

9. Jail Booking Number: N/A Police Agency/Report Number: N/A

10. Describe the damage/injury/loss incurred so far as is known as of the time of this claim:

Claimant suffered economic and non-economic damages, including but not limited to loss of personal property, general damages for personal injury (severe burn injuries, pain and suffering, emotional distress, fear, annoyance, loss of quiet enjoyment), loss of use of personal property, and medical and incidental expenses, among others.

11. Name(s) of County employee(s) causing damage/injury/loss, if known: _____

Specific County employee(s) names are unknown. Employees were part of Orange County Public Works.

12. License number of County vehicle (if applicable): N/A

13. Name, address and phone number of any and all witnesses known: _____

Burl Dean James, Jr. and Jacquelyn Marie Hunter. They may be contacted through counsel, Singleton Schreiber.

14. Any additional information that may assist us in evaluating your claim: _____

See attached complaint.

DAMAGES CLAIMED

15. a. If the amount claimed is less than \$10,000:

Amount claimed to present: \$ _____

Estimated amount of any prospective damage/injury/loss: \$ _____

TOTAL AMOUNT CLAIMED: \$ 150,000,000.00

b. If the amount claimed exceeds \$10,000, would the case be a limited civil case (\$25,000 or less)?


Check one: Yes _____ No X

c. Basis of computation of the amount of damages (Please attach any estimates and/or receipts): Damages are based on the severity of the personal injury, estimates of the total value of

lost personal and real property, and other economic harm, as well as non-economic harm.

**WARNING: IT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE TO FILE A FALSE CLAIM
(PENAL CODE § 72)**

I have read the matters and statements in the above claim and I know the same to be true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters stated upon information and belief and as to such matters, I believe the same to be true. I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



Signature of Claimant/Claimant's Representative

10/24/2024

Date

N/A
THIS CLAIM FORM MUST BE SIGNED!!

N/A



San Diego Office
591 Camino de la Reina, Suite 1025, San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 771-3473 | singletonschreiber.com

October 24, 2024

VIA PERSONAL SERVICE

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
400 W. Civic Center Drive, 6th Floor
Santa Ana, CA 92701

Re: Airport Fire 2024 (origin – Trabuco Canyon)
Date of Incident: September 9, 2024

Dear Clerk,

Our firm represents Mr. Burl D. James Jr., Ms. Jacquelyn Marie Hunter, and Mr. Joseph Jefferies McLean in their claims against the County of Orange, California, for harm caused to them by the Airport Fire. As such, please find the relevant Government Claims forms for each of our clients as well as a draft complaint that will be filed against the County of Orange should the attached claims be denied or deemed denied.

Also, please note we previously submitted Government Claim Form #20240846 for Mr. Joseph Jefferies McLean on September 26, 2024. However, we noticed that we had inadvertently failed to list a “total amount” claimed for line 15(a). In an abundance of caution, we have amended the claim form and are resubmitting it on behalf of Mr. McLean.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul Starita".

Paul Starita

Enclosures:

- (1) Claim for Ms. Jacquelyn Marie Hunter.
- (2) Claim for Mr. Burl D. James Jr.
- (3) Amended Claim #20240846 for Mr. Joseph Jefferies McLean.

1 SINGLETON SCHREIBER, LLP
Gerald Singleton (SBN 208783)
2 *gsingleton@singletonschreiber.com*
John C. Lemon (SBN 175847)
3 *jlemon@singletonschreiber.com*
591 Camino de la Reina, Suite 1025
4 San Diego, CA 92108
Telephone: (619) 771-3473
5

6
7 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
8 **FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE**
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Plaintiffs,

v.

COUNTY OF ORANGE, ORANGE COUNTY
PUBLIC WORKS, AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100
inclusive.

Case No.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Plaintiffs") bring the following Complaint for damages against County of Orange ("County"), inclusive of Orange County Public Works department ("OCPW") and other as of yet unknown entities and individuals, Does 1 through 100 (collectively, the "Defendants"), as a result of the damages that Plaintiffs sustained in the wildfire known as the "Airport Fire."


THE AIRPORT FIRE

1. This Complaint arises from a wildfire that ignited on September 9, 2024, and has burned across two counties in Southern California called the Airport Fire.

