Complaint For Damages

| 4              |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3              | 2. The subjects of this action are the land with single family dwellings and other improvements |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4              | thereon, owned by Plaintiffs respectively, (hereinafter collectively referred to as the         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5              | "PROPERTY") located in the County of Fresno, State of California, described as follows:         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6              |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7              | 1. ROBYN AGNEW, 1113 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93961   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8              | 2. STEVEN & YVONNE ATHEY, 242 W. GOSHEN, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9              |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10             | 4. DANIEL & CARA BANDY, 1163 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11             | 5. RAUL & CARMEN CHACON, 1173 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10             | 6. SHARON FANCIULLO, 1073 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12             | 7. MICHAEL & MELANIE FRANKLIN, 292 W. GOSHEN, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13             | 8. PAUL & NANCY GARNIER, 1083 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14             | 9. DANIEL & LEANN GONCHEROFF, 1042 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15             | 10. TONY & LUPE GRAVES, 272 W. GOSHEN, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16             | 11. RICHARD & REBECCA JACKSON, 1023 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                              |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17             | 12. STUART & CHERYL KAWASAKI, 1023 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18<br>19<br>20 | 13. FARIDA MADBOULY, 1112 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                | 14. KURT MAES, 1092 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                | 15. BERTO & PATRICIA MARTINEZ, 263 W. JORDAN, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21             | 16. CRAIG & CYNTHIA POWELL, 1170 N. HOLMSY, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22             | 17. CLAUDIO & MARISELLA SARABIA, 262 W. GOSHEN, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                              |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23             | 18. KURT & GLORIS STOEHR, 1192 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24             | 19. RAYMOND & JEANNE TACKETT, 1081 N. HOLMSY, CLOVIS, CA., 93611                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25             | 20. JILL TAKAHASHI, 1192 N. HALIFAX, CLOVIS, CA., 93611   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26  <br>27     |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 1 1          |   |  |  |  |  |  |

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

| 3. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that at all times herein mentioned |
|--|
| and material hereto that U.S. HOMES CORPORATION, was and is a corporation duly authorized          |
| to conduct business in the state of California and was and is engaged in business in the County of |
| Fresno, State of California and was a developer of the PROPERTY.                                   |

- 4. The names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise of certain developers, builders, general contractors, subdividers and/or their alter egos sued herein as DOES 1 through 100 inclusive, are presently unknown, and Plaintiffs will amend the complaint to insert the same when ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that each of these Defendants was a resident of said County and State and/or have principal offices or were doing business in said County and State and were and are responsible in some way for the happenings and damages alleged in this complaint. Said Defendants, along with the Defendants named in paragraph 3 above, will hereinafter be referred to as the "DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS."
- In order to build and construct said project the DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS hired, 5. retained, employed, or contracted for the services of certain persons or entities to plan, design, and prepare drawings and specifications for the building of the project. The identities of said persons or entities, whether individual, corporate or otherwise, sued herein as Does 101 through 200, are presently unknown to plaintiff who therefore sues such persons by their fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereupon allege that said persons or entities are wholly or in some part responsible for the occurrences set forth in the complaint. These Defendants will hereinafter be referred to as the "DESIGN DEFENDANTS."

///

///

24 /// 25

/// 26

///

27

| 1  | 6. In order to build and construct said project the DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS hired,                        |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 2  | retained, employed, or contracted for persons or entities to provide for labor and materials in the    |  |  |  |
| 3  | construction of the project. The identities of said persons or entities, whether individual, corporate |  |  |  |
| 4  | or otherwise, sued herein as Does 201 through 300 are presently unknown to Plaintiffs who              |  |  |  |
| 5  | therefore sue such persons by their fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and          |  |  |  |
| 6  | thereupon allege that said persons or entities are wholly or in some part responsible for the          |  |  |  |
| 7  | occurrences set for in the complaint. These Defendants will hereinafter be referred to as the          |  |  |  |
| 8  | "CONTRACTOR DEFENDANTS."   |  |  |  |
| 9  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that at all times herein               |  |  |  |
| 11 | mentioned Defendants and each of them were the agents, servants, employees, assistants and             |  |  |  |
| 12 | consultants of their co-Defendants and were as such acting within the course and scope of their        |  |  |  |
| 13 | agency and authority of such agency and employment.  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION  |  |  |  |
| 17 | (FOR STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY AGAINST THE DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS)                                       |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 8. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege Paragraphs 1 through 7, inclusive, and incorporate the              |  |  |  |
| 20 | same as if set forth herein at length.   |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | 9. DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, at all times herein mentioned                               |  |  |  |
| 23 | were in the business of developing and mass producing homes in the within County and State, and        |  |  |  |
| 24 | selling them to members of the public at large.  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 10 DEVELOPED DESCRIPTION   |  |  |  |
| 26 | 10. DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS and each of them, developed and mass produced the                             |  |  |  |

PROPERTY.

