, lied Superior Court of California, Sacramento 09/19/2023 crowtht By _____, Deputy 23CV008662

SUPERIOS COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Prime Auctions, LLC., a California limited liability company; Propagate, LLC., a California limited liability company; Elizabeth R., an individual; Nicolas M., an individual; Kari H., an individual; Sean M., an individual; Patrick K., an individual

Ognian Gavrilov, State Bar No. 258583

Michael Coleman, State Bar No.295462

(916) 504-0529

(916) 727-6877

Nicolas M., Kari H., Sean M., and Patrick K.

ognian@gavrilovlaw.com

Prime Auctions LLC, Propagate LLC, Elizabeth R.,

mcoleman@gavrilovlaw.com

GAVRILOV & BROOKS

2315 Capitol Avenue

Telephone:

Facsimile:

Email:

Email:

Sacramento, CA 95816

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,

Plaintiffs,

CITY OF SACRAMENTO and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive

Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR: 1) Negligence 2) Public Nuisance 3) Private Nuisance 4) Inverses Condemnation

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

v.

1	Plaintiffs Prime Auctions LLC, Propagate LLC, Elizabeth R., Nicolas M., Kari H., Sean				
2	M., and Patrick K. (collectively "Plaintiffs") hereby file this Complaint against defendant City				
3	of Sacramento (the "City") and Does 1 through 100, inclusive, as follows:				
4	INTRODUCTION				
5	1. Sacramento is the most important and influential state capital in the country. As				
6	the epicenter of the fifth largest economy in the world, ¹ the decisions emanating from the City				
7	reverberate throughout the United States and across the globe.				
8	2. Sadly, the City is dying. Darrell Steinberg ("Steinberg"), the City's Mayor, is				
9	the executioner. The failure to address the ubiquitous spread of homelessness throughout the				
10	City is Steinberg's poison.				
11	3. Since Steinberg took office in 2016, the City's homeless population has				
12	increased more than 250 percent. This unprecedented surge in homelessness is the direct result				
13	of a mayoral decree (the "Steinberg Decree") which prohibits police and other City officials				
14	from clearing dangerous homeless encampments that clutter the sidewalks and pollute local				
15	neighborhoods.				
16	4. The Steinberg Decree has transformed this once bucolic tree-lined city into a				
17	rotting cesspool of decay and despair. Far from exuding the prestige which accompanies being				
18	the nerve center of a massive global economy, the streets and neighborhoods of Sacramento				
19	resemble the urban decay that blight the world's poorest developing nations.				
20	5. Once prominent City streets and parks are now shanty towns ("Shanty Towns")				
21	littered with tents, urine, feces, and garbage. Prostitutes openly peddle their trade. Drug dealers				
22	sell with impunity. Drug addicts inject narcotics in plain sight. Shattered drug vials, used				
23	syringes, and discarded contraceptives blanket the ground in their wake.				
24	6. Perhaps even more shocking is the public health crisis ravaging the homeless				
25	occupants of these Shanty Towns. Medieval diseases have reemerged and are decimating				
26	homeless communities. The encampments lack basic necessitates such as running water,				
27					
28	¹ Only the United States, China, Japan, and Germany, respectively, boast larger economies than California.				
	- 1 - COMPLAINT				

bathrooms, showers, kitchens, and laundry facilities. Rats and fleas infest these communities,
 spreading disease and sickness person-by-person. The homeless occupants are dying at an
 estimated rate of two people per-day.

7. Violent crime pervades the Shanty Towns. Homeless residents are routinely
beaten and robbed. The women are raped and sexually abused. In many cases, homeless
residents with no prior history of drug abuse have turned to methamphetamines to keep awake
to fend off nightly attacks.

8 8. This constant, inescapable sorrow is the unique byproduct of the Steinberg
 9 Decree. Though every citizen and City resident continues to suffer from its effects, Plaintiffs,
 10 as alleged herein, have individualized stories and injuries capable of redress. With this Action,
 11 Plaintiffs seek to end the regime of suffering caused by Steinberg and the Steinberg Decree.