//

//

1 2. Defendants caused the Airport Fire when they used steel machinery to move
2 boulders during an excessive heat warning due to a triple-digit heat wave and dry conditions.
3 Defendants, aware of the fire risk, were moving the boulders to block access to unmaintained
4 vegetation susceptible to wildfires when its steel machinery sparked the blaze.



18 Photo from The Orange County Register Article: 'Reckless and stupid,' 'incompetent':
19 OC work that started Airport fire questioned, blasted by Teri Sforza

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 jurisdiction over Defendants by California courts consistent with the traditional notions of fair play
2 and substantial justice.

3 8. The claims asserted in this complaint arise out of acts, omissions, transactions, and
4 conduct that occurred within the County of Orange, and therefore this action is properly venued in
5 the Superior Court for the County of Orange.

6 9. The amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

7 **PLAINTIFFS**

8 10. Plaintiffs (see attached claimant forms).

9 **DEFENDANTS**

10 11. Plaintiffs, upon information and belief, allege that Defendant County is, and was at
11 all relevant times, a political subdivision and/or entity of the State of California. Orange County
12 Public Works (OCPW) is a governmental agency in and for the County of Orange.

13 12. County provides services to approximately three million residents, including
14 Plaintiffs. County owns, operates, and controls public property and infrastructure. County is
15 comprised of several departments, including OCPW. The OCPW, in turn, is responsible for
16 planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining the County's property and infrastructure: public
17 roads, transportation systems, bridges, equipment maintenance, water, and vegetation
18 management, among others.

19 13. County is a public entity pursuant to California Government Code section 811.2.

20 14. At all times relevant to this complaint, County is and was vested by law with
21 authority to acquire property through the power of eminent domain pursuant to the provisions of
22 California Constitution Article I, section 19 and California Code of Civil Procedure sections
23 1230.010, 1235.190, 1240.040, et seq.

24 15. At all times mentioned herein, County planned, installed, operated, constructed,
25 built, and maintained its infrastructure for the benefit of the general public, including but not
26 limited to the use of heavy equipment to move boulders.

27
28

1 16. At all times mentioned herein, County provided pre-fire management and fire
2 prevention services in Orange County, including but not limited to vegetation management of its
3 State Responsibility Areas and open space lands and/or districts.

4 17. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
5 otherwise of the Defendants Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs who sue said
6 Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 474. The term
7 "Defendants" used throughout this complaint refers collectively to the County, including OCPW,
8 and Does 1 through 100, and each of them.

9 18. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants, and/or each of them, were the
10 servants, employees, partners, aiders and abettors, co-conspirators, and/or joint venturers of each of
11 the other Defendants and were operating within the purpose and scope of said agency, service,
12 employment, partnership, enterprise, conspiracy, and/or joint venture; and each of Defendants has
13 ratified and approved the acts of each of the remaining Defendants.

14 19. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants install, own, maintain,
15 construct, manage, build, and/or operate infrastructure for the benefit of the general public,
16 including but not limited to the use of heavy equipment to move boulders.

17 20. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants perform pre-fire management
18 and fire prevention services, including but not limited to vegetation management for the benefit of
19 the general public.

20 21. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants are in some manner responsible for the acts
21 and occurrences set forth in this Complaint. Plaintiffs may amend or seek to amend this Complaint
22 to allege the true names, capacities, and responsibility of these Doe Defendants once they are
23 ascertained, and to add additional facts and/or legal theories. Plaintiffs make all allegations
24 contained in this Complaint against all Defendants, including Does 1 through 100 pursuant to
25 Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Some or all of the Doe Defendants may be residents of the
26 State of California. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and/or each of them, are
27 responsible in some manner for the conduct alleged herein, including, without limitation,
28 furnishing the means and or acting in capacities that create agency, respondent superior, co-

1 venturer, and/or predecessor- or successor-in-interest relationships with the Defendants. The Doe
2 Defendants are private individuals, associations, partnerships, corporations, or otherwise that
3 actively assisted and participated in the negligent and wrongful conduct alleged herein in ways
4 that are currently unknown to Plaintiffs.

5 **COMPLIANCE WITH GOVERNMENT CODE**

6 22. On or around September 30, 2024, prior to the filing of Plaintiffs' complaint,
7 presented a claim on behalf of themselves to Defendant County of Orange and OCPW pursuant to
8 Government Code section 910, et seq. Defendant County of Orange and OCPW failed to act on
9 Plaintiffs' claim within 45 days after it was presented, thus it was deemed rejected pursuant to
10 Government Code section 912.4.

