1	Richard K. Bridgford, Esq., SBN: 119554				
2	Michael H. Artinian, Esq., SBN: 203443 BRIDGFORD, GLEASON & ARTINIAN				
	26 Corporate Plaza, Suite 250				
3 4	Newport Beach, CA 92660 Telephone: (949) 831-6611 Facsimile: (949) 831-6622	ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California, County of Orange			
5	Brian S. Kabateck, Esq., SBN: 152054	02/01/2016 at 06:08:00 PM			
6-	Joshua H. Haffner, Esq., SBN: 188652	Clerk of the Superior Court By Sarah Loose,Deputy Clerk			
7	KABATECK BROWN KELLNER LLP 644 South Figueroa Street				
8	Los Angeles, CA 90017				
9	Telephone: (213) 217-5000 Facsimile: (213) 217-5010				
10	John Patrick McNicholas, IV, Esq., SBN: 1258	268			
11	McNICHOLAS & McNICHOLAS, LLP 10866 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90024				
12	Telephone: (310) 474-1582				
13	Facsimile: (310) 475-7871				
14	Penny J. Manship, Esq., SBN: 198077 THE MANSHIP LAW FIRM 20929 Ventura Blvd., Suite 47-446 Woodland Hills, CA 91364 Telephone: (818) 313-9090 Facsimile: (818) 313-9030				
15					
16					
17					
18	Attorneys for Plaintiffs KIRAN SHAH; HEMA	ANGINI PATEL, ANTHONY GODFREY			
19	and NAOMI GODFREY; VICTOR GUDZUN DUARTE and MADELEINE DUARTE, on be	AS and JULIE GUDZUNAS; EYNALD			
20	situated	enant of themselves and an others similarly			
21	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
22	COUNTY OI	F ORANGE			
23	KIRAN SHAH, an individual;	Case No.: 30-2014-00731604-CU-OR-CXC			
24	HEMANGINI PATEL, an individual; ANTHONY GODFREY, an individual:	Assigned for all purposes to:			
25	NAOMI GODFREY, an individual; VICTOR GUDZUNAS, an individual;	Judge Thierry Patrick Colaw Dept. CX-105			
26	JULIE GUDZUNAS, an individual; EYNALD DUARTE, an individual; and	r			
27	HEMANGINI PATEL, an individual; HEMANGINI PATEL, an individual; ANTHONY GODFREY, an individual; NAOMI GODFREY, an individual; VICTOR GUDZUNAS, an individual; JULIE GUDZUNAS, an individual; EYNALD DUARTE, an individual; and MADELEINE DUARTE, an individual; on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT			
28	Plaintiffs,	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
- 1	1				

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

were signed by the builder on or after January 1, 2003.

THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff Kiran Shah and Hemangini Patel are individuals and residents of the Kerrigan Ranch area in Yorba Linda, California, whose principal residence is located at 4041 Paso Fino Way, Yorba Linda, California 92886.
- 6. Plaintiff Vic and Julie Gudzunas are individuals and residents of the Kerrigan Ranch area in Yorba Linda, California, whose principal residence is located at 19703 Morgan Court, Yorba Linda, California 92886.
- 7. Plaintiff Anthony and Naomi Godfrey are individuals and residents of the Kerrigan Ranch area in Yorba Linda, California, whose principal residence is located at 19696 Morgan Court, Yorba Linda, California 92886.
- 8. Plaintiff Eynald and Madeleine are individuals and residents of the Kerrigan Ranch area in Yorba Linda, California, whose principal residence is located at 3981 Paso Fino Way, Yorba Linda, California 92886.
- 9. Plaintiffs' and the class members' homes at issue in this action are all residences in the Kerrigan Ranch area in Yorba Linda, California, including but not limited to, homes in the 92886 zip code, that contain or contained copper pipe, were substantially completed within ten (10) years of the filing of the original complaint in this action, whose original purchase agreements were signed by the builder on or after January 1, 2003, and are collectively referred to herein as the "Subject Homes."
- 10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that at all times relevant, defendant Pulte Home Corporation was or is a business entity engaged in business in the State of California.
- 11. The term "Pulte" refers to defendant Pulte Home Corporation. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that defendant Pulte constructed the Subject Homes, and supplied and/or distributed the copper pipe at issue used in class members' homes.
- 12. As used herein, the term "defendants" refers collectively to all defendants named herein.

