1 MICHAEL J. EMLING - SBN 121435 JOSEPH E. PORTER -PORTER EMLING 555 E. OCEAN BOULEVARD, SUITE 500 3 LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802 (562) 491 1400 (Tel) (562) 491 3400 (Fax) Attorney for * 6 7 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 9 10 JOSEPH ESCALANTE, CHI-COM, Case No. SC075679 INTERNATIONAL, A CALIFORNIA) 12 | CORPORATION CROSS-COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (Breach of Contract) Plaintiff, 13 (Fraud) (Breach of Fiduciary Duty) 14 V . 15 STEVEN OLIVER PFAUTER, JAN) NILS ACKERMANN, STEVEN) 16 RONALD JENSEN, CHALMER LUMERY) AND DOES 1-50, 17 Defendants. 18 STEVEN OLIVER PFAUTER, JAN) NILS ACKERMANN, STEVEN 19 RONALD JENSEN, CHALMER LUMERY) 20 Cross-complainants 21 v. JOSEPH ESCALANTE, CHI-COM,) INTERNATIONAL, A CALIFORNIA) 23 CORPORATION, AND ROES 1-50 DEPT: JUDGE: HON. JON L. SEGAL Cross-defendants 24 DATE CASE FILED: 1/28/03 25 CMC: 6/27/0 NONE 26 TRIAL DATE: GENERAL ALLEGATIONS 28 1 CROSS-COMPLAINT CROSS-COMPLAINANT *, ALLEGES AS FOLLOWS 1 Cross-complainant is unaware of the true names, capacities and acts giving rise to the liability of cross-defendants Roes said cross-defendants by such fictitious 5 complainant will amend to insert the true names of said defendants when their names, capacities and acts giving rise to Cross-complainant is informed and believes liability become known. and thereon alleges that Roes 1-50 are responsible in some manner for the events and injuries herein alleged. Cross-complainant is informed and believes and thereon alleges 10 11 that at all times herein mentioned, each cross-defendant 12 employee of each of the remaining cross-defendants, and 13 in the scope of his agency and employment in doing alleged. 14 15 3. Cross-complainant STEVE PFAUTER, is an individual and a resident of Los Angeles, California. 16 4. Cross-complainant JAN NILS ACKERMANN, is an individual and 17 a resident of Los Angeles, California. 18 5. Cross-complainant STEVEN JENSEN, is an individual and a 19 resident of Khei, Hawaii. 20 21 6. Cross-complainant CHALMER LUMARY, is an individual and a resident of San Bernardino, California. 7. Cross-complainant JOSEPH ESCALANTE, is an attorney and 23 practicing in Los Angeles, California. 24 Cross-complainant CHI-COM INTERNATIONAL INC., is a 25 California Corporation with a principal place of business in Los 26 27 Angeles, California. 9. In or about 1980, ACKERMANN formed a music group which was 28 CROSS-COMPLAINT 1 known as "THE VANDALS." PFAUTER, JENSEN, and ESCALANTE thereafter joined the group as members. 11. The group as so constituted operated as a partnership, with each partner being entitled to an equal share of the profits. 12. In or about 1983, PFAUTER was replaced by LUMERY as a member of "THE VANDALS." 8 13. The group as so constituted operated as a partnership, with each partner being entitled to an equal share of the profits. 9 14. "THE VANDALS" entered into a recording agreement with 10 Epitaph records in or about 1981. 11 12 15. "THE VANDALS" released three albums on the Epitaph label between approximately 1981 and 1985, "PEACE THRU VANDALISM," 13 "WHEN IN ROME, DO AS THE VANDALS," and "SLIPPERY WHEN ILL." The 14 members of the group as then comprised were co-authors of the 15 16 sound recordings, and were co-authors of many of the musical compositions embodied therein. 17 16. Epitaph records subsequently released its rights in the 18 19 master recordings of said albums back to the members of the 20 group. 21 17. Defendants ESCALANTE and CHI-COM have since exploited the master recordings to their own advantage, while failing to 22 23 account to the group members for the proceeds. 18. ESCALANTE, by virtue of his position as a co-partner with defendants, owed a fiduciary duty to account to his co-partners. 25 26 By reason of the fiduciary relationship, any statute of

```
Cross-complainant refers to and incorporates herein by reference
paragraphs 1 through 18 of this cross-complaint.
```

