plain language of *Doe* should control.

Second, the Courts have the “*power and duty*” to not enforce illegal contracts. *Lewis & Queen v. N. M. Ball Sons* (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 141, 147-48. The evidence of illegality *is* before this Court and it has the power and duty to not give effect to an illegal contract by denying this appeal. Further, “a court has the power to conduct an independent investigation in order to determine whether it has been the victim of fraud.” (*Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.* (1991) 501 U.S. 32, 44.) Attached as Exhibit 2 is a list of eleven cases in which identical illegal contracts are being enforced by the courts. In other words, wealthy parties who acquired undisclosed interests in cannabis businesses. Their attorneys are deceiving the courts into ratifying those illegal contracts like they did against me. The Court should exercise its jurisdiction and investigate whether the courts have also been victimized by wealthy parties and their attorneys. To deny this appeal is to unjustly ignore my nearly six-year quest in search of justice seeking to prove the obvious – sanctioned parties cannot own state cannabis licenses not in their names.

Date: August 23, 2022

Darryl Cotton
Plaintiff and Appellant

Signature: _____

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Darryl Cotton', written over a horizontal line.



The VERY PUBLIC California City and County Regulations Watch

Public group · 685 members

+ Invite

Browse

Manage 1

Community home

Rooms

Discussion

Topics

Media

Files

People



Darryl Cotton

Admin · 5h ·

Are there any group member attorneys who can help me this? On 04/25/22 I filed a non-statutory interlocutory appeal of a lower court ruling in the 4th Appellate District Division 1 Court. What I'm appealing is how the current widespread practice of using **proxies**, as opposed to the undisclosed criminals who are actually behind them, submit cannabis license applications to local and state government agencies being a violation of law and the lower court refuses to accept that the law is being violated or even explain in their decisions how the practice they are upholding is somehow legal!

What I really need help finding is ANY case that supports my right to appeal a lower court decision where that decision granted a void judgment, an illegal contract, to stand. I have not found any controlling case law that exists to support that right but alternatively I have not found any case law that denies that right either. What I can cite is that anyone, including cannabis license applicants, their lawyers and/or their lobbyists who have or are engaging in the false filing of the applications is **guilty of a felony**. See CA Penal Code Section 115 @ <https://leginfo.ca.gov/.../codes...>

The COA gave me until today to file a letter brief that, in addition to the brief I've already filed with the COA @

https://151farmers.org/.../22-07-21_Appellant-Opening...

gives the court reason to allow my appeal to be heard without having to have a final judgment in the case. See the 08/18/22 COA Order to Cotton @ <https://151farmers.org/.../D080460-Order-081822...>

I would think the COA would want to correct the lower court ruling which allows this practice but if no case law exists which I can cite I am truly in a legal limbo that it appears only a higher court can remedy. Any assistance is greatly appreciated.

Appellate Courts Case Information

CALIFORNIA COURTS
THE JUDICIAL BRANCH OF CALIFORNIA

Welcome

Search

E-mail

Calendar

Help

Opinions

4th Appellate District Division 1

Change court

Case Summary

Docket

Briefs

Scheduled Actions

Disposition

Parties and Attorneys

Trial Court

Case Summary

Trial Court Case: 37-2022-00000023-CU-MC-CTL
Court of Appeal Case: D080460
Division:
Case Caption: Cotton v. Geraci
Case Type: CV
Filing Date: 04/25/2022
Completion Date:
Oral Argument Date/Time:

Cotton I -VII and Razuki I-IV: Parties, Counsel and Judges

Cotton I

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

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Wohlfeil	Darryl Cotton	Pro se	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; Elyssa Kulas; Scott Toothacre - Ferris & Britton
		Jason Thornton – Finch Thornton & Baird		Megan Lees
		Rishi Bhatt – Finch Thornton & Baird		
		Evan Schube – Tiffany & Bosco		
		Jacob Austin – Law Offices		
		Andrew Flores – Law Offices		
		JoEllen Baskett – Law Offices		