11 **FACTS**

12 **A. County's knowledge of drought conditions, wildfire risks and actions are below the**
13 **standard of care**

14 23. County owns, operates, and controls property and infrastructure, including public
15 roads, canyons, parks, and other property. County controls and maintains the County's
16 infrastructure, including public roads, bridges, open space conservation districts, and equipment.
17 County, through OCPW and OCFA, also performs vegetation management, fire prevention, and
18 fire suppression or reduction efforts.

19 24. Orange County had been under an Excessive Heat Warning, which means high fire
20 danger due to extreme temperatures and low humidity.² The Excessive Heat Warning began on
21 September 4, 2024 and lasted through September 10, 2024.
22
23
24
25
26

27 ² The Orange County Register 'Reckless and stupid,' 'incompetent': OC work that started Airport fire
28 questioned, blasted by Teri Sforza; <https://www.ocregister.com/2024/09/12/reckless-and-stupid-incompetent-oc-work-that-started-airport-fire-questioned-blasted/>

1 25. Orange County experienced two wet winters that fueled growth in the wildlands.
2 Followed by an Excessive Heat Warning, this overgrown foliage becomes quite dry, brittle and
3 receptive to ignition.³

4 26. County knew or should have known about the significant risk of wildfires in the
5 area posed by the ongoing and immediate climate, weather, and drought conditions in and around,
6 its service territory, including but not limited to Trabuco Canyon (“Canyon”) in Orange County,
7 California, and the substantially elevated risk of fire ignition resulting from these known and
8 foreseeable conditions. Defendants knew, prior to the Airport Fire’s ignition, that hot, dry weather
9 conditions create an elevated risk of wildfires and that Southern California, including Orange
10 County, faced record highs throughout 2024.⁴ Defendants also knew that surrounding counties,
11 like Riverside County, faced significant drought having recorded the driest August over the past
12 130 years.⁵

13 27. According to CAL FIRE’s Hazard Severity Zones in Orange County, the Airport
14 Fire’s general area of origin was located in a red zone; also referred to as a “Very High Fire
15 Hazard Severity Zone” (“Red Zone”).⁶ This classification put Defendants on notice to use
16 heightened safety measures and increased precautions when operating their equipment.
17 Additionally, CAL FIRE continuously updates its Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. This viewer
18 has the Airport Fire’s General Area of Origin labeled with an overlay as “VHFHSZ” standing for
19 Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.⁷ The following screenshot was taken of CAL FIRE’s Fire
20 Hazard Severity Viewer, and the red dot depicts the Airport Fire’s general area of origin in the
21 VHFHSZ zone:

22
23


24 ³ *Id.* quoting Alex Tardy of the National Weather Service

25 ⁴ See Powerful heat wave hits Southern California starting Tuesday, but how hot will it be? - ABC7 Los Angeles; Triple-digit heat wave continues to broil Southern California - Los Angeles Times (latimes.com).

26 ⁵ See Riverside County Conditions | Drought.gov.

27 ⁶ See Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer | CAL FIRE Hub (arcgis.com).

28 ⁷ *Id.*



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

28. Despite the known risks, Defendants allowed the Canyon to become overgrown and filled with dry brush. Given the high fire danger this overgrown dry brush presented, County operated steel machinery to move, crush, and/or place boulders—creating the foreseeable risk of sparking—in a forested canyon. Defendants had a duty to properly maintain its infrastructure and equipment to ensure its safe operation by adequately planning, constructing, and operating its systems and services. However, Defendants violated these duties by using its machinery in a manner that posed a significant risk of and in fact, did cause a wildfire.

29. Defendants were aware that its operations, including but not limited to the use of heavy machinery to move, crush, and/or place boulders, is an inherently dangerous and ultrahazardous activity given its proximity to forested areas filled with dry brush and the significant threat of wildfire. Indeed, Defendants were placing the boulders to prevent access to vegetation susceptible to wildfires. Defendants are required to exercise an increased level of care commensurate with and proportionate to the increased risk of danger associated with their conduct. The conditions and circumstances existing at the time of the Airport Fire’s ignition were reasonably foreseeable by Defendants.

