1	Cadmium Q. Eaglefeather (SBN 502981)				
2	EAGLEFEATHER LAW OFFICES 5678 Hollywood Blvd., Ste. D451 Los Angeles, CA 90027				
3					
4	(323) 555-1435 (866) 555-1147 fax				
5	cadmium@cqelaw.com				
6	Attorney for Plaintiff				
7					
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
10					
11	Tuivio Augustin dividually and an	Coop No. DCFFF1212			
12	Trixie Argon, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situ-	Case No. BC5551212			
13	ated persons,	Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and			
14	Plaintiff;	Motion to Compel Defendant MegaCorp to Produce Financial			
15		Records at Trial; Points &			
16	VS.	Authorities			
17	MegaCorp Inc., a California cor-	Complaint filed: June 9, 2013			
18	poration, and Does 1 through 100, inclusive,	Trial date: August 20, 2015			
19	•	Assigned for all purposes to			
20	Defendants.	Judge Jerry Blank, Dept. 1010, Central Civil Division			
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					

1	NOTICE OF MOTION			
2				
3	To all parties and their attorneys of record:			
4	You are hereby notified th	at at a date and time to be determined, in		
5	Dept. 1010 of the above-entitle	ed court, plaintiff Trixie Argon will move the		
6	Court for a motion to compel of	defendant MegaCorp to produce financial		
7	records she previously requested.			
8	This motion is made on the ground that Ms. Argon served MegaCorp			
9	with a valid notice to produce financial records at trial. Cal. Civ. Proc. Code			
10	\S 1987(c), Cal. Civ. Code \S 3295(c). MegaCorp served objections and refused to			
11	comply.			
12	Ms. Argon's notice to produce seeks information directly relevant to			
13	her trial for punitive damages against MegaCorp. Therefore, the documents			
14	are material to Ms. Argon's case and there is good cause to order them to be			
15	produced. Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 1987(c).			
16	The motion will be based	The motion will be based on this notice, on the attached points and		
17	authorities, on the papers and records on file, and — if there is a hearing on			
18	this motion — on the evidence presented at the hearing.			
19				
20	November 19, 2015	EAGLEFEATHER LAW OFFICES		
21				
22		By:		
23		Cadmium Q. Eaglefeather		
24		Attorney for Plaintiff		
25				

26

1	POINTS & AUTHORITIES			
2				
3	Previously, the Court denied MegaCorp's motion for summary adjudication of			
4	Ms. Argon's claims for punitive damages. (Eaglefeather Decl. \P 1.) Ms. Argon			
5	served MegaCorp with a timely notice to produce financial records at trial.			
6	(Eaglefeather Decl. \P 2.) MegaCorp responded with boiler plate objections			
7	to Ms. Argon's requests and refused to produce any financial records.			
8	(Eaglefeather Decl. \P 3.) This motion seeks to compel MegaCorp to produce			
9	these records.			
10				
11	1. Ms. Argon is entitled to the financial records.			
12	Because this is a punitive-damages case, Ms. Argon is entitled to subpoena			
13	documents "to be available at the trial for the purpose of establishing the			
14	profits or financial condition" of MegaCorp. Cal. Civ. Code § 3295(c).			
15	Ms. Argon has a right to these records even without showing that there is			
16	a "substantial probability that [she] will prevail". Id. That's the rule for pretrial			
17	discovery of financial records, but not for records to be brought to trial. Id.			
18				
19	2. The financial records are material to Ms. Argon's case.			
20	If the jury finds MegaCorp liable for punitive damages, the jury may then			
21	consider "[e]vidence of profit and financial condition" of those defendants			
22	to determine the amount of punitive damages. Cal. Civ. Code $\S\S$ 3294(a) and			
23	3295(d); Nolin v. Nat'l Convenience Stores, Inc., 95 Cal. App. 3d 279, 288 (1979).			
24				
25				
26				

1	3. Ms. Argon will be prejudiced without the financial records,		
2	so there is good cause to compel their production.		
3	MegaCorp was ordered to stand trial on punitive damages. (Eaglefeather		
4	Decl. \P 4.) If the jury returns an initial verdict for punitive damages, Ms. Argon		
5	will need these financial records to prove the amount of punitive damages.		
6	MegaCorp cannot circumvent the trial by withholding evidence that the jury		
7	must consider. Cal. Civ. Code § 3295(d).		
8			
9	4. Conclusion		
10	For these reasons, Ms. Argon asks that the Court order MegaCorp to		
11	produce the requested financial records.		
12			
13	November 19, 2015	EAGLEFEATHER LAW OFFICES	
14			
15		By:	
16		Cadmium Q. Eaglefeather	
17		Attorney for Plaintiff	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

To: Cadmium Q. Eaglefeather

From: Trixie Argon

Date: 10 September 2015

Re: Cause of action for malicious prosecution

Malicious prosecution has three elements that must be pleaded and proved:

- 1) the defendant commenced a judicial proceeding against the plaintiff;
- 2) the original proceeding was "initiated with malice" and "without probable cause"; and
- 3) the proceeding was "pursued to a legal termination in [the plaintiff's] favor."

Bertero v. National General Corp., 13 Cal. 3d 43, 50 (1974).

1. Commencement of judicial proceeding

Any civil proceeding where the plaintiff seeks affirmative relief may be the basis of a malicious-prosecution claim. The original plaintiff does not need to personally sign the complaint. If the plaintiff is "actively instrumental" or the "proximate and efficient cause" of the action, the plaintiff may be liable. Jacques Interiors v. Petrak, 188 Cal. App. 3d 1363, 1372 (1987).

