RECEIVED FOR SCANNING VENTURA SUPERIOR COURT

NOV 12 2019

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Ber number and address).	FLD-F1-001	
Colleen O'Hara, #201827	FOR COURT USE ONLY	
Law Office of Colleen O'Hara	1	
205 South Broadway Suite 902		
Los Angeles, CA 90012		
TELEPHONE NO: 213628-3929 FAX NO. (Optional): 213628-3908	1	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): colleenoharalaw@yahoo.com		
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Adam George		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Ventura	-∤ .	
STREET ADDRESS: 800 South Victoria Avenue		
MAILING ADDRESS:	ì	
CITY AND ZIP CODE Ventura, CA 93009		
· ·		
BRANCH NAME: Spring Street Courthouse		
PLAINTIFF: Adam George		
DEFENDANT: Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC		
Lorin Lindner and Matthew Simmons		
DOES 1 TO 100		
COMPLAINT—Personal Injury, Property Damage, Wrongful Death		
AMENIDED (Number)		
Type (check all that apply):		
]	
The state of the s	ŀ	
Jurisdiction (check all that apply): ACTION IS A LIMITED CIVIL CASE	CASE NUMBER	
	-	
exceeds \$10,000, but does not exceed \$25,000 ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (exceeds \$25,000)		
ACTION IS RECLASSIFIED by this amended complaint	·	
	}	
from limited to unlimited from unlimited to limited		
Plaintiff (name or names): Adam George		
alleges causes of action against defendant (name or names):		
Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC, Lorin Lindner, Matthew Simmons and	DOES 1-100	
2. This pleading, including attachments and exhibits, consists of the following number of page 2.	nes: IO	
3. Each plaintiff named above is a competent adult	900. 189	
a. except plaintiff (name):		
(1) a corporation qualified to do business in California		
(2) an unincorporated entity (describe):		
(3) a public entity (describe):		
(4) a minor an adult		
· /	Handard Charles A	
 (a) for whom a guardian or conservator of the estate or a guard (b) other (specify): 	lian ad litem has been appointed	
(5) other (specify):		
The state of the s		
· /	_	
(a) for whom a guardian or conservator of the estate or a guardian ad litem has been appointed		
(b) other (specify):		
(5) other (specify):		
information about additional plaintiffs who are not competent adults is shown in Attac	chment 3.	
Form Approved for Optional Use COMPLAINT—Personal Injury, Property Judicial Council of California	Page 1 of 3 Code of Civ., Procedure, § 425 12	
PLP-001 Rev. January 1 2007	www.courtinfo.ca.gov	

SHORT TITLE:	
	CASE NUMBER:
George v LARC PC, Lindner and Simmons and DOE	ES 1-100
4. Plaintiff (name):	
is doing business under the fictitious name (specify):	•
(
and has complied with the fictitious business name laws	S .
5. Each defendant named above is a natural person	
a. except defendant (name): LARC PC	c except defendant (name):
(1) a business organization, form unknown	(1) a business organization, form unknown
(2) a corporation	(2) a corporation
(3) an unincorporated entity (describe):	(3) an unincorporated entity (describe):
(A) [The matter of the state of	
(4) a public entity (describe):	(4) a public entity (describe):
(5) other (specify):	
(3) Other (specify).	(5) other (specify):
b. except defendant (name):	d. except defendant (name):
(1) a business organization, form unknown	(1) a business organization, form unknown
(2) a corporation	(2) a corporation
(3) an unincorporated entity (describe):	(3) an unincorporated entity (describe):
	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
(4) a public entity (describe):	(4) a public entity (describe):
(E) [All and (a and (b))	
(5) other (specify):	(5) other (specify):
	4
Information about additional defendants who are not na	tural persons is contained in Attachment 5
Information about additional defendants who are not nate.	
The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to	
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 	plaintiff
6. The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the	plaintiff
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of th Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 	were the agents or employees of other agency or employment.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of th Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction. 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names):
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corpo 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corporcing injury to person or damage to personal property occinity. 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corpo 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corporcing injury to person or damage to personal property occinity. 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corporcing injury to person or damage to personal property occinity. 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corpo c. injury to person or damage to personal property occid. other (specify): 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corpoint. the principal place of business of a defendant corpoint. other (specify): Plaintiff is required to comply with a claims statute, and 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corpo c. injury to person or damage to personal property occ d. other (specify): Plaintiff is required to comply with a claims statute, and a. has complied with applicable claims statutes, or 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corpoint. the principal place of business of a defendant corpoint. other (specify): Plaintiff is required to comply with a claims statute, and 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.
 The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 1-15 named defendants and acted within the scope of the b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 16-100 plaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedum. This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdiction b. the principal place of business of a defendant corpo c. injury to person or damage to personal property occ d. other (specify): Plaintiff is required to comply with a claims statute, and a. has complied with applicable claims statutes, or 	were the agents or employees of other at agency or employment. are persons whose capacities are unknown ure section 382 are (names): all area. area.

