ORIGINAL

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

John Singleton. Anchored by gritty performances, a redemptive story, a strong script by Craig Brewer, and Singleton's reputation as a premiere producer of feature films, Hustle And Flow was the culmination of Singleton's unique passion and considerable talents. The picture created immediate buzz, generating significant publicity, promotion and interest before the 2005 Sundance Film Festival. Singleton then took his masterpiece to Sundance in 2005 in the hopes of securing a distribution deal with a major studio. The picture was the hit of Sundance, winning the Audience Award and prompting numerous distributors to begin a competitive bidding war for the distribution rights. Ultimately, despite the fact that at least one studio offered a higher advance than Paramount, Singleton chose Defendants (Paramount and its affiliate, MTV Films) because in addition to an advance against the back-end revenues from Hustle And Flow, Defendants promised Crunk that it would have the right to "put" two pictures to Paramount within the ensuing five years. The gist of the "puts" was that as long as the budget of each of the two pictures did not exceed \$3.5 million each, and as long as the producer fee for each picture did not exceed 7.5% of the budget. Paramount would finance and distribute the pictures. Obtaining the "puts" for two Plaintiffy to agree to dditional motion pictures from Paramount was material consideration for convey the distribution rights in Hustle

stopped entertaining offers and ceased negotiating with other interested distributors, including at least one that was offering an advance that was substantially higher than that offered by Defendants. Instead, Singleton accepted Paramount's offer, and Defendants proceeded to distribute Hustle And Flow, which received critical acclaim immediately upon its release, was nominated for two Academy Awards, and went on to win an Academy Award, enabling Paramount to reap an enormous profit on the back of the picture's resounding appeal and enormous critical and commercial success. Approximately eighteen months later, because Singleton reasonably believed that Defendants would honor the "puts," he also facilitated Paramount's acquisition of the distribution rights to another picture penned by Craig Brewer, Black Snake Moan, which rights Singleton controlled as a producer on the picture. Unfortunately, when Crunk attempted to exercise its right to "put" the two pictures to Paramount, Paramount

began asserting self-imposed, non-existent conditions on the "puts" that prevented Singleton from making the pictures and frustrated his enjoyment of the very contractual right that had persuaded him to reject the other bidders on *Hustle And Flow* and go with Defendants in the first place.

Though he has been one of the preeminent film makers in the entertainment industry for over twenty (20) years, this is the first time that Singleton has brought legal action to make sure he is not taken advantage of and his rights are protected. Singleton has been forced to bring this action because despite his good faith efforts, Defendants deprived Singleton of the core contractual benefit for which he had bargained, prompting Singleton to seek what is just, fair and equitable, and to teach Defendants that they cannot make false promises to fraudulently acquire distribution rights to valuable assets and reap vast economic reward without repercussion.

THE PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff John Singleton is and at all times relevant hereto has been, an individual and a resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Singleton is renowned as a writer, director and producer of feature films, including Boyz N the Hood, 2 Fast 2 Furious, Shaft and Four Brothers.
- 5. Plaintiff Crunk Pictures, LLC ("Crunk") is, and at all times relevant hereto has been, a California limited liability company with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California. Crunk is an independent motion picture production company owned by Singleton, and is authorized to conduct and conducting business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Singleton produced *Hustle And Flow* through Crunk.
- 6. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that Defendant Paramount Pictures Corporation ("Paramount") is, and at all times relevant hereto has been, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, authorized to conduct and conducting business in, and with its principal place of business located in, the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Paramount is engaged in the business of distributing theatrical motion pictures.
 - 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that Defendant MTV

Films is, and at all times relevant hereto has been, a subsidiary of Paramount Pictures Corporation, conducting business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California as a distributor of theatrical motion pictures. Defendants Paramount Pictures Corporation and MTV Films are collectively referred to herein as "Defendants."

Relaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 474, the fictitiously named defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 20, inclusive, and each of them, were in some manner responsible or legally liable for the actions, events, transactions and occurrences alleged herein. The true names and capacities of such fictitiously named defendants whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, are presently unknown to Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs will seek leave of Court to amend the Complaint to assert the true names and capacities of such fictitiously named defendants when the same have been ascertained. For convenience, each reference to Paramount herein shall also refer to the Doe

Defendants, and each of them.