PARTIES

9. Defendant City of Sacramento is a charter city organized and existing under the
 laws of the State of California and located in the County of Sacramento.

12

15 10. Plaintiff Prime Auctions LLC ("Prime Auctions") is a California limited liability
16 company organized under the laws of the State of California. Prime Auctions is situated and
17 conducts business in the City of Sacramento.

18 11. Plaintiff Propagate LLC ("Propagate") is a California limited liability company
organized under the laws of the State of California. Propagate is situated and conducts business
20 in the City of Sacramento.

21 12. Plaintiff Elizabeth R. is an individual who resides and works within the City of
22 Sacramento.

23 13. Plaintiff Nicolas M. is an individual who resides and works within the City of
24 Sacramento.

25 14. Plaintiff Kari H. is an individual who resides and operates a business within the
26 City of Sacramento.

27 15. Plaintiff Sean M. is an individual who resides and works within the City of
28 Sacramento.

- 2 -COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Patrick K. is an individual who resides and works within the City of 16. 1 Sacramento. 2 17. Plaintiffs Elizabeth R., Nicolas M., Kari H., Sean M., and Patrick K. are 3 collectively referred to herein as the "Individual Plaintiffs." The Individual Plaintiffs are each 4 referred to herein using their first names and last initial due to reasonable and credible fears of 5 retribution from the City and various violent individuals. 6 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 7 18. 8 Plaintiffs seek only equitable and injunctive relief for the causes of action 9 asserted herein. Accordingly, Plaintiffs need not submit a claim with the City or any other public entity pursuant to the Tort Claims Act, Gov. Code 810 et seq., to proceed with their 10 claims. 11 All of the matters complained of and all of the damage sustained as alleged 19. 12 herein occurred in the City of Sacramento. Accordingly, this Court has jurisdiction to 13 adjudicate Plaintiffs' claims and venue is proper. Code Civ. Proc. §§ 394, 410.10. 14 15 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS The Commerce Circle Encampment** 16 Prime Auctions owns the commercial real property located at 320 Commerce 20. 17 18 Circle in Sacramento and operates its business on the premises. Nicolas M. owns the commercial real property located at 175 Commerce Circle in Sacramento and is trying to lease 19 the premises to prospective tenants. Sean M. is a leasing and sales agent of commercial 20 property who maintains several listings in and/or around Commerce Circle. Prime Auctions, 21 22 Nicolas M., and Sean M. are collectively referred to herein as "Commerce Circle Plaintiffs." 23 21. For the past few years, hundreds of transient homeless have inhabited a Shanty Town consisting of trailers, tents, and makeshift structures at Commerce Circle. 24 22. The Shanty Town fully occupies entire stretches of sidewalk, thereby impeding 25 ingress and egress to Commerce Plaintiffs' locations. Commerce Plaintiffs' staff members, 26 customers, and prospective clients must walk in the road to access the properties at their peril. 27 111 28 - 3 -COMPLAINT

