

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BYRON CHAPMAN,

NO. CIV. S-04-1339 LKK/DAD

Plaintiff,

v.

O R D E R

PIER 1 IMPORTS (U.S.) INC.,

Defendant.

_____ /

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint asserts one claim under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181-89 ("Public Accommodations and Services Operated by Private Entities"), against defendant Pier 1 Imports (U.S.), Inc. ("Pier 1"),¹ along with several California state claims.

¹ The complaint alleges: (1) that plaintiff was denied the "full and equal enjoyment" of defendant's facility, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a); (2) that Pier 1's facility was not designed to be "readily accessible to and usable" by the disabled, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1); (3) that Pier 1's facility was altered in a manner that failed to make the facility

1 Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief under the ADA and monetary relief
2 under the state claims.

3 The parties have cross-moved for summary judgment. For the
4 reasons that follow, defendant's motion for summary judgment (and
5 other ancillary motions) will be denied, and plaintiff's cross-
6 motion for summary judgment will be granted.

7 **II. BACKGROUND**

8 **A. The Original Complaint.**

9 Plaintiff filed his original complaint on July 13, 2004,
10 asserting claims under the federal ADA, as well as California state
11 claims under the Unruh Act (Cal. Civ. Code § 51), and The Disabled
12 Persons Act (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 54 & 54.1).² The complaint alleged
13 the existence of architectural barriers in the store that violated
14 his rights under the ADA.

15

16

17 accessible, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2); and (4) that
18 Pier 1 failed to make "reasonable modifications" in their policies,
19 practices or procedures needed to afford reasonable access to the
20 facility to the disabled, in violation of 42 U.S.C.
21 § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

22 ² The state claims are entirely dependent on the federal
23 claims. The Second Amended Complaint does not allege any conduct
24 beyond that which is alleged to violate the ADA. The Unruh Act
25 provides that conduct violative of the ADA is also a violation of
26 state law. Cal. Civ. Code § 51(f) ("A violation of the right of
any individual under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act
of 1990 (P.L. 101-336) shall also constitute a violation of this
section"). The Disabled Persons Act provides the same. Cal. Civ.
Code § 54(c) ("A violation of the right of any individual under the
federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-336)
also constitutes a violation of this section"); 54.1(d) ("A
violation of the right of an individual under the Americans with
Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) also constitutes a
violation of this section").

1 **B. First Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment.**

2 The parties filed their first cross-motions for summary
3 judgment in 2005. This court determined, first, that Chapman's
4 standing was not restricted to those barriers he had personally
5 encountered. Chapman v. Pier 1 Imports, 2006 WL 1686511 at *4-5
6 (E.D. Cal. 2006). The court further held that Chapman was not
7 limited to those barriers he had alleged in his complaint, and that
8 defendant had fair notice of them by the time the summary judgment
9 motions were filed. Id., at *4-5. On the merits, this court
10 partially granted and partially denied each party's motions.³

11 **C. The Appeal.**

12 On appeal, the initial Ninth Circuit panel found that Chapman
13 had standing as to those barriers he had actually encountered, but
14 lacked standing as to any un-encountered barrier which did not

15 ³ The court dismissed the claim for improper or missing signs
16 designating "permanent room and spaces," finding that Chapman
17 lacked standing. Chapman, 2006 WL 1686511 at *9.

18 The court granted summary judgment to defendant on the claims
19 relating to: ten alleged barriers for which there was simply no
20 evidence (id., at *8); blocked routes to the restroom and emergency
21 exit, as the evidence showed these were only temporary in nature
22 (id., at *9-10); and the force required to open the entrance door
23 (id., at 11).

24 The court granted summary judgment to Chapman on the claims
25 involving: improper posting of "ISA signage" on the store's
26 entrance doors (id., at *9); improper "dimensional tolerances"
27 (id., at *11); and the minimum 36" aisle width requirement (id.,
28 at *12).

29 The court denied summary judgment on plaintiff's claims relating
30 to: the placement of the International Symbol of Accessibility
31 ("ISA") (id., at *11); the Pictogram on the men's restroom wall
32 (id., at *12-13); and the pressure required to operate the men's
33 restroom door (id., at *13).

1 deter him from re-entering the store. Chapman v. Pier 1 Imports
2 (U.S.) Inc., 571 F.3d 853 (9th Cir. 2009).

3 On en banc review, the Ninth Circuit agreed with this court
4 that Chapman had standing to sue for injunctive relief as to
5 barriers he had encountered, but also as to "other barriers related
6 to his disability, even if he is not deterred from returning to the
7 public accommodation at issue." Chapman v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.)
8 Inc., 631 F.3d 939, 944 (9th Cir. 2011) (en banc). Thus, even in
9 the absence of actual deterrence, Chapman has standing if he
10 demonstrates "injury-in-fact coupled with an intent to return to
11 a noncompliant facility." Id. The Ninth Circuit also agreed
12 that after establishing standing as to encountered barriers,
13 Chapman "may also sue for injunctive relief as to unencountered
14 barriers related to his disability." Id.

15 The Ninth Circuit vacated this court's decision and remanded
16 for dismissal however, because Chapman failed to establish that he
17 "personally suffered discrimination as defined by the ADA as to
18 encountered barriers on account of his disability." Id.

19 **D. The Remand.**

20 Although the Ninth Circuit instructed this court to dismiss
21 the complaint for lack of federal jurisdiction, plaintiff sought
22 leave to amend his complaint. It was not clear if this was
23 permitted by the Ninth Circuit mandate, and so this court sought
24 clarification. The Ninth Circuit ultimately clarified that the
25 court could grant leave to amend, in its discretion. The court
26 granted leave to amend the complaint.

1 **E. The Amended Complaint.**

2 Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint, and ultimately was
3 granted leave to amend that complaint. The Second Amended
4 Complaint, the operative complaint here, specifically alleges that
5 Chapman visited the Pier 1 store at 2070 Harbison Drive in
6 Vacaville, California, and encountered barriers that interfered
7 with his ability to use and enjoy the facility. Those barriers
8 are: (1) a customer service counter that was cluttered with
9 merchandise;⁴ and (2) store aisles that are too narrow, that is,
10 less than 36 inches wide, because they too, are cluttered with
11 merchandise and other obstructions. These allegations are
12 sufficient to establish Chapman's standing to sue under the Ninth
13 Circuit's mandate, since he now identifies which barriers he
14 actually encountered and how he was injured by them. Defendant
15 does not argue lack of standing on these cross-motions.

16 Chapman also alleges that defendant is in violation of
17 California's Health & Safety Code, Part 5.5 (§§ 19955, et seq.),
18 and Govt. Code § 4450, which relate to California's standards for
19 making buildings accessible.

20 **F. The Current Cross-Motions.**

21 Defendant moves for summary judgment on the ADA claims on
22 three grounds: (1) the accessible counter and the aisles were
23 completely clear on January 30, 2012, rendering plaintiff's claims

24
25 ⁴ The complaint is less than crystal clear on this allegation.
26 However, both parties seem to interpret it in the manner just
described. It appears that plaintiff is not complaining that the
accessibility counter was the wrong height.

1 moot; (2) any obstructions on the counter or in the aisles were
2 "movable" or "were only temporary," and thus did not violate the
3 ADA; and (3) Chapman has no "competent evidence" of any blockage
4 of the accessibility counter. As for the claim under the
5 California Health & Safety Code, defendant asserts that plaintiff
6 "cannot establish any violation of state accessibility standards."

7 Chapman cross-moves for "summary judgment or partial summary
8 judgment," although he does not specify which claim or claims he
9 seeks judgment upon.⁵ Since his brief addresses the ADA, the court
10 infers that Chapman seeks summary judgment on the claims relating
11 to the ADA claim, as well as the Unruh Act, and The Persons with
12 Disabilities Act (as noted above, both state claims are established
13 if the ADA claim is established).⁶ Chapman asserts that the
14 accessibility counter and the store's aisles were regularly blocked
15 by merchandise. He further asserts that these blockages were not
16 temporary, "but a systematic pattern of abuse against the
17 disabled."

18 ////

20 ⁵ Defendant moves to preclude plaintiff from moving for
21 summary judgment, arguing that plaintiff missed the deadline for
22 filing the cross-motion by one day. That motion will be denied.
23 Defendant also moves to strike portions of plaintiff's declaration
24 as "legal conclusions." The court can discern which assertions are
25 factual and which are legal without striking portions of the
26 declaration. That motion will also be denied.

24 ⁶ Chapman's brief says nothing about this fourth claim,
25 relating to California's Health & Safety Code and the Gov't Code.
26 It thus appears that Chapman does not seek summary judgment on that
claim. To the degree Chapman does move for summary judgment on his
fourth claim, it will be denied.

1 **II. STANDARDS**

2 **A. Summary Judgment.**

3 Summary judgment is appropriate "if the movant shows that
4 there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant
5 is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P.
6 56(a); Ricci v. DeStefano, 557 U.S. 557, ___, 129 S. Ct. 2658, 2677
7 (2009) (it is the movant's burden "to demonstrate that there is 'no
8 genuine issue as to any material fact' and that they are 'entitled
9 to judgment as a matter of law'"); Walls v. Central Contra Costa
10 Transit Authority, 653 F.3d 963, 966 (9th Cir. 2011) (per curiam)
11 (same).

12 Consequently, "[s]ummary judgment must be denied" if the court
13 "determines that a 'genuine dispute as to [a] material fact'
14 precludes immediate entry of judgment as a matter of law." Ortiz
15 v. Jordan, 562 U.S. ___, 131 S. Ct. 884, 891 (2011), quoting Fed.
16 R. Civ. P. 56(a); Comite de Jornaleros de Redondo Beach v. City of
17 Redondo Beach, 657 F.3d 936, 942 (9th Cir. 2011) (en banc), cert.
18 denied, 565 U.S. ___, 131 S. Ct. 1566 (2012) (same).

19 Under summary judgment practice, the moving party bears the
20 initial responsibility of informing the district court of the basis
21 for its motion, and "citing to particular parts of the materials
22 in the record," Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1)(A), that show "that a fact
23 cannot be ... disputed." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1); Nursing Home
24 Pension Fund, Local 144 v. Oracle Corp. (In re Oracle Corp.
25 Securities Litigation), 627 F.3d 376, 387 (9th Cir. 2010) ("The
26 moving party initially bears the burden of proving the absence of

1 a genuine issue of material fact"), citing Celotex v. Catrett, 477
2 U