Paramount and MTV Filtris, artithose Defendants such herein as Does, were acting in concert or participation with one another, or were joint participants and collaborators in the acts complained of, and were the officers, directors, agents or employees of named Defendants Paramount and MTV Films in doing the acts complained of herein, each and all of them acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or employment, each and all of them acting in concert with the other and all together. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that at all times herein mentioned each of the Doe Defendants was and is the agent, servant, alter ego, officer, director, and/or employee of named Defendants Paramount and MTV Films, and all of the things alleged to have been done by said Defendants were done in a capacity of an agent, servant, alter ego, officer, director, and/or employee of and for named Defendants Paramount and MTV Films.

THE HUSTLE AND FLOW DISTRIBUTION AGREEMENT

10. Defendants and Crunk entered into a written agreement dated as of January 22, 2005 (the "Agreement") which contained the following material provisions:

(i)	Crunk granted Defendants an exclusive license to distribute, exhibit, reissue
advertise, promote o	r otherwise exploit the motion picture Hustle and Flow (the "Picture"), and
all prequel, sequel, re	emake and television and direct-to-video/DVD production rights, in all media
throughout the world	i, for a term of twenty (20) years;

- (ii) Defendants agreed to pay Crunk an advance of Nine Million Dollars (\$9,000,000), plus certain contingent compensation and box office bonuses;
- "[Crunk] shall have the right to 'put' two (2) pictures to Paramount Pictures Corporation (the 'Put Pictures'), within the five (5) years of the date hereof, on the following material terms: (a) [Paramount] must approve the all-in budget of each Put Picture, which shall be reasonable and customary, not to exceed \$3.5M [excluding any contingency, financing fees and bond fees]. The producer fee included in such budget shall not exceed 7-½% of the budget [excluding any contingency, financing fees and bond fees]." Paragraph 14 also contained provisions regarding the allocation of gross receipts on the Put Pictures for either a theatrical release on an finitial release as a direct-to-video/DVD motion picture, and granted Paramount the right to distribute, exhibit reissue, atvertise, premote or otherwise exploit the Put Pictures in all media, worldwide, in perpetuity, including soundtrack album rights (revenues from which would be split 50/50 between Crunk and Paramount).

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Fraud by Plaintiffs Against Defendants)

- 11. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 10, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 12. During the 2005 Sundance Film Festival, there was a competitive bidding war for the distribution rights to *Hustle And Flow*, and several major U.S. studios were offering Plaintiffs advances in excess of \$10 million. Although Defendants only offered Plaintiffs an advance of \$9 million, Defendants sweetened their offer by promising Plaintiffs the right to "put" two (2) pictures to Paramount within the ensuing five (5) years. Defendants represented to Plaintiffs that

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

there would be only two conditions to the puts, namely that the budget for each Put Picture proposed by Plaintiffs could not exceed \$3.5M [excluding any contingency, financing fees and bond fees], and the producer fee included in each budget for each Put Picture could not exceed 7-1/2% of the budget [excluding any contingency, financing fees and bond fees].

- 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that Defendants were aware of the competitive bidding war over the distribution rights to the Picture, and that Defendants offered Plaintiffs the right to "put" two (2) pictures to Paramount within the ensuing five (5) years as a means of inducing Plaintiffs to accept Defendants' bid even though Defendants were offering a lesser advance than some of the other bidders.
- Plaintiffs are further informed and believe and based thereon allege that when 14. Defendants represented to Plaintiffs that the Put Pictures would be accepted as long as the budget for each Put Picture proposed by Plaintiffs did not exceed \$3.5M, and as long as the producer fee included in each budget did not exected 1-1/2% of the budget, Defendants knew that their representations were false, and that Paramount in fact intended to place other conditions on the aled from Plaintiffs in order to induce intentionally Plaintiffs to accept Defendants bid to the two pictures to Paramount, example, when Plaintiffs attempted to exercise their right to Paramount for the first time informed Plaintiffs that it was Paramount's position that the Put Pictures had to be delivered to Paramount within the five years after the date of the Agreement (i.e., by January 22, 2010), that the Put Pictures had to be fully completed films rather than films in production, and that the Put Pictures had to be scripted full-length theatrical or direct-to-video motion pictures. None of these conditions is contained in the Agreement, and Defendants actively concealed and failed to disclose these conditions to Plaintiffs at the time that Plaintiffs and Defendants were negotiating the terms of the Agreement.
- 15. Plaintiffs reasonably and justifiably relied on Defendants' representations. If Defendants would have disclosed the concealed conditions that Paramount subsequently attempted to place on the puts, Plaintiffs would have either granted the distribution rights to the Picture to another bidder for a higher advance, or taken steps to comply with the concealed conditions such