2. Initiated without probable cause and with malice

The malicious-prosecution plaintiff must establish both malice and lack of probable cause by the defendant in the underlying action.

In a malicious-prosecution action against an attorney in a civil suit, the standard for probable cause is whether a reasonable attorney would have thought the underlying claim was tenable at the time the original complaint was filed. Sheldon Appel Co. v. Albert & Oliker, 47 Cal. 3d 863, 885–86 (1989). An attorney may be liable for continuing to prosecute a claim after

they discover the action lacks probable cause, even if there was probable cause at the outset. Zamos v. Stroud, 32 Cal. 4th 958, 970 (2004).

The adequacy of an attorney's research is not relevant, because probable cause relies on an objective standard of reasonableness. But if the court finds no probable cause, the thoroughness of the attorney's research may apply to showing malice. Sheldon Appel Co., 47 Cal. 3d at 875.

The showing of malice requires evidence of "ill will or some improper purpose," ranging "anywhere from open hostility to indifference." Grindle v. Lorbeer, 196 Cal. App. 3d 1461, 1465 (1987). Malice may be inferred from lack of probable cause if the party's behavior was clearly unreasonable. However, this is not an automatic inference. Grindle, 196 Cal. App. 3d at 1468 ("Negligence does not equate with malice"). As above, failure by an attorney to conduct an adequate investigation may be evidence of "indifference" suggesting malice.

3. Favorable termination

Malicious prosecution requires that the underlying complaint to have been terminated in favor of the malicious-prosecution plaintiff. This means that a defendant cannot make a malicious-prosecution counterclaim as a "defense" to a complaint that appears to be malicious. Until the underlying complaint has been resolved, a malicious-prosecution claim cannot lie. Babb v. Superior Court, 3 Cal. 3d 841, 846-847 (1971). Thus, procedurally, the only option is to complete the underlying action, and then file a claim for malicious prosecution in a followon action.

"Termination" usually means the entry of judgment in favor of the malicious-prosecution plaintiff on a given claim. But any termination—for instance, deleting a claim from an amended complaint—is adequate basis for malicious prosecution. Whether the underlying claim may be revived (e.g., on appeal) is not relevant for malicious prosecution. As long as it's been judicially terminated once, it's fair game.

4. Defenses

The plaintiff in a malicious-prosecution action may still be barred from recovery if defendant successfully pleads an affirmative defense. The major affirmative defense is reliance on counsel, but this is not available when the malicious-prosecution defendant is himself the counsel in the underlying action.

Another major affirmative defense is proof that the underlying action was only initiated after an independent investigation of the charges by appropriate authorities. For example, in a medical-malpractice case where the doctor had been investigated by the Board of Medical Quality Assurance, who recommended bringing the malpractice claim, the malicious-prosecution defendants successfully pled this affirmative defense. Hogen v. Valley Hospital, 147 Cal. App. 3d 119, 125 (1983).

The statute of limitations for malicious prosecution is two years. Ordinarily this period starts at the time of entry of judgment in the underlying action, even though that action may still be subject to appeal. However, if the appeal is filed, the statute of limitations stops running until the appellate process is exhausted, at which time it continues running. Feld v. W. Land & Dev. Co., 2 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1334 (1992).

5. Remedies

The successful malicious-prosecution plaintiff is entitled to compensatory damages, and in certain cases, punitive damages. Compensatory damages include reasonable attorney's fees and costs in defending the underlying action. They also can include damages for emotional distress, mental suffering, impairment to reputation, and value of time and wages lost to the underlying action. Bertero v. Nat'l Gen. Corp., 13 Cal. 3d 43, 59 (1974); Rupp v. Summerfield, 161 Cal. App. 2d 657, 667 (1958).

THE LAW OFFICES OF CADMIUM Q.
EAGLEFEATHER
PLC

5419 HURLEY BLVD STE C731LOS ANGELES CA 90027323 555 1435323 555 1439 FAX

CADMIUM @ CQELAW.COM

February 15, 2015

George Falkenburg Falkenburg, Fester, and Funk LLP 1252 W. 83rd Street Bakersfield, CA 90909

Re: Nicholson v. Amygdala Inc., Case No. B718590125-2

Dear Mr. Falkenburg:

In response to your recent request, I've enclosed a DVD of photographs I took during the inspection of the Amygdala facility on October 30, 2014.

I apologize for the delay, but I was recently hospitalized for a concussion sustained while rollerblading. Rest assured that I am on the mend. If you have any questions about this DVD, please let me know.

Separately: you recently served a set of 953 interrogatories on my client. These interrogatories were not accompanied by the declaration of necessity that's required when serving more than 35 requests. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2030.050.

I must, therefore, ask you to withdraw these interrogatories. While you are welcome to serve them again with the necessary declaration, my client is not obligated to respond to procedurally defective discovery requests. Furthermore, if you don't withdraw these interrogatories within six days, I will file a motion for protective order and seek sanctions against you and your client.

By the way, it was great seeing you and Thelma over the holidays. I think we still have your cheesecake platter. Let's talk soon about our plans for Maui in the spring.

Sincerely,

CADMIUM Q. EAGLEFEATHER

CQE / bqe Enclosure

TRIXIE B. ARGON

5678 HOLLYWOOD BLVD. STE. D451 LOS ANGELES CA 90027 (323) 555-1435 TRIXIEARGON @ GMAIL.COM

0
6
_
W
_
7
5