///
///

1 39. On September 9, 2024, Plaintiffs are the owners of real and/or personal property
2 located within Riverside County that was damaged, destroyed, or affected by the Airport Fire,
3 which ignited in Orange County.

4 40. Prior to and on September 9, 2024, County, controlled, operated, maintained,
5 constructed, used and/or serviced equipment, infrastructure, and public property within Orange
6 County, including performing fire hardening, fire suppression, fire prevention, and vegetation
7 management in and around the Airport Fire’s location or origin. County’s conduct was for the
8 benefit of the general public.

9 41. On September 9, 2024, County was aware of the inherent dangers and risks
10 associated with allowing dry brush to become overgrown during extreme fire conditions. County
11 was also aware of the inherent dangers and risks associated with the use of heavy, steel machinery
12 to move, crush, and/or place boulders in a Red Zone. Indeed, the boulders were being moved,
13 crushed, and/or placed to block access to this overgrown dry brush that was susceptible to
14 wildfires for the benefit of the general public.

15 42. This inherent risk was realized on September 9, 2024, when the steel machinery
16 and boulders connected, created a spark that ignited the dry brush in the Canyon causing the
17 Airport Fire and resulted in the taking and/or damaging of Plaintiffs’ real and/or personal property.

18 43. This taking was legally and substantially caused by County’s actions and inactions
19 in constructing, installing, operating, controlling, using, servicing, and/or maintaining its property,
20 equipment, and infrastructure, including the placement of boulders with steel machinery.

21 44. Plaintiffs have not been adequately compensated, if at all, for this taking.

22 45. Pursuant to Article 1, Section 19 of the California Constitution, Plaintiffs seek just
23 compensation for this taking, according to individual proof at trial.

24 46. Plaintiffs further seek, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1036, to recover
25 all litigation costs, expense, and interest with regard to the compensation of damage to their
26 property, including attorneys’ fees, expert fees, consulting fees, and litigation costs.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **NEGLIGENCE**

3 **By Plaintiffs for Negligence Against County**

4 47. Plaintiffs hereby re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation
5 contained above as though the same were set forth herein in full.

6 48. Under Government Code section 820, public employees are liable for torts like
7 private people. Under Government Code section 815.2, public entities are liable for torts of public
8 employees done in the course and scope of their employment.

9 49. County employees acting within the course and scope of their employment in
10 controlling, operating, and maintaining County equipment, property, and infrastructure were
11 under a duty codified in Civil Code section 1714(a), which states, in pertinent part:

12 Everyone is responsible, not only for the result of his or her willful
13 acts, but also for an injury occasioned to another by his or her want
14 of ordinary care or skill in the management of his or her property or
15 person, except so far as the latter has, willfully or by want of ordinary
care, brought the injury upon himself or herself.

16 50. County and its employees have a nondelegable duty to apply a level of care
17 commensurate with and proportionate to the danger of constructing, controlling, operating, and
18 maintaining its property and infrastructure, inclusive of its equipment, services performed, and
19 vegetation management.

20 51. County and its employees have a nondelegable duty of vigilant oversight in the
21 maintenance, repair, operation, installation, management, and supervision, appropriate to the
22 changing conditions and circumstances of their property, infrastructure, equipment, and services.

23 52. County and its employees have a nondelegable duty to maintain its property in a
24 safe condition, including performing vegetation management, fire suppression, fire hardening, and
25 fire prevention activities.

26 53. County and its employees have special knowledge and expertise far beyond that of a
27 layperson, that they were obligated and required to use in the construction, use, operation, repair,
28 and maintenance of their infrastructure, property, equipment, and services to assure safety under

1 the local conditions of the service area, including but not limited to, the equipment used, the
2 activity untaken, and operation of equipment, all of which were prone to ignite sparks in the
3 service area given local conditions, including unprecedented heatwaves, dry conditions, and
4 susceptible vegetation, which was left unmaintained.

5 54. County and its employees breached their duties in negligently controlling,
6 operating, and maintaining County equipment and infrastructure in a manner that was foreseeable
7 to start a fire. County employees failed to utilize appropriate fire safety methods to prevent County
8 equipment from igniting dry brush in the Canyon.