that Plaintiffs could have received the benefit for which they bargained. However, as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fraudulent concealment of the conditions, Plaintiffs forewent other bids for the distribution rights to the Picture that would have included advances that were several million dollars greater than the advance offered by Defendants, and Plaintiffs were denied the right to put two pictures to Paramount (which would have earned Plaintiffs producer fees in excess of \$500,000, potential back end fees, and credit and recognition for producing two additional films).

16. Plaintiffs also reasonably and justifiably relied on Defendants' representations when Singleton agreed to grant Paramount the distribution rights to *Black Snake Moan*, which rights Singleton controlled, and which rights Singleton only agreed to grant to Paramount because Singleton reasonably believed that Defendants would honor their promise to give him two puts with Paramount in connection with the *Hustle And Flow* Agreement. If Defendants would have disclosed the concealed conditions that Paramount subsequently attempted to place on the puts, Singleton would not have granted the assemble to Black Snake Moan to Paramount, and instead would have granted said distribution rights to another studio for a higher advance and better backered ferms.

- hereinabove, Plaintiffs have suffered damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdictional limits of the Court, the exact amount subject to proof at the time of trial.
- described conduct of Defendants, and each of them, was willful and intentional and done with malice, fraud and oppression, and constitutes despicable conduct in conscious and reckless disregard of Plaintiffs' rights and interests, such that the conduct warrants the imposition of punitive damages in a sum appropriate to punish Defendants, and each of them, and to deter Defendants from engaging in future similar misconduct, the exact sum subject to proof at the time of trial.
- 26 || ///

- 27 | 1//
- 28 | 1/

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Rescission by Crunk Against Defendants)

- Crunk repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 19. through 10 and 12 through 16, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- By virtue of the aforesaid tortious and unconscionable conduct of Defendants, 20. including, inter alia, their making of knowingly false and fraudulent misrepresentations and assurances regarding the puts, there has been a material failure of consideration for the Agreement, and Crunk was fraudulently induced to execute the Agreement and to grant distribution rights in the Picture to Defendants. But for Defendants' fraudulent conduct, Crunk would not have entered into the Agreement and would not have granted Defendants distribution rights or any other rights with respect to the Picture. As a result, the Agreement was procured by fraud and there has been a material failure of consideration for the Agreement, and Crunk 12 hereby gives notice and intends transmission of this Complaint to serve as notice of the rescission anted to Defendants in connection with Hustle of the Agreement and of any rights it may have gr
 - consideration furnished Crunk hereby offers to rest 21. by Defendants under the Agreement on the condition that (i) Defendants pay over to Crunk all monies that have been received by Defendants (or any of their assignees) from any and all third parties pursuant to the Agreement and/or in connection with Defendants' exploitation of the Picture, (ii) Defendants assign to Crunk all future monies that are anticipated to be received by Defendants (or any of their assignees) from any and all third parties pursuant to the Agreement and/or in connection with Defendants' exploitation of the Picture, and (iii) any and all rights in and to the Picture that Defendants otherwise purported to acquire under the Agreement revert back to Crunk, and Defendants release, relinquish, waive and forego any and all such rights.
 - As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, as alleged above, 22. on the basis of which wrongful conduct Crunk has sought to rescind the Agreement, Crunk has sustained damages, together with accrued interest thereon at the legal rate, in an amount in excess of Twenty Million Dollars (\$20,000,000).