23. The homeless inhabitants regularly light campfires ("Campfires") on the 1 sidewalk and in the street. The Campfires endanger Commerce Plaintiffs' properties and the 2 safety of their employees and prospective clients. Compounding this obvious danger, the 3 Shanty Town and its inhabitants impede necessary access to public fire hydrants. 4 24. The inhabitants openly sell and use drugs, break into cars, steal property, 5 defecate in the street and on the sidewalk, and engage in prostitution. Further, many of the 6 homeless residents have dogs which roam Commerce Circle off leash and/or unsupervised. 7 8 Commerce Plaintiffs' employees have been chased and/or threatened by vagrant canines. 25. Piles of garbage litter the street and sidewalk, attracting rats and other vermin to 9 Commerce Circle. The rodents and vermin infest Commerce Plaintiffs' properties, to their 10 11 profound detriment. Prior to the homeless taking over Commerce Circle, Commerce Plaintiffs did not experience rodents and/or other vermin infestations on/in their respective properties. 12 13 26. The Shanty Town residents regularly trespass upon Commerce Plaintiffs' properties, finding alcoves and dimly lit areas to defecate, use drugs, fornicate and/or 14 masturbate. The trespasses have resulted in piles of feces and toilet paper festering on the 15 properties, creating foul smells and unsanitary conditions. 16 27. 17 The Shanty Town residents dump garbage on Commerce Plaintiffs' properties. 18 Shanty Town residents camp and sleep on Commerce Plaintiffs' properties. Late at night, Shanty Town residents routinely attempt to break into the buildings on Commerce Plaintiffs' 19 properties. 20 28. The Shanty Town residents have become increasingly aggressive and territorial. 21 22 Commerce Plaintiffs' employees are regularly threatened and/or assaulted. 29. 23 Commerce Plaintiffs have called the City's 3-1-1 non-emergency response line ("311") on numerous occasions. Commerce Plaintiffs have also complained to law 24 25 enforcement. In response to the complaints, Police and other City officials routinely inform Commerce Plaintiffs that nothing can be done. 26 30. 27 Commerce Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that the Police and other City officials refuse to address the dangers posed by the Shanty Town on Commerce 28 - 4 -COMPLAINT

1 Circle subject to the express directive of the Steinberg Decree.

2

The Midtown Encampments

31. Elizabeth R., Kari H., and Patrick K. live in and around the neighborhood
encompassing 17th to 30th Street between I Street and C Street ("Midtown"). Propagate LLC
operates a business in and around Midtown. Elizabeth R., Kari H., Patrick K. and Propagate
LLC are collectively referred to herein as the "Midtown Plaintiffs." Several large Shanty
Towns are now embedded in and around Midtown.

32. Elizabeth R. has lived in Midtown for years. The Shanty Town residents 8 9 regularly trespass upon her property and steal items from her porch. The Shanty Town residents defecate on and in front of her yard. The Shanty Town residents have stolen bikes from her 10 yard and leave garbage on and in front of her property. Further, a neighbor near her home has 11 established a community refrigerator for Shanty Town residents which draws homeless persons 12 13 to the area, causing damage to and around her property. Shanty Town residents have thrown bricks at her house, bottles at her head, and have threatened her as she enters and exits her 14 home. Shanty Town residents regularly sit on the stairs of her front porch, and scream 15 obscenities throughout the night. 16

33. Kari H. has owned her home in Midtown for years. She has a separate rental unit 17 ("Rental Unit") attached to her home. To generate additional income, she advertises the Rental 18 Unit on the website Airbnb.com. On several occasions, Shanty Town residents have broken 19 into the Rental Unit and claimed it as their own. Further, prospective tenants of the Rental Unit 20 have, on more than one occasion, cancelled their Airbnb reservations (the "Airbnb 21 Cancellations"), citing the Shanty Towns near and around Kari H's home as the reason for their 22 23 cancellations. The Airbnb Cancellations have caused Kari H. substantial financial injury. Kari H. has and continues to regularly encounter Shanty Town residents sleeping under the stairs of 24 her porch and defecating on her property. She has witnessed transactions between prostitutes 25 and "Johns" in nearby Marshall Park. As a result of the multiple Shanty Towns near and around 26 27 her home, Kari H. is unable to walk her dog down certain streets and in certain parks in Midtown. 28

> - 5 -COMPLAINT

34. Patrick K. has lived in Midtown for years. The Shanty Town residents regularly 1 trespass upon his property and steal items from his porch. The Shanty Town residents defecate 2 3 on and in front of his yard. A neighbor near his home has established a community refrigerator for Shanty Town residents which draws additional homeless persons to the area, causing 4 5 damage to and around Mr. K's property. Further, Mr. K. and his wife are consistently forced to encounter mentally ill individuals on and around their property due to the nearby Shanty Towns. 6 A Shanty Town resident locally known as the "blanket stabber" regularly marches in front of 7 Mr. K's home stabbing a wool blanket with a knife or machete, thereby endangering Mr. K., his 8 wife, and their two young children when they exit their home. 9