- 13. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereupon allege that defendants, including DOES, are/were involved in the planning, development, design, construction, warranting, repair, selection of materials, supply of materials, installation of materials and/or sale of the Subject Homes, and/or were responsible for the design, development, testing, manufacture, distribution, supply, marketing, sale, and warranting of the Subject Homes in the Kerrigan Ranch area of Yorba Linda, California that contain the copper pipe at issue.
- 14. Plaintiffs are currently ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of the defendants sued herein under the fictitious names Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore, sue such defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of said fictitiously named defendants when their true names and capacities have been ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the fictitiously named Doe Defendants legally responsible in some manner for the events and occurrences alleged herein, and for the damages suffered by the class.
- 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that all defendants, including the fictitious Doe defendants, were at all relevant times acting as actual agents, conspirators, ostensible agents, alter egos, partners and/or joint venturers and/or employees of all other defendants, and that all acts alleged herein occurred within the course and scope of said agency, employment, partnership, alter ego relationship, and joint venture, conspiracy or enterprise, and with the express and/or implied permission, knowledge, consent, authorization and ratification of their co-defendants; however, each of these allegations are deemed "alternative" theories whenever not doing so would result in a contradiction with other allegations.
- 16. Does 1-50, whose identities are presently unknown, are the subject of ongoing discovery and therefore are sued under fictitious names. Does 1-50 were involved in the planning, development, design, construction, warranting, repair, selection of materials, supply of materials, installation of materials and/or sale of the Subject Homes, which contain the defective copper pipe at issue, and proximately caused the injuries and damages herein alleged. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities as they are ascertained.

- 17. Does 51-100, whose identities are presently unknown, are the subject of ongoing discovery and therefore are sued under fictitious names. Does 51-100 were responsible for and engaged in the design, development, testing, manufacture, distribution, supply, marketing, sale, and warranting of the defective copper pipe at issue. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities as they are ascertained.
- 18. All allegations in this complaint are based on information and belief and/or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery. Whenever allegations in this complaint are contrary or inconsistent, such allegations shall be deemed alternative.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 19. The contracts at issue in this case were entered into, approved and/or ratified within the venue of this Court. Venue as to each defendant is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 17203, and Code of Civil Procedure sections 395(a) and 395.5.
- 20. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court. Federal jurisdiction over this action does not exist. The amount in controversy as to the representative plaintiffs does not exceed \$75,000.00, including interest and any pro rata award of attorneys' fees and costs. The damages, attorneys' fees and costs of individual class members may not be aggregated to meet the federal jurisdictional amount.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 21. Defendants installed and used defective copper pipe in the Subject Homes.

 Defendants manufactured, designed, supplied, distributed, warranted, the copper pipe at issue, and/or constructed numerous homes utilizing it.
- 22. These Subject Homes are located in a number of subdivisions throughout the Kerrigan Ranch area of Orange County, including but not limited to, homes in the 92886 zip code (the "Class Area"). Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the copper pipe utilized in the Subject Homes was defective for the water conditions in the Class Area, and damages Plaintiffs' and class members' homes in violation of the standards of residential

construction set forth in California Civil Code §895, et seq.

- 23. The homes have in common a serious defect, namely the incorporation of defective copper pipe instead of stronger resistive pipe.
- 24. Plaintiffs Kiran Shah and Hemangini Patel, Vic and Julie Gudzunas, Anthony and Naomi Godfrey, and Eynald and Madeline Duarte, purchased four of the Subject Homes, containing the defective copper pipe, which has caused damage to their homes.
- 25. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereupon allege that the above-referenced defective condition violates the standards of residential construction set forth in California Civil Code §895, et seq. and has proximately caused damage to homeowners who are members of the class.
- 26. Plaintiffs are informed, believe and thereupon allege that the Builders' contractors are agents of the builders. One such contractor has confirmed in sworn deposition testimony that it has known about pinhole leaks in copper pipe in Orange County for years prior to building the Subject Homes. Despite this clear notice, they failed to warn the homeowners of possible defects, neglected to select proper pipe for the water type, and incorporated a defective component pipe into the residences.
- 27. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereupon allege that the builders and/or their contractors received reports of numerous complaints that gave them notice of the defect inherent in the copper pipe incorporated into residences in the class area, including complaints of pinhole leaks, for homes in Orange County, prior to building the subject homes.
- 28. Plaintiffs are informed, believe and based thereupon allege that the builder and/or their contractors have tested the water and/or pipe installed in the homes prior to installing copper pipe into the subject homes, and had information prior to incorporating the copper pipe into the residences confirming that the copper pipe installed in the homes was defective.
- 29. Each of the named Plaintiffs and class members have a contract and/or are in privity with defendants and/or are third party beneficiaries of contracts. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend their complaint to attach a copy of the contracts and warranties at issue after an appropriate opportunity for discovery.

- 30. Plaintiffs and the class members' homes have an actionable defect which violates the standards set forth in California Civil Code §895, et seq. Individual product manufacturers, material suppliers, builders, general contractors, and subcontractors are subject to an action for recovery of damages for the violation of the standards enumerated in California Civil Code section 895, et seq.
- 31. Plaintiffs and class members will be required to retain the services of experts and consultants to investigate the nature and extent of the defect, and seek damages for those investigative costs pursuant to California Civil Code section 944.
- 32. Plaintiffs have incurred, and will incur during the pendency of this action, attorney's fees and costs, which are necessary for the prosecution of this action and will result in a benefit to members of the class. This action will result in the enforcement of important rights supported by a strong public policy affecting the public interest which will confer a significant benefit on the general public and a large class of persons, where the necessity and burden of private enforcement are such as to make an award appropriate pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.
- 33. Plaintiffs allege and assert that its claims and this legal action have all been brought in a timely manner and within the statute of limitations and repose periods, if applicable. The defect in the copper pipe, as alleged herein, is latent in nature. Plaintiffs and class members did not discover, and could not reasonably have discovered, its defective nature until a date within the statute of limitations for each cause of action alleged.
- 34. To the fullest extent of the law, Plaintiffs seek recovery for injuries and/or damages to property.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

35. The class consists of:

All homeowners in the Class Area whose residences contain copper pipe, were constructed by Pulte and substantially completed within ten (10) years of the filing of the original complaint in this action, and the original purchase agreements were signed by the builder on or after January 1, 2003.

36. The class is so numerous that joinder would be impractical and disposition of the

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Standards of Residential Construction)

(By Plaintiffs Against All Defendants)

- 42. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.
- 43. Defendants are subject to an action for recovery of damages for the violation of the standards enumerated in California Civil Code §895, et seq.
- 44. Defendants are liable for damages arising out of and related to the incorporation, at the time of original construction, of defective copper pipe into Plaintiffs' and class members' residences, which is leaking and/or corroding so as to impede the useful life of the system.
- 45. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' violations of standards for residential construction, Plaintiffs and class members have been damaged and are entitled to recover the cost of remedying the incorporation of the defective copper pipe in addition to all other damages permitted under Section 944 and/or that the court deems just and proper.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unfair Business Practices, Business & Professions Code §§17200, et seq.) (By Plaintiffs Against All Defendants)

- 46. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 47. Business & Professions Code section 17200 prohibits any unfair competition, including any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.
- 48. The conduct of defendants, as set forth in the allegations in this complaint, constitutes unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices.
- 49. Defendants' <u>unlawful</u> conduct includes, but is not limited to, violation of California Civil Code § 896, et seq. Specifically, the building standards set forth at sections 896(a)(14) and/or (15) were violated by Defendants' incorporation, selection, design, manufacture, supply and/or utilization of the defective pipe at issue herein that has leaked and/or corroded so as to impede the useful life of the system a statutory violation of law.

50. Defendants' <u>fraudulent</u> conduct includes, but is not limited to, concealing from bot
original and subsequent purchasers that the copper pipe installed in the Subject Homes was not
compatible and adequate for the water conditions in the area, which defendants knew or should
have known; Defendants had express knowledge that the pipe used would corrode and/or leak
given the water conditions in the class area, and failed to disclose the same to original and
subsequent purchasers of the Subject Homes. As previously herein alleged, the builders and/or
their contractors received reports of numerous complaints that gave them notice of the defect
inherent in the copper pipe incorporated into residences in the class area, including complaints of
pinhole leaks, for homes in Orange County, prior to building the subject homes; and the builders
and/or contractors have tested the water and/or pipe installed in the homes prior to installing
copper pipe into the subject homes, and had information prior to incorporating the copper pipe int
the residences evidencing that the copper pipe installed in the homes was defective. Plaintiffs
relied upon Defendants accurately disclosing the impact of the water on the copper pipe which did
not meet the building standards set forth at Civ. Code Section 896(a)(14) and/or (15).

- 51. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful and/or fraudulent conduct described hereinabove, Plaintiffs and the putative class have suffered actual injury and economic loss in the form of diminution in the effective life of the copper pipe and diminution in the useful life of the plumbing system on the whole, in addition to diminution in value of the Subject Homes.
- 52. On behalf of the general public, plaintiffs and members of each class request that this Court order that Defendants be required to disgorge the profits they have wrongfully obtained through the use of these unlawful, unfair or fraudulent practices, provide restitution, and that an injunction issue to correct the wrongful business practices alleged in this complaint.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 1. For general, special, and consequential damages;
- 2. For the cost to repair and/or replace the defective copper pipe;
- 3. For costs and expenditures to correct, cure, or mitigate damages caused or that will

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

1	DATED: February 1, 2016	BRIDGFORD, GLEASON & ARTINIAN
2		KABATECK BROWN KELLNER LLP McNICHOLAS & McNICHOLAS
3	·	THE MANSHIP LAW FIRM
4		I MA (tates)
5		By: Richard K. Bridgford
6		Michael H. Artinian Brian S. Kabateck
7		Joshua H. Haffner
8		John Patrick McNicholas, IV Penny J. Manship
9		Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Class Representatives, on behalf of themselves and
10	1	all others similarly situated
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury of all claims and causes of action in this lawsuit. DATED: February 1, 2016 BRIDGFORD, GLEASON & ARTINIAN KABATECK BROWN KELLNER LLP McNICHOLAS & McNICHOLAS THE MANSHIP LAW FIRM By: Richard K. Bridgford Michael H. Artinian John Patrick McNicholas, IV Brian S. Kabateck Joshua H. Haffner Penny J. Manship Attorneys for Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated

PROOF OF SERVICE Shah v. Pulte Homes, et al.

Orange County Superior Court Case No.: 30-2014-00731604

I, the undersigned, declare that:

I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. I am employed in the County where the Proof of Service was prepared and my business address is Law Offices of BRIDGFORD, GLEASON & ARTINIAN, 26 Corporate Plaza, Suite 250, Newport Beach, CA 92660.

On the date set forth below, I served the following document(s): <u>FIRST</u> <u>AMENDED</u> COMPLAINT on the interested party(s):

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

by the following means:

- () BY MAIL: By placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am readily familiar with the business practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is processed for collection and mailing it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service in Newport Beach, California to the address(es) shown herein.
- () BY PERSONAL SERVICE: By placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope, I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand to the recipients herein shown (as set forth on the service list).
- () BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: I served the foregoing document by Overnight Delivery as follows: I placed true copies of the foregoing document in sealed envelopes or packages designated by the express service carrier, addressed to recipients shown herein (as set forth on the service list), with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.
- (X) BY ELECTRONIC MAIL (EMAIL): I caused a true copy thereof sent via email to the address(s) shown herein.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: February 1, 2016

Debbie Knipe

SERVICE LIST

Shah v. Pulte Homes, et al.

Orange County Superior Court Case No.: 30-2014-00731604

Joseph A. Ferrentino, Esq.

895 Dove Street, 5th Floor Newport Beach, CA 92660

NEWMEYER & DILLON LLP

KABATECK BROWN KELLNER LLP

McNICHOLAS & McNICHOLAS, LLP

John Patrick McNicholas, IV, Esq.

10866 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1400

THE MANSHIP LAW FIRM 20929 Ventura Blvd., Suite 47-446

Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Jeffrey R. Brower, Esq.

Brian S. Kabateck, Esq. Joshua H. Haffner, Esq.

644 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017

Los Angeles, CA 90024 Penny J. Manship, Esq.

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

Facsimile: (949) 854-7009
joseph.ferrentino@ndlf.com
jeffrey.brower@ndlf.com
Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs
Telephone: (213) 217-5000
Facsimile: (213) 217-5010
<u>bsk@kbklawyers.com</u>
jhh@kbklawyers.com
Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs
Telephone: (310) 474-1582
Facsimile: (310) 475-7871
pmc@mcnicholaslaw.com
Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs
Telephone: (818) 313-9090
Facsimile: (818) 313-9030
pmanship@msn.com

Counsel for Defendant PULTE HOME

CORPORATION

Telephone: (949) 854-7000