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Unjust Enrichment by Plaintiffs Against Defendants)

- 23. Plaintiffs repeat and realiege each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 10, 12 through 16, and 20 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 24. As alleged hereinabove, by fraudulently concealing from Plaintiffs material information regarding alleged conditions on the puts, Defendants induced Plaintiffs (i) to enter into the Agreement and grant Defendants distribution rights to *Hustle And Flow*, and (ii) to grant Paramount distribution rights to *Black Snake Moan*, which rights Plaintiffs otherwise would not have granted to Paramount. The only reason Singleton granted Paramount the distribution rights to *Black Snake Moan* was because Singleton believed that Paramount would honor the puts and Singleton would be in business with Paramount for many years.
- 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that Defendants have earned tens of millions of dollars in profits from their distribution and exploitation of the pictures Hustle And Flow and Black Snake Moan, both of which had successful theatrical releases and have enjoyed great commercial success.
- 26. As a result of its miscenduct, Defendants have been unjustive priched, and are in possession of substantial money which in good conscience belongs to Plaintiffs.
- 27. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' tortious and unjust enrichment, Plaintiffs have suffered damages in the form of monies Defendants have earned and will earn from the distribution and exploitation of the pictures *Hustle And Flow* and *Black Snake Moan*, which monies should be disgorged to Plaintiffs, and which damages are well in excess of Twenty Million Dollars (\$20,000,000).

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(In The Alternative - For Breach of Contract by Crunk against Defendants)

28. Crunk repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 10, 12 through 16, 20 through 21, and 24 through 26, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.

- 29. In the event that the Agreement is not rescinded, then Crunk alleges that Defendants have materially breached the Agreement by, among other things: (a) failing and refusing to allow Crunk to "put" two pictures to Paramount; and (b) failing and refusing to approve the all-in budget of each put picture, even though the budget for each Put Picture proposed by Crunk did not exceed \$3.5M [excluding any contingency, financing fees and bond fees], and even though the producer fee included in each budget did not exceed 7-½% of the budget [excluding any contingency, financing fees and bond fees].
- 30. Crunk has performed all conditions, covenants and promises required pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, except to the extent such performance was waived, excused or prevented by reason of the acts or omissions of Defendants.
- 31. As a direct and proximate result of the material breach of the Agreement by Defendants, Crunk has suffered damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdictional



- 32. Crunk repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 10, 12 through 16, 20 through 21, 24 through 26, and 29 through 30, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 33. Inherent in every contract is an implied condition and covenant that the parties will act in good faith and that no party will engage in conduct that is designed to and/or has the natural effect of depriving any other party of the benefits for which the parties bargained under the contract. Such implied covenant existed in the Distribution Agreement between Crunk and Defendants with respect to *Hustle And Flow*.
- 34. In the event that the Agreement is not rescinded, then Crunk alleges that Defendants have breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing by, among other things, (a) asserting that the Put Pictures had to be delivered to Paramount within the five years after the date

of the Agreement (i.e., by January 22, 2010), (b) asserting that the Put Pictures had to be fully completed films rather than films in production, and (c) asserting that the Put Pictures had to be scripted full-length theatrical or direct-to-video motion pictures. None of these conditions is contained in the Agreement, and Crunk alleges that Defendants sought to impose these conditions for the specific purpose and intent of depriving Crunk of one of the very core benefits for which Crunk bargained when it negotiated the Agreement (namely, the benefit of receiving the puts).

35. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing inherent in the Agreement, Crunk has suffered damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdictional limits of the Court, the exact amount subject to proof at the time of trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs Loun, Singleton and Crunk Pictures, LLC pray for Judgment against Defendants Paramount Pictures Corporation and MTV Films as follows:

AS TO THE FIRST CAUSIOF ACTION:

- 1. For compensatory damages in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdictional limits of the Court, the exact amount subject to proof at the time of trial;
- 2. For punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish Defendants, and each of them, and to deter Defendants from engaging in future similar misconduct, the exact amount subject to proof at the time of trial;

AS TO THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

3. For rescission of the Agreement, pursuant to which Crunk seeks, among other things, a Judgment requiring (i) that Defendants pay over to Crunk all monies that have been received by Defendants (or any of their assignees) from any and all third parties pursuant to the Agreement and/or in connection with Defendants' exploitation of *Hustle And Flow*, (ii) that Defendants assign to Crunk all future monies that are anticipated to be received by Defendants (or any of their assignees) from any and all third parties pursuant to the Agreement and/or in connection with Defendants' exploitation of the Picture, and (iii) that any and all rights in and to

1100/01/01

Plaintiffs John Singleton and Crunk Pictures, LLC hereby demand trial by jury.