10 35. Propagate operates a store and event space (the "Storefront") in Midtown. As a result of the Shanty Towns near and around Propagate's business, used needles litter the street 11 12 in front of the Storefront. Shanty Town residents defecate in front of and around the Storefront, leaving piles of foul-smelling feces in plain sight. Shanty Town residents bang on the windows 13 of the Storefront during events, and sleep under the awning at night when it rains. For months, 14 15 homeless camped in a trailer directly in front of the Storefront, impeding traffic and repelling 16 would-be customers. When Propagate complains to the City, it is told nothing can be done. 17 36. The Midtown Plaintiffs have called 311 and law enforcement on numerous

18 occasions. In response to the complaints, Police and other City officials routinely inform the19 Midtown Plaintiffs that nothing can be done.

37. Midtown Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that the Police
and City officials refuse to address the dangers posed by the Shanty Towns in and around
Midtown subject to the express directive of the Steinberg Decree.

23		FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
24		Negligence
25		(All Plaintiffs Against City)
26	38.	Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set
27	forth in para	graphs 1 through 37 above as though fully set forth herein.
28	39.	City, by and through its agents, has the sole right and responsibility to control,
		- 6 -
		COMPLAINT

maintain, and keep safe public areas, including parks, sidewalks, streets, and public buildings. 1 Consistent with this obligation, the City must enforce laws and local ordinances to ensure public 2 health and safety. City must, inter alia, maintain public areas such as parks, sidewalks, and 3 streets in a manner that does not unreasonably interfere with Plaintiffs' free passage or use. 4 Further, the City must address and alleviate conditions which are harmful to Plaintiffs' health 5 and/or offensive to the senses, including remediating conditions which encourage/permit Shanty 6 Town residents to light fires, defecate, camp, sell drugs, use drugs, and peddle prostitution in 7 City parks and on City streets and sidewalks. 8 40. Plaintiffs are entitled to the free and unobstructed use of City parks, streets, and 9 sidewalks. City has the duty to ensure Plaintiffs can enjoy free passage on and through the 10 parks, streets, and sidewalks. The Steinberg Decree, and the City's adherence thereto, breaches 11 this duty. 12 41. The bases for this cause of action include the conduct, acts and omissions of 13 Steinberg and other City officials pursuant to, *inter alia*, the doctrine of *respondeat superior*. 14 15 42. With this Action generally, and this cause of action specifically, Plaintiffs do not seek monetary damages. Plaintiff's seek only equitable and injunctive relief. Accordingly, the 16 17 City is not entitled to immunity. Gov. Code § 814 et seq. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION 18 **Public Nuisance** 19 20 Civ. Code §§ 3490 et seq. 21 (All Plaintiffs Against City) 43. 22 Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1 through 42 above as though fully set forth herein. 23 44. 24 California law defines nuisance as "[a]nything which is injurious to health, 25 including, but not limited to, the illegal sale of controlled substances, or is indecent or offensive 26 to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the 27 comfortable enjoyment of life or property, or unlawfully obstructs the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of any ... public park, square, street or highway[.]" Civ. Code § 3479. A 28 -7-COMPLAINT

1 public nuisance is the substantial and unreasonable interference with a public right.

