1 Timothy E. Herr, Esq. Bar # 126798 Herr & Zapala, llp 152 N. 3rd Street, Suite 500 2 San Jose, CA 95112 3 Telephone: 408-287-7788 Facsimile: 408-287-7263 4 Attorneys for Shannon Zamani 5 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 6 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA UNLIMITED JURISDICTION 7 8 Case Number: 1-02-CV806141 SHANNON ZAMANI, 9 Plaintiff, NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION 10 vs. 11 PETER N. MALAE; RANDALL 12 HOWARD ZIMMER AND RUTH ANN ZIMMER, both individually and dba 13 ADVANTAGE DRIVING SCHOOL; ADVANTAGE DRIVING SCHOOL, INC. 14 A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, and Does 1 to 10, inclusive 15 Defendants. 16 17 TO PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD: 18 NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on February 22, 2005 the above-entitled court entered the order 19 attached hereto as Exhibit A.. 20 Herr & Zapala, llp Respectfully Submitted 21 22 Timothy E. Herr, Attorneys for Plaintiff, Shannon Zamani 23 24 25 26 27 Jose, ~ 18-287-7788

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING SUMMARY ADJUDICATION

Herr & Zapala, Ilp 152 North 3rd Street, Suite 500 San Jose, CA 95112



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

SHANNON ZAMANI,

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

13

10

11

12

14

15

v.

DOES 1-10,

PETER N. MALAE; RANDALL HOWARD

ZIMMER AND RUTH ZIMMER, individually

ADVANTAGE DRIVING SCHOOL, INC.; and

and dba ADVANTAGE DRIVING SCHOOL;

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Case No. 1-02-CV-806141

ORDER RE: SUMMARY ADJUDICATION OF ISSUES

The Motion for Summary Adjudication to Plaintiff Shannon Zamani's ("Plaintiff" or "Zamani") First Amended Complaint ("FAC") brought by Defendants Advantage Driving School, Inc., Randall Zimmer, and Ruth Ann Zimmer (collectively "Defendants") came on for hearing before the Honorable Kevin E. McKenney on February 22, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. in

Department 16. The matter having been submitted, the Court orders as follows:

Order re: Summary Adjudication

1-02-CV-806141 Page 1 of 2

Exhibit A

1

2

3

4

5

Defendants' Motion for Summary Adjudication of the 5th cause of action for B&P Code \$17200 violation is DENIED because Defendants have not met their burden of showing that Plaintiff cannot establish her unfair business practices claim. Contrary to Defendants' contention, Baugh v. CBS, Inc. (1993) 828 F.Supp. 745 does not hold that personal injury claims can never be a proper subject for a §17200 violation cause of action. Baugh is also inapplicable in the instant case because Plaintiff does not seek compensation for her embarrassment and emotional distress as restitutionary damages. As for the claim of restitutionary damages, Defendants have not met their burden of showing that they received no ill-gotten gains and hence should not be liable for restitution. Statement of Undisputed Material Fact (UMF) #8. On the issue of injunctive relief, Plaintiff has presented evidence that there still exists a threat that the allegedly wrongful conduct will continue (e.g., Defendants do not conduct an independent background check separate from the DMV check). UMF #14. Therefore, there is a triable issue of material fact as to each claim.

Defendants' Motion for Summary Adjudication of Plaintiff's claim for attorney's fees is DENIED. The issue of attorney's fees, which constitute costs, not damages, is not a proper subject for summary adjudication in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure §437c(f)(1). Hence, Defendants have not met their burden of showing that there is no triable issue of material fact.

Defendants' Motion for Summary Adjudication of Plaintiff's claim for punitive damages is DENIED. Plaintiff has presented evidence to create a triable issue of material fact as to Defendants' advance knowledge of Defendant Peter Malae's unfitness for the position of driving instructor, including the DMV's cancellation notice, conflicting testimony as to Defendants' knowledge of Malae's whereabouts when he was in lock-down, and information from the principal of Pioneer High School regarding student complaints. UMF #32.

26

27

28

Date: February 22, 2005 Kevin E. McKenney

Judge of the Superior Court

Order re: Summary Adjudication

Page 2 of 2

I am employed in the County of Santa Clara, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 152 N. 3rd Street, Suite 500, San Jose, CA 95112. On the date set forth below, I served the following documents:

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR SUMMAN ABUILDING

[] (BY MAIL) By placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope to the address(es) listed below with first class postage thereon fully prepaid, for collection and mailing on that date following ordinary business practices, in the United States mail at the offices of Herr & Zapala, LLP, in San Jose, California.

[X] (BY HAND DELIVERY) By causing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope, to be delivered by hand to the address(es) shown below.

[] (BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) By placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope, with delivery charges to be paid by sender, to be delivered by overnight express mail to the address(es) shown below.

[] (BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION) By transmitting a true copy thereof by facsimile transmission from facsimile number (408)287-7263, to the below listed interested parties at the facsimile number(s) shown below.

These documents were served by the above indicated means on the following persons:

Law Offices of Anthony Pakgas 1570 The Alameda, Suite 215 San Jose, CA 95126	Ericksen, Arbuthnot, Kilduff, Day & Lindstrom 152 N. 3 rd Street, Suite 700 San Jose, CA 95112
By deliver at the Santa Clara Superior Court 191 North First Street	By delivery at the Santa Clara Superior Court 191 North First Street

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

Executed on February 22, 2005 at San Jose, California

Timothy E. Herr