DATE: October 19, 2011

K:\4772-2\PLE\Complaint 101411,wpd

LAVELY & SINGER

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

MARTIN D. SINGER MICHAEL D. HOETZ

Attorneys for Plaintiffs JOHN SINGLETON and CRUNK PICTURES, LLC

Legal

Solutions & Plus

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3,400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES the case is complex.

Auto Tort Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Inju

Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Ashestos (04) Asbestos Property Damage

Asbestos Personal la Wrongful Death Product Liability (not asbestos or

toxic/environmental) (24) Medical Malpractice (45)

Medical Malpractice

Tort

Physicians & Surgeons Other Professional Health Care Malpractice Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)

Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism)

Intentional Infliction of **Emotional Distress**

Negligent Infliction of **Emotional Distress**

Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business

Practice (07)

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., stander, libel) (13)

Fraud (16)

Intellectual Property (19)

Professional Negligence (25)

Legal Malpractice

Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)

Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

Employment

Wrongful Termination (36)

Other Employment (15)

CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]

Contract

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06) Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)

Contract/Warranty Breach-Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)

Negligent Breach of Contract

ract/Warranty

Contractual Fraud

Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)

Writ of Possession of Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure

Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure)

Unlawful Detainer

Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise,

report as Commercial or Residential)

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Writ of Mandate (02)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Case Matter

Writ-Other Limited Courl Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)

Review of Health Officer Order Notice of Appeal-Labor

Commissioner Appeals

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)

Construction Defect (10)

Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)

Securities Litigation (28)

Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)

Insurance Coverage Claims (arising from provisionally complex case type listed above) (41)

ment (Out of

Judement (non-

Ja dament

ninistrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes Other Enforcement of Judgment

Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

RICO (27)

Other Complaint (not specified

above) (42)

Declaratory Relief Only

Injunctive Relief Only (non-

harassment)

Mechanics Lien

Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)

Other Civil Complaint

(non-tort/non-complex)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition Partnership and Corporate

Governance (21)

Other Petition (not specified

above) (43). Civil Harassment

Workplace Violence

Elder/Dependent Adult

Abuse

Election Contest

Petition for Name Change

Petition for Relief from Late

Claim

Other Civil Petition

Page 2 of 2

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.			
Item 1. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case: JURY TRIAL? [X] YES CLASS ACTION? [YES LIMITED CASE? [YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 5-7 [HOURS/[X] DAYS			
		TES LIMITED CASET TES TIME ESTIMATED	
item II. Ind	licate the correct district an	nd courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to	item III, Pg. 4):
Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected. Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case.			
Step 2	: Check one Superior Cou	in type of action in Column S below which best describes the flataire st	
Step 3 checked	In Column C, circle the red. For any exception to the	eason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you court location, see Local Rule 2.0.	ı have
Applicable Reasons for Choosing Countieuse Location (see Column C below) 1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Countieuse, central district. 2. May be filed in central (other county, or no badily injury/property damage). 3. Location where cause of action arose. 4. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred. 5. Location where performance required or idefendant resides. 6. Location where performance of action arose. 7. Location where one or damage occurred. 8. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 9. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office. 11. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Countieuse, central district. 12. Location where performance or functions wholly. 13. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 14. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 15. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 16. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 17. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 18. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 19. Location of Labor Commissioner Office. 19. Location of Labor Commissioner Office. 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office. 11. Location of Labor Commissioner Office. 12. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 13. Location where one or damage or more by the parties reside. 14. Location where one or damage or damage. 15. Location where one or damage or damage. 16. Location of Labor Commissioner Office. 17. Location where one or damage or damage. 18. Location where one or damage or damage. 19. Location of Labor Commissioner Office. 19. Location of Labor Commissioner Office. 19. Locati			
	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Aut	Uninsured Motorist (46)	A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	A6070 Asbestos Property Damage A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
	Product Liability (24)	A7250 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.
į či		ONTO CACE COVED CHEET ADDENDUM	ocal Rule 2.0