Cotton II

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

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Sturgeon	Darryl Cotton	David Demian – Finch Thornton & Baird	City of San Diego	Mara Elliott - City of San Diego City Attorney
		Rishi Bhatt – Finch Thornton & Baird		George Schaefer - City of San Diego Assistant City Attorney
		Adam Witt – Finch Thornton & Baird		M. Travis Phelps City of San Diego Deputy City Attorney
		Jason Thornton – Finch Thornton & Baird		Jana Will, City of San Diego Deputy City Attorney
				Michael Weinstein - Ferris & Britton

Cotton III

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

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Curiel	Darryl Cotton	Pro se & Jacob Austin-Law Offices	Lawrence AKA “Larry” Larry Geraci	James Crosby-Law Offices
Bashant			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	James Kjar, Jon Schwalbach, Gregory Emdee - Kjar, McKenna & Stockalper
			City of San Diego	M. Travis Phelps - Deputy City Attorney
			David Demian	Corinne Bertsche - Lewsi & Brisbois
			Cynthia Bashant	Carmela Duke - San Diego Superior Court
			Joel Wohlfeil	Carmela Duke - San Diego Superior Court
			Jessica McElfresh	Laura Stewart - Walsh McKean Furcolo LLP
			Interested Party	Katherine Parker, DOJ-USAO

Cotton IV

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

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Curiel	Darryl Cotton	Jacob Austin – Law Offices	Lawrence AKA “Larry” Larry Geraci	James Crosby
	Joe Hurtado	Jacob Austin – Law Offices	Rebecca Berry	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 V

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

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Sammartino	Andrew Flores	In Propria Persona	Gina M. Austin	
Bashant	Amy Sherlock	Andrew Flores – Law Offices	Austin Legal Group	
Sabraw	T.S. (Minor)	Andrew Flores – Law Offices	Joel R. Wohlfeil	Carmela Duke - Superior Court of California
Robinson	S.S. (Minor)	Andrew Flores – Law Offices	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
			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	
			Finch Thornton & Baird LLP	
			James D. Crosby	
			Abhay Schweitzer	
			James (AKA Jim) Bartell	
			Bartell & Associates	
			Matthew William Shapiro	
			Matthew W. Shapiro APC	
			Natalie Trang-My Nguyen	
			Aaron Magagna	
			A-M Industries	

Cotton V (Continued)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant 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 VI

Cotton v. Geraci: 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 se	Lawrence AKA “Larry” Larry Geraci	James Crosby – Law Offices
				Michael Weinstein – Ferris & Britton

Cotton VII

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	In Propria Persona	Lawrence AKA “Larry” Larry Geraci	James Crosby – Law Offices
	Amy Sherlock	Andrew Flores – Law Offices	Rebecca Berry	Michael Weinstein – Ferris & Britton
	T.S. (Minor)	Andrew Flores – Law Offices	Stephen Lake	Steven Wilson Blake - - Blake Law Firm
	S.S. (Minor)	Andrew Flores – Law Offices	Jessica McElfresh	Laura E. Stewart – Walsh McKean Furcolo LLP
	Christopher Williams	Andrew Flores – Law Offices	Finch Thornton & Baird LLP	
			Salam Razuki	
			Abhay Schweitzer	
			Ninus Malan	
			James Bartell	
			Bartell & Kwiatowski (Formerly Bartell & Associates)	
			Natalie Trang-My Nguyen	
			Bradford Harcourt	
			Logan Miller	
			Eulenthias Duane Alexander	
			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	
			Allied Spectrum Inc	
			Prodigious Collectives LLC	