ξ.,·

PLD-PI-001 [Rev. January 1, 2007]

COMPLAINT—Personal Injury, Property Damage, Wrongful Death

Page 3 of 3

			PLD-PI-001(4
SHORT TITLE:	SPC Lindner and Simmons and DOES 4 400	CASE NUMBER:	
George V LANC	PC, Lindner and Simmons and DOES 1-100		
1	CAUSE OF ACTION—Premis	ses Liability	Page 4
ATTACHME	,		
	laintiff (name): Adam George		
	alleges the acts of defendants were the legal (proximate) cause of	f damages to plaintiff. Ired on the following pr	emises in the following
	fashion (description of premises and circumstances of injury): Adam George was working at the Defendant Lockwood Animal Relocated at 15660 Curtis Trail, Frazier Park 93225. This property is Simmons. Employee James Thompson asked Adam George to a Plaintiff George could perform a safety check of the perimeter of the Usually, the wolves would be placed in separate cages before Plainton However, on this occasion, two wolves remained free roaming in that it would be fine and Mr. George followed him in and began the enclosure quickly to take a phone call and closed Mr. George in by a wolf Count One—Negligence The defendants who negligently operated the described premises were (names): Matthew Simmons Lorin Lindner	s owned by Defendants ccompany him into a wane enclosure to make s intiff George would con the enclosure. Mr. Tho e check. Suddenly, Mr. y himself with the wolve	Lorin Lindner and Matthew off enclosure so that ure that it was secure. duct this safety check. Impson assured Mr. George Thompson exited the es. Mr. George was then
	Does 1 to 10		
Prem.L-3.	Count Two—Willful Failure to Warn [Civil Code section or maliciously failed to guard or warn against a dangerous (names): Matthew Simmons Lorin Lindner	846] The defendant ow condition, use, structu	ners who willfully re, or activity were
	Does 1 to 10		
	Plaintiff, a recreational user, was an invited guest	a paying guest.	
Prem.L-4.	Count Three—Dangerous Condition of Public Property on which a dangerous condition existed were (names):	The defendants who d	owned public property
Prem.L-5. a.	a The defendant public entity had actual dangerous condition in sufficient time prior to the ib The condition was created by employees of the defendants who other defendants and acted within the scope of the agency	injury to have corrected efendant public entity. o were the agents and	f it.
b.	The defendants who are liable to plaintiffs for other reasons described in attachment Prem.L-5.b as follows:	s and the reasons for the vs (names):	neir li a bility are

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: STRICT LIABILITY FOR INJURY CAUSED BY WILD ANIMAL Page 5

ATTACHMENT TO COMPLAINT AS TO DEFENDANT LOCKWOOD ANIMAL RESCUE CENTER, PC

(LARC, PC)

On November 15, 2017, Plaintiff Adam George was working at the Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC, which is operated on property located at 15660 Curtis Trail, Frazier Park 93225. The property itself is owned by the individual Defendants, Lorin Lindner and Matthew Simmons.

Employee James Thompson is an individual, (now deceased), whose job involved working directly with the wolves at the center as a trainer.

Plaintiff Adam George's job was to provide maintenance support, safety checks for the enclosures, and to build cages and sheds, and other items when necessary. Mr. George's job was not to work with the wolves directly.

On November 15, 2017, Mr. Thompson asked Adam George to accompany him into a wolf enclosure so that Plaintiff George could perform a safety check of the perimeter of the enclosure to make sure that it was secure. Usually, the wolves would be placed in separate cages before Plaintiff George would conduct this safety check. However, on this occasion, two wolves remained free roaming in the enclosure. Mr. Thompson assured Mr. George that he would be safe because he would accompany him and that the wolves would not attack him. Accordingly, Mr. George followed Mr. Thompson into the enclosure and began the safety check.

Without warning, Mr. Thompson exited the enclosure quickly to take a phone call and closed Mr. George in by himself with the wolves. One of the wolves immediately attacked Mr. George. Because Mr. Thompson was not facing the enclosure during the call, he did not see one of the wolves attacking Mr. George for an unduly prolonged period of time. When Mr. Thompson finally noticed the ongoing attack, it took him awhile to enter the enclosure because of the way the access gate is configured.

Mr. George was seriously injured in the attack and was taken to a nearby urgent care for stitches and treatment.

Before he arrived there, Matthew Simmons, the executive director of the Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC, told Mr. George that his employment would be terminated if he did not lie to the medical provider at urgent care regarding the cause of his injuries. Mr. Simmons told him to tell the medical provider that he had run into a fence on a dirt bike. Not wanting to lose his job, Mr. George promised to comply with this request, and he did. Accordingly, Mr. Simmons, in his capacity as the executive director of the Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, fraudulently concealed Mr. George's injuries.

While being driven to the urgent care facility, Mr. George asked Mr. Simmons if LARC, PC would cover his medical costs since he did not have health insurance. At that time, Mr. Simmons promised, on behalf of LARC, PC, to cover all of his medical costs.

During this conversation, Mr. George asked Mr. Simmons if he should file a workers compensation claim and Mr. Simmons told him not to file a workers compensation claim. Mr. Simmons told Mr. George that LARC, PC did not have workers compensation coverage and, further, that if Mr. George filed a workers compensation coverage claim in spite of the non-coverage, that the wolf who attacked him would be euthanized. A search of Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau of California (WCIRB) online corroborated Mr. Simmon's assertion that LARC, PC did not have workers compensation coverage.

On behalf of LARC, PC, Mr. Simmons reimbursed Mr. George for his medical costs from his urgent care visit. However, Mr. Simmons later said that LARC, PC would not pay for anymore medical costs.

Mr. George returned to work at LARC, PC, and his injuries became exacerbated from nontreatment and he was in constant pain.

When Mr. George complained to Mr. Simmons about his injuries, Mr. Simmons then terminated Mr. George's employment on the basis that Mr. George was no longer

physically able to satisfy the demands of his position.

Mr. George has since undergone wrist and back surgery and has accrued over a quarter of a million dollars in medical bills.

Plaintiff Adam George hereby alleges that the Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC, owned, kept, and controlled multiple wolves on November 15, 2017.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that he was harmed by one of the wolves.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that one of the Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC's wolves attacked him and therefore was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that based on Executive Director Matthew Simmons' admission and a search of Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau of California (WCIRB) online, that Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center fraudulently concealed Plaintiff Adam George's injuries, which led to a delay in treatment and an exacerbation of his injuries.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that the Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center fraudulently concealed Plaintiff Adam George's injuries, which led to a delay in treatment and an associated exacerbation of his injuries.

Plaintiff Adam George seeks damages according to proof.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENT HIRING, SUPERVISION, RETENTION Page 8

ATTACHMENT TO COMPLAINT AS TO DEFENDANT LOCKWOOD ANIMAL RESCUE CENTER, PC (LARC, PC)

On November 15, 2017, Plaintiff Adam George was working at the Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC, which is operated on property located at 15660 Curtis Trail, Frazier Park 93225. The property itself is owned by the individual Defendants, Lorin Lindner and Matthew Simmons.

Employee James Thompson is an individual, (now deceased), whose job involved working directly with the wolves at the center as a trainer.

Plaintiff Adam George's job was to provide maintenance support, safety checks for the enclosures, and to build sheds, and other structures when necessary. Mr. George's job was not to work with the wolves directly.

On November 15, 2017, Mr. Thompson asked Adam George to accompany him into a wolf enclosure so that Plaintiff George could perform a safety check of the perimeter of the enclosure to make sure that it was secure. Usually, the wolves would be placed in separate cages before Plaintiff George would conduct this safety check. However, on this occasion, two wolves remained free roaming in the enclosure. Mr. Thompson assured Mr. George that he would be safe because he would accompany him and that the wolves would not attack him. Accordingly, Mr. George followed Mr. Thompson into the enclosure and began the safety check.

Without warning, Mr. Thompson exited the enclosure quickly to take a phone call and closed Mr. George in by himself with the wolves. One of the wolves immediately attacked Mr. George. Because Mr. Thompson was not facing the enclosure during the call, he did not see one of the wolves attacking Mr. George for an unduly prolonged period of time. When Mr. Thompson finally noticed the ongoing attack, it took him awhile to enter the enclosure because of the way the access gate is configured.

 Mr. George was seriously injured in the attack and was taken to a nearby urgent care for stitches and treatment.

Before he arrived there, Matthew Simmons, the executive director of the Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC, told Mr. George that his employment would be terminated if he did not lie to the medical provider at urgent care regarding the cause of his injuries. Mr. Simmons told him to tell the medical provider that he had run into a fence on a dirt bike. Not wanting to lose his job, Mr. George promised to comply with this request, and he did. Accordingly, Mr. Simmons, in his capacity as the executive director of the Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, fraudulently concealed Mr. George's injuries.

While being driven to the urgent care facility, Mr. George asked Mr. Simmons if LARC, PC would cover his medical costs since he did not have health insurance. At that time, Mr. Simmons promised, on behalf of LARC, PC, to cover all of his medical costs.

During this conversation, Mr. George asked Mr. Simmons if he should file a workers compensation claim and Mr. Simmons told him not to file a workers compensation claim. Mr. Simmons told Mr. George that LARC, PC did not have workers compensation coverage and, further, that if Mr. George filed a workers compensation coverage claim in spite of the non-coverage, that the wolf who attacked him would be euthanized. A search of Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau of California (WCIRB) online corroborated Mr. Simmon's assertion that LARC, PC did not have workers compensation coverage.

On behalf of LARC, PC, Mr. Simmons reimbursed Mr. George for his medical costs from his urgent care visit. However, Mr. Simmons later said that LARC, PC would not pay for anymore medical costs.

Mr. George returned to work at LARC, PC, and his injuries became exacerbated from nontreatment and he was in constant pain.

When Mr. George complained to Mr. Simmons about his injuries, Mr. Simmons then terminated Mr. George's employment on the stated basis that Mr. George was no

longer physically able to satisfy the demands of his position.

Mr. George has since undergone wrist and back surgery and has accrued over a quarter of a million dollars in medical bills.

Plaintiff Adam George hereby alleges that the Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC, hired (former) employee James Thompson.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that James Thompson became unfit or incompetent to perform the work for which he was hired.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC, knew or should have known that Mr. Thompson had become unfit or incompetent and that this unfitness or incompetence created a particular risk to others.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center, PC's negligence in hiring, supervising, or retaining Mr. Thompson was a factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that based on Executive Director Matthew Simmons' admission and a search of Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau of California (WCIRB) online, that Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center did not have workers compensation insurance coverage.

Plaintiff Adam George alleges that the Defendant Lockwood Animal Rescue Center fraudulently concealed Plaintiff Adam George's injuries, which led to a delay in treatment and an exacerbation of his injuries.

Plaintiff Adam George seeks damages according to proof.