9 55. It was foreseeable that a massive wildfire would destroy personal and real property,
10 force residents in the fire area to evacuate, and prevent customers of businesses located within the
11 fire area from patronizing those businesses. Notwithstanding the above, County employees failed to
12 take reasonable precautions to protect adjoining property owners against the foreseeable risk of
13 harm created by their activities. The Airport Fire was a direct and legal result of the negligence,
14 carelessness, recklessness, and/or unlawfulness of County employees who breached their respective
15 duties owed to Plaintiffs, and each of them, including but not limited to: (1) failing to comply with
16 the applicable statutory, regulatory, and/or professional standards of care; (2) failing to take
17 necessary precautions given conditions and circumstances in service area; (3) failing to construct,
18 monitor, operate, and/or maintain its machinery in a manner that avoids the potential to ignite a
19 fire; (4) failing to implement procedures based upon service conditions, including procedures for
20 using machinery to move objects prone to ignite fires; (5) failing to adequately maintain vegetation
21 in public property; (6) failing to properly train and supervise employees and agents responsible for
22 maintenance, inspection, and operation of the machinery, services provided, and vegetation
23 management; and/or (7) violating Health and Safety Code section 13007 by allowing fire to be set
24 to the property of another.

25 56. As a direct and legal result of County and its employees' actions and/or omissions,
26 Plaintiffs suffered damages, which were clearly and certainly caused by the Airport Fire, including
27 the cost to repair and replace the damaged and/or destroyed real and personal property, personal
28

1 injuries, evacuation expenses, medical expenses, lost wages, emotional distress, and other
2 damages

3 57. Public policy supports finding a duty of care in this circumstance due to County
4 and its employees' violation of California Civil Code sections 3479 and 3480.

5 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **By Plaintiffs For Trespass Against County and Does 1-100**

7 58. Plaintiffs incorporate and re-allege each of the paragraphs above as though fully set
8 forth herein at length.

9 59. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiffs were the owners and/or lawful occupants of
10 real property damaged or destroyed by the Airport Fire.

11 60. Defendants, including County, had a duty to use reasonable care not to enter,
12 intrude on, or invade Plaintiffs' real properties. Defendants, including County through the acts of
13 its employees as established above, negligently allowed the Airport Fire to ignite and/or spread out
14 of control, causing injury to Plaintiffs. The spread of a negligently caused fire to wrongfully
15 occupy land of another constitutes a trespass.

16 61. Plaintiffs did not grant permission for Defendants to cause the Airport Fire to their
17 property.

18 62. As a direct, proximate and substantial cause of the trespass, Plaintiffs have suffered
19 and will continue to suffer damages, including but not limited to damage to property, discomfort,
20 annoyance, and emotional distress in an amount to be proven at trial.

21 63. As a further direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs have
22 hired and retained counsel to recover compensation for loss and damage and are entitled to recover
23 all attorney's fees, expert fees, consultant fees, and litigation costs and expenses, as allowed under
24 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1029.1.

25 64. As a further direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs seek
26 the reasonable cost of repair or restoration of their property to its original condition and/or loss of
27 use damages, as allowed by California Civil Code section 3334.

28 65. Defendants' conduct was willful and wanton, and with a conscious disregard for the

1 disastrous consequences that Defendants knew would occur as a result of their dangerous conduct.
2 Accordingly, Defendants acted with malice towards Plaintiffs, which is an appropriate predicate fact
3 for an award of exemplary damages in an amount according to proof.

4 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **By Plaintiffs For Private Nuisance Against County and Does 1-100**

6 66. Plaintiffs incorporate and re-allege by this reference each of the paragraphs set forth
7 as though fully set forth herein.

8 67. Plaintiffs own and/or occupy real property in the fire area. At all times relevant
9 herein, Plaintiffs had a right to occupy, enjoy, and/or use their property without interference by
10 Defendants.

11 68. Defendants' actions, conduct, omissions, negligence, trespass, and failure to act
12 resulted in a fire and foreseeable obstruction to the free use of Plaintiffs' property, invaded the right
13 of Plaintiffs to use their property, and interfered with Plaintiffs' enjoyment of their property, causing
14 Plaintiffs unreasonable harm and substantial actual damages constituting a nuisance pursuant to
15 *Civil Code* § 3479.

16 69. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs seek the
17 reasonable cost of repair or restoration of their property to its original condition and/or loss-of-use
18 damages, as allowed under *Civil Code* section 3334.