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

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant 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 II***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 Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Sturgeon	Salam Razuki	John W. Zryd – Law Offices of John W. Zryd Esq	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 – Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			Sunrise Property Investments LLC	Douglas Jaffe – Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			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. Gorla - Gorla & Weber
			Heidi Rising	
			Sarah Razuki	Steven A. Elia - Elia Law Firm APC; Douglas Jaffe - Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			Matthew Razuki	Steven A. Elia - Elia Law Firm APC; Douglas Jaffe - Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			Marvin Razuki	Steven A. Elia - Elia Law Firm APC; Douglas Jaffe - Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			Razuki Investments LLC	James Joseph – Elia Law Firm APC
			RM Property Holders LLC	Douglas Jaffe – Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			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. Gorla - Gorla & Weber
			Melrose Place Inc	James Joseph – Elia Law Firm APC
			Lemon Grove Plaza LP	James Joseph – Elia Law Firm APC

Razuki II (Continued)

Judge	Plaintiff	Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
			Adam Knopf	
			Chris Hakim	Charles F. Gorla - Gorla & Weber; Gregory D. Hagen - Greg Hagen Law
			Goldn Bloom Ventures Inc	Douglas Jaffe – Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			G10 Galuppo Law (Intervenor)	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 Injury and Accident
			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	Douglas Jaffe - Douglas Jaffe Law Offices

Razuki III

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

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Gallo	United States of America	Derek Timothy Ko - USDOJ	Salam Razuki (1)	Dana M. Grimes, Thomas J. Warwick Jr., Jay Temple - Grimes & Warwick; Antonia F. Yoon - Kegel, Tobin & Truce
Bencivengo		Fred A. Shepard - USDOJ	Sylvia Gonzales (2)	Brian P. Funk - Law Offices of Brian P. Funk
		Shital Thakkar - USDOJ	Elizabeth Juarez (3)	Allen Robert Bloom - Allen Bloom Law Offices

Razuki IV

Ninus Malan v. Salam Rakuki et al; Case No 27-2019-00041260 (Total Docket Entries as of 08/05/22: 77)

Judge	Plaintiff	Plaintiff Counsel	Defendant – Cross Defendant	Defendant Counsel
Frazier	Ninus Malan	John Gomez: Jessica Sizemore – Gomez Law	Salam Razuki	
			Marvin Razuki	
			Sarah Razuki	
			Matthew Razuki	
			Razuki Investments	
			SH Westpoint Group LLC	
			San Diego Private Investments LLC	
			Sunrise Property Investments LLC	Douglas Jaffe - Douglas Jaffe Law Offices
			Super 5 Consulting Group LLC	Douglas Jaffe - Douglas Jaffe Law Offices

Razuki IV (Continued)

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

PROOF OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE (Court of Appeal)

Notice: This form may be used to provide proof that a document has been served in a proceeding in the Court of Appeal. Please read *Information Sheet for Proof of Service (Court of Appeal)* (form APP-009-INFO) before completing this form.

Case Name: Darryl Cotton vs. Larry Geraci

Court of Appeal Case Number: D080460

Superior Court Case Number: 37-2022-00000023-CU-MC-CTL

1. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age.
 2. a. My ☐ residence ☒ business address is (specify):
6176 Federal Boulevard, San Diego, CA. 92114
 - b. My electronic service address is (specify): 151DarrylCotton@gmail.com
 3. I electronically served the following documents (exact titles):
Appellant's Letter Brief Response to the Courts 08/18/2022 Request that Appellant Address Appealability.
 4. I electronically served the documents listed in 3. as follows:
 - a. Name of person served: James D. Crosby
On behalf of (name or names of parties represented, if person served is an attorney):
Lawrence Geraci
 - b. Electronic service address of person served: Crosby@CrosbyAttorney.com
 - c. On (date): 08/23/2022
- ☒ The documents listed in 3. were served electronically on the persons and in the manner described in an attachment (write "APP-009E, Item 4" at the top of the page).

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: August 23, 2022

Darryl Cotton

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS FORM)



(SIGNATURE OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS FORM)