24. ESCALANTE, as a fiduciary, owed an affirmative duty of

disclosure to his co partners as to his use of the masters, and

25. ESCALANTE omitted to fully disclose his use of the masters,

and the amount of profits, and from time to time falsely

26. ESCALANTE intended by his omissions and misrepresentations to

induce cross-complainant to refrain from investigating and pursuing his

Cross-complainant reasonably relied on the aforementioned

omissions representations in failing to investigate and pursue the full

interest in royalties arising from any use of the masters.

limitations is tolled and does not run as to defendant

3

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(BREACH OF CONTRACT AGAINST ESCALANTE)

Cross-complainant refers to and incorporates herein by reference

20. The parties hereto agreed to enter into an oral partnership

known as "THE VANDALS," and further agreed to share equally in

Cross-defendant has breached said agreement by converting

the intellectual property of the group to his own benefit, and

22. Cross-complainant has been damaged thereby in an amount

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(FRAUD AGAINST ESCALANTE)

by failing to account to his co partners for the profits.

paragraphs 1 through 18 of this cross-complaint.

as to the funds derived therefrom.

extent of his interests.

according to proof.

according to proof.

according to proof.

remaining cross-defendants agreed

their respective rights.

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (CONTRACT)

ON THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (FRAUD)

Costs of suit herein incurred;

ON THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (FIDUCIARY DUTY)

Costs of suit herein incurred;

masters to the exclusion of cross-complainant, and

of the causes of action alleged herein.

paragraphs 1 through 18 of this cross-complaint.

as to the funds derived therefrom.

misreported earnings from use of the masters.

the profits of the venture.

according to proof.

CROSS-COMPLAINT

CROSS-COMPLAINT

27

28

1

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

2.

3.

4.

2.

herein;

34.

35.

31.

23.

Escalante.

28. Cross-complainant has been damaged thereby in an amount

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY AGAINST ESCALANTE)

disclosure to his co partners as to his use of the masters, and

masters to his own benefit, and by failing to truthfully account

32. Cross-complainant has been damaged thereby in an amount

33. The conduct of cross-defendant alleged herein was fraudulent in

nature, entitling cross complainants to exemplary damages in an amount

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(CIVIL CONSPIRACY AGAINST ESCALANTE AND CHI-COM AND ROES 1-50)

profits therefrom into one or more entities controlled by ESCALANTE,

making each such cross defendant co-liable with ESCALANTE on all

to his co-partners for the profits derived from the masters.

Cross-complainant refers to and incorporates herein by reference

ESCALANTE, as a fiduciary, owed an affirmative duty of

ESCALANTE breached his fiduciary duty by converting the

```
Cross-complainant refers to and incorporates herein by reference
paragraphs 1 through 33 of this cross-complaint.
      Cross-complainant is informed and believes and thereon alleges
that at all times herein mentioned, ESCALANTE and
                                                     of
                                                           each of
                                                                     the
```

to appropriate

and

have diverted the

CROSS-COMPLAINT

```
(DECLARATORY RELIEF AGAINST ESCALANTE AND CHI-COM AND ROES 1-
                                  50)
36.
       Cross-complainant refers to and incorporates herein by reference
paragraphs 1 through 35 of this cross-complaint.
```

37. An actual controversy has arisen between the parties hereto

as to the ownership of the master recordings, copyright

interests in the sound recordings and compositions referred to

herein. The parties are entitled to a judicial declaration of

WHEREFORE, Cross-complainant prays for judgment as follows:

General damages in an amount according to proof;

Such other relief as the court may deem proper.

General damages in an amount according to proof;

General damages in an amount according to proof;

Prejudgment interest in an amount according to proof; and,

CROSS-COMPLAINT

Punitive Damages in amount according to proof;

Such other relief as the court may deem proper.

Punitive Damages in amount according to proof;

Prejudgment interest in an amount according to proof; and,

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

	3.	Costs of suit herein incurred;
	4.	Prejudgment interest in an amount according to proof; and,
	5.	Such other relief as the court may deem proper.

ON THE FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (CIVIL CONSPIRACY)

General damages in an amount according to proof;

Prejudgment interest in an amount according to proof; and,

A declaration of the rights of the parties as alleged

MICHAEL J. EMLING, Attorney

CROSS-COMPLAINT

for CROSS COMPLAINANT

Punitive Damages in amount according to proof;

Such other relief as the court may deem proper. 5. ON THE FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (DECLARATORY RELIEF)

Costs of suit herein incurred;

Date: May 11, 2003 PORTER EMLING By:

Such other relief as the court may deem proper.

7