26

**27** 

| 14. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing defects, the PROPERTY has                       |
|---|
| experienced resultant and consequential damage in the form of breaking, cracking, separations,        |
| excessive moisture, leaking, seepage, unsanitary conditions, movement and other structural distress,  |
| damage, failure, and defective component parts. This resultant and consequential damage includes,     |
| but is not limited to, excessive cracking and breaking of concrete foundation slabs, walls, roofs and |
| windows, excessive moisture intrusion through concrete slabs damaging floor coverings,                |
| furnishings and personal effects, cracking and separation of exterior siding, chimneys and cement     |
| flatwork, soil movement and subsidence, insect infestation, roof leakage, cracking exterior walls,    |
| faulty plumbing fixtures and systems, resultant mold, mildew and bio-organic growth, separating       |
| and sagging cabinets and molding, poor framing resulting in excessive stucco cracking, roof           |
| sagging and damage to the roof systems, faulty or non-existent lot drainage, defective drywall        |
| installation, painting, flooring and other workmanship damaging other components of the               |
| PROPERTY, all of which have rendered the PROPERTY incapable of withstanding normal and                |
| reasonably foreseeable use and environmental forces, and damaged as a result.                         |
|   |
| 15. Within the last 3 years Plaintiffs became aware of the defects and deficiencies. The              |
| Plaintiffs thereafter gave DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS due and timely notice of the defective                |
| quality of the above mentioned items.   |
|   |
|   |

The defects alleged hereinabove are defects that were not apparent by reasonable 16. inspection of the PROPERTY at the time of the purchase. The defects thereafter manifested. ///

///

///

/// 

Carmel, Ca., 93921

///

1

2

3

4

- 17. Because of the defective conditions of the PROPERTY as hereinabove alleged, Plaintiffs have been specifically damaged in the following ways, as well as others that will be inserted with leave of court when ascertained:
  - Plaintiffs will be forced to incur expenses for the restoration and repairs of the A. PROPERTY to cure the defects and/or deficiencies. The exact amount of the damages is presently unknown, except that the costs will exceed the sum of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, according to proof.
  - The Plaintiffs have been damaged through the diminution in value of the B. PROPERTY. Plaintiffs are unaware of the precise amount of such damage but will establish such amount at time of trial.
  - The Plaintiffs have been forced to retain expert consultants to analyze and determine C. the method of repairing the aforementioned defects, as well as to prosecute the instant litigation after DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS wrongfully refused to repair the defective conditions specified above. Plaintiffs are unaware of the precise amount of such damage but will establish such amount at time of trial.
  - 18. Defendants, and each of them, as developers, mass producers, builders and sellers of residential dwelling units are strictly liable and responsible to Plaintiffs for all damage suffered as a result of the above described defects and deficiencies in the PROPERTY.

2

3

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**27** 

28

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

## (FOR BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF FITNESS

## FOR INTENDED USE AGAINST THE DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS)

- 19. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege Paragraphs 1 through 18 inclusive, and incorporate the same as if set forth herein at length.
- At all times herein mentioned and material hereto the DEVELOPER 20. DEFENDANTS were and now are the merchants and sellers of newly constructed housing, the type of merchandise sold to Plaintiffs as hereinabove alleged and described.
- 21. DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, at the time and place of the sale of the PROPERTY, impliedly warranted that it was properly constructed and fit for use as homes.
- 22. The PROPERTY was not properly constructed, and not fit for its intended use, and was defective as previously alleged hereinabove in paragraphs 13 and 14.
- 23. Within the last 3 years Plaintiffs discovered the defective quality of the PROPERTY. Plaintiffs thereafter gave the DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, due and timely notice of the defective quality of the above mentioned items.
- 24. The defects described hereinabove caused by the breaches of warranty by the DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, were defects not apparent by reasonable inspection of the PROPERTY at the time of purchase. The defects and damages were latent and were not reasonably apparent to Plaintiffs until on or about the time of notification to the DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS.