LAC|V 109 (Rev. 03/11) LASC Approved 03-04

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION **ORIGINAL**

Page 1 of 4

Type of Action Check only one See St	
Defamation (13)	
Wrongful Termination (36)	
Other Employment (15) A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) A6003 Contract/ Francy Breach - Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or aegligence) A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or aegligence) A6019 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff Collections (03) A6015 Insurance Coverage (18) A6015 Insurance Coverage (18) A6009 Contractual Fraud Other Contract (37) A6009 Contractual Fraud A6007 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14) A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels 2. 5. 6.	
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (06) (not insurance) A6008 Contract/ Varianty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) 12., 5 12.,	
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) A6008 Contract/ Varranty (not insurance) A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud) A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or siegligence) A6012 Collections Case Seller Plaintif Collections (03) A6015 Insurance Coverage (18) A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complete X A6009 Contractual Fraud Other Contract (37) A6031 Tortious Interference A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14) A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels 2. 5. 1. 2. 5. 1. 2. 5. 1. 2. 5. 1. 2. 5. 1. 2. 5. 1. 2. 5. 2. 6. 2. 6. 2. 6. 2. 6. 2. 6. 2. 6. 2. 7. 6. 2. 6. 2. 6. 2. 7. 6. 2. 7. 6. 2. 7. 6. 2. 7. 6. 2. 7. 6. 2. 7. 6. 2. 7. 7. 6. 2. 7. 7. 6. 2. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 2. 7. 7. 2. 7.	
Other Contract (37) X A6009 Contractual Fraud 1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	
Condemnation (14)	3., 5. 3., 5.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	
A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure 2., 6. A6032 Quiet Title 2., 6.	
A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) 2., 6.	···
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction) 2., 6.	
Column C	
Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure 2., 6.	

Unlawful I UACIV 109 (Rev. 03/11) LASC Approved 03-04

Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION

A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs

HORT TITLE:	JOHN SINGLETON, et a ES CORPORATION, et a	al., v. PARAMOUNT CASE NUMBER	
	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
:	Asset Forfeiture (05)	.A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
riew	Petition re Arbitration (11)	A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review	Writ of Mandate (02)	A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
ation	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
r Littly	Construction Defect (10)	A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
e)dux	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
ally Co	Securities Litigation (28)	A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Pro	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	A6014 Insurance Countage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement	A6141 Sister State Judgment A6160 Abstract of Judgment A6167 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2.6
Enforc of Jud	of Judgment (20)	A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unveile (area) A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2., 8.
		A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	<u> </u>
<u>. s</u>	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	A6030 Declaratory Relief Only A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civit Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	A6121 Civil Harassment A6123 Workplace Harassment A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case A6190 Election Contest A6110 Petition for Change of Name A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8.

TO THE OWN OF THE PART AMOUNT	DICTURES	CASE NUMBER
SHORT TITLE: JOHN SINGLETON, et al., v. PARAMOUNT	PICTURES	CASE NUMBER
CORPORATION, et al.	<u> </u>	

Item III. Statement of Location: Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other circumstance indicated in Item II., Step 3 on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.

REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.			ADDRESS: PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION 5555 MELROSE AVENUE
□1.[X]2.□3.□4.□	5. □6. □ 7. □8	3. □ 9. □10.	
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:	
LOS ANGELES	CA	90038	
item IV. Declaration of Assign	ment: I declare un	der penalty of p	perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true

and correct and that the above-entitled matter is properly filed for assignment to the LOS ANGELES District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)].

Dated October 19, 2011

MICHAEL D. HOLTZ

PLEASE HAVE TH COMMENCE YOUR NEW COUL

- Original Complaint or Petition
- 2.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form C
- Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement 03/11).
- Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.