19 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **By Plaintiffs For Public Nuisance Against County and Does 1-100**

21 70. Defendants owed a duty to the public, including Plaintiffs, to conduct their business
22 in a manner that did not cause harm to the public welfare.

23 71. Defendants in maintaining public property in a dangerous condition and, by its
24 employees acting and/or failing to act, as alleged herein above, created a condition that was harmful
25 to the health of the public, including Plaintiffs, and created a fire which damaged and interfered with
26 the quite use and enjoyment of their property. This interference is both substantial and unreasonable.

27 72. Plaintiffs do not consent, expressly or impliedly, to the wrongful conduct of
28 Defendants.

1 73. The Airport Fire which was created by Defendants affected a substantial number of
2 people at the same time within the general public, including Plaintiffs, and constituted a public
3 nuisance under Civil Code sections 3479 and 3480 and Public Resources Code sections 4170 and
4 4171.

5 74. The damaging effects of Defendants' creation of a fire hazard and the resulting
6 Airport Fire are ongoing and affect the public at large.

7 75. As a direct and legal result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered harm
8 that is different from the type of harm suffered by the general public. Specifically, Plaintiffs have
9 lost the occupancy, possession, use, and/or enjoyment of their land, real, and/or personal property,
10 including, but not limited to a diminution of value of their real property; an impairment of the ability
11 to sell their property; property exposed to chemical retardant agents dropped from airborne
12 firefighting aircraft; and lingering smell of smoke, soot, ash and dust in the air.

13 76. As a further direct and legal result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs have
14 suffered, and will continue to suffer, discomfort, anxiety, fear, worry, annoyance, and/or stress
15 attendant to the interference with the occupancy, possession, use and/or enjoyment of their property.

16 77. A reasonable, ordinary person would be annoyed or disturbed by the conditions
17 caused by Defendants, and the resulting Airport Fire.

18 78. Defendants' conduct is unreasonable and the seriousness of the harm to the public,
19 including Plaintiffs, outweighs the social utility of Defendants' conduct. There is little to no social
20 utility associated with causing wildfires to destroy the property of the Plaintiffs.

21 79. The unreasonable conduct of Defendants is a direct and legal cause of the harm,
22 injury, and/or damage to the public, including Plaintiffs.

23 80. Defendants have failed to maintain its property, equipment, or infrastructure in a safe
24 condition. Defendants failed to comply with its fire hardening and vegetation management policies,
25 failed to trim and/or remove vegetation on public property, and/or remediate the potential for
26 harmful contact between Defendants' equipment and boulders thereby creating a spark, and
27 Defendants' failure to do so exposed every member of the public to a foreseeable danger of personal
28 injury, death, and/or a loss or destruction of real and personal property.

1 and damages.

2 89. As a direct and legal result of the wrongful acts and/or omissions of Defendants,
3 Plaintiffs suffered, and continues to suffer, the injuries and damages as set forth above.

4 90. As a further direct and legal result of the wrongful acts and/or omissions of
5 Defendants, Plaintiffs seek the recovery of punitive and exemplary damages against Defendants as
6 set forth above.

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 Plaintiffs pray for judgment against the County and Does 1 through 100, and each of them
9 as follows:

- 10 1. For monetary damages in an amount to be proven at trial, which exceeds the
11 jurisdictional minimum of this Court;
 - 12 2. Loss of the use, benefit, goodwill, and enjoyment of Plaintiffs' real and/or
13 personal property;
 - 14 3. Loss of wages, earning capacity, goodwill, and/or business profits or proceeds
15 and/or any related displacement expenses;
 - 16 4. Out of pocket costs;
 - 17 5. Damage to real and personal property;
 - 18 6. Past and future medical expenses and incidental expenses;
 - 19 7. General damages for personal injury, emotional distress, fear, annoyance,
20 disturbance, inconvenience, mental anguish, and loss of quiet enjoyment of
21 property;
 - 22 8. For prejudgment interest in accordance with California Civil Code section 3287
23 and the California Constitution;
 - 24 9. For attorneys' fees and cost of suit to the extent allowed by California law,
25 including California Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.9 and 1036; and
 - 26 10. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.
- 27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial on all causes of action for which a jury is available under the law.

SINGLETON SCHREIBER, LLP

Dated: October 24, 2024

By: _____
Paul Starita

Attorneys for Plaintiffs