26 ///

| 1  | 30.  | Within the last 3 years Plaintiffs discovered the defective quality of the PROPERTY.   |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2  | Plaintiffs thereafter gave the DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, due and timely          |  |  |  |  |
| 3  | notice of the  | notice of the defective quality of the above mentioned items.                          |  |  |  |
| 4  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5  | 31.  | The defects described hereinabove caused by the breaches of warranty by                |  |  |  |
| 6  | DEVELOPI   | ER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, were defects not apparent by reasonable               |  |  |  |
| 7  | inspection o   | f the PROPERTY at the time of purchase. The defects and damages were latent and        |  |  |  |
| 8  | were not reasonably apparent to Plaintiffs until on or about the time of notification to the   |  |  |  |  |
| 9  | DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS.  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 32.  | Because of the foregoing breaches of implied warranties by DEVELOPER                   |  |  |  |
|    |  | DEFENDANTS, and each of them, Plaintiffs have been specifically damaged as             |  |  |  |
| 12 |  | hereinabove alleged.   |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION   |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | (FOR NEGLIGENCE AGAINST THE DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS,  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | DESIGN DEFENDANTS AND CONTRACTOR DEFENDANTS)   |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 33.  | Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege paragraphs 1 through 32 inclusive, and incorporate the |  |  |  |
| 20 | same as if set forth herein at length.   |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | 34.  | The aforementioned Defendants so carelessly and negligently planned, constructed,      |  |  |  |
| 22 | modified, ins  | pected, and/or performed work and services at the PROPERTY so as to proximately        |  |  |  |
| 23 | cause damages to the systems, buildings, and improvements as hereinabove alleged in paragraphs |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |

13 and 14.

25

26

27

28

///

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| Because of the foregoing breaches of implied warranties by the DEVELOPER   |
|--|
| DEFENDANTS, and each of them, Plaintiffs have been specifically damaged as |
| hereinabove alleged in paragraph 17.                                       |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION  |
| (FOR BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY                         |
| AGAINST THE DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS)  |
|  |

- Plaintiffs repeat and reallege Paragraphs 1 through 25 inclusive, and incorporate the 26. same as if set forth herein at length.
- At all times herein mentioned and material hereto the DEVELOPER 27. DEFENDANTS were and now are the merchants and sellers of newly constructed housing, the type of merchandise sold to Plaintiffs as hereinabove alleged and described.
- The DEVELOPER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, at the time and place of the 28. sale of the PROPERTY, impliedly warranted that they it was properly constructed and of merchantable quality.
- 29. The PROPERTY was not properly constructed, and not of merchantable quality in that it was defective as previously alleged hereinabove in paragraphs 13 and 14.

/// ///

25 ///

26 /// **27** 

|   | 35.      | Because of the carelessness and negligence of each of the Defendants, and as         |  |  |  |
|---|----------|--|--|--|--|
| a proximate result thereof, Plaintiffs have been damaged as previously alleged hereinabove. |          |  |  |  |  |
|   |          |  |  |  |  |
|   | 36.      | Within the last 3 years Plaintiffs discovered the defective quality of the PROPERTY. |  |  |  |
|   |          |  |  |  |  |
|   | 37.      | The damages described hereinabove was caused by the negligently and carelessly       |  |  |  |
|   |          | performed work of the Defendants, and each of them, were defects not apparent by     |  |  |  |
|   |          | reasonable inspection of the PROPERTY at the time of purchase.                       |  |  |  |
|   |          |  |  |  |  |
|   |          |  |  |  |  |
|   | WHE      | REFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against the Defendants, and each of them, as    |  |  |  |
| follov  | ws:      |  |  |  |  |
|   |          |  |  |  |  |
|   | ON T     | HE FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, AND FOURTH CAUSES OF ACTION:                                |  |  |  |
| 1.  | For co   | osts of hiring engineers and other experts to investigate and analyze the damages    |  |  |  |
| accor   | ding to  | proof at the time of trial;  |  |  |  |
| 2.  | For co   | osts of restoration and repairs to the PROPERTY in excess of the jurisdictional      |  |  |  |
| minin   | num of t | he Court, according to proof;  |  |  |  |
| 3.  | For di   | iminution of value of the PROPERTY according to proof at time of trial;              |  |  |  |
| 4.  | For co   | osts of suit;  |  |  |  |
| 5.  | For su   | ich other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.                     |  |  |  |
| TO A OTT  | CD. I    | 17.0000 THE WHITE ARED I AND TODA  |  |  |  |
| DAII  | ED: Jani | uary 17,2002 THE WHITAKER LAW FIRM   |  |  |  |
|   |          | Man and he wither  |  |  |  |
|   |          | By: Michael T. Whitaker Attorneys for Plaintiffs                                     |  |  |  |
|   |          | ·· - <del></del>   |  |  |  |