ain the public property under its tates and perpetuates a public City parks, sidewalks, and streets sanitary conditions in the Shanty risk of contracting noxious hout the Shanty Towns places risk. All Plaintiffs have he enjoyment of their property. njury as a result of the Shanty own right and in a manner the City's tortious conduct.
City parks, sidewalks, and streets sanitary conditions in the Shanty risk of contracting noxious hout the Shanty Towns places risk. All Plaintiffs have he enjoyment of their property. njury as a result of the Shanty own right and in a manner the City's tortious conduct.
sanitary conditions in the Shanty risk of contracting noxious hout the Shanty Towns places risk. All Plaintiffs have he enjoyment of their property. njury as a result of the Shanty own right and in a manner the City's tortious conduct.
risk of contracting noxious hout the Shanty Towns places risk. All Plaintiffs have he enjoyment of their property. njury as a result of the Shanty own right and in a manner the City's tortious conduct.
hout the Shanty Towns places risk. All Plaintiffs have he enjoyment of their property. njury as a result of the Shanty own right and in a manner o the City's tortious conduct.
risk. All Plaintiffs have he enjoyment of their property. njury as a result of the Shanty own right and in a manner o the City's tortious conduct.
he enjoyment of their property. njury as a result of the Shanty own right and in a manner o the City's tortious conduct.
njury as a result of the Shanty own right and in a manner o the City's tortious conduct.
own right and in a manner o the City's tortious conduct.
the City's tortious conduct.
the City's tortious conduct.
<u>DN</u>
/)
e each and every allegation set
h herein.
vise controls all or a portion of the
and/or inactions, as alleged
ion to exist that is harmful to
cts the free passage and use of
citation of prostitution near and/or
it drugs near and/or in front of
and in front of Plaintiffs'
able, or unintentional but
, et annound out

1	negligent or reckless. Alternatively, the conditions permitted by way of the Steinberg Decree			
	negligent of reekless. The mattery, the containents permitted by they of the Stenioers Deeree			
2	are the result of abnormally dangerous activities that substantially interfere with each Plaintiff's			
3	use or enjoyment of his/her/its land that would reasonably annoy or disturb an ordinary person.			
4	No Plaintiff consented to City's conduct; each Plaintiff was harmed; City's conduct was a			
5	substantial factor in causing the harm; and the seriousness of the harm outweighs any perceived			
6	public benefit, for which there is none.			
7	50. Plaintiffs do not seek monetary damages. Plaintiffs seek only equitable and			
8	injunctive relief. Accordingly, City is not entitled to any claim of immunity. Gov. Code § 814.			
9	FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION			
10	Inverse Condemnation			
11	Cal. Const. art. I § 9			
12	(All Plaintiffs Against City)			
13	51. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set			
14	forth in paragraphs 1 through 50 above as though fully set forth herein.			
15	52. California Constitution, Article I Section 19(a) provides, in relevant part,			
16	"Private property may be taken or damaged for a public use and only when just compensation,			
17	ascertained by a jury unless waived, has first been paid to, or into court for, the owner."			
18	53. City's actions and/or inactions by way of the Steinberg Decree have and continue			
19	to limit, damage, and/or burden Plaintiffs' properties and/or businesses to such a degree that			
20	they rise to the level of a regulatory taking for which no compensation has been (or can be)			
21	provided.			
22	54. Plaintiffs do not seek monetary damages. Plaintiffs seek only equitable and			
23	injunctive relief. Accordingly, the City is not entitled to any claim of immunity. Gov. Code §			
24	814.			
25	PRAYER FOR RELIEF			
26	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pay for judgment against Defendant City of Sacrament and for			
27	relief as follows:			
28	1. Injunctive/equitable relief in a manner to be determined by law;			
	- 9 - COMPLAINT			

1	2. An award of costs of s	An award of costs of suit, including attorneys' fees as permitted by law; and		
2	3. Such other and further	Such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.		
3				
4				
5 Dated:	September 19, 2023	GAVRILOV & BROOKS		
6		10/100		
7		OGNIAN GAVRILOV		
8		MICHAEL COLEMAN Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
9		Prime Auctions LLC, Propagate LLC, Elizabeth R., Nicolas M., Ka		
0		H., Sean M., and Patrick K.		
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8		사람이 아파 것은 것 같은 것이 같아?		
9				
0				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
.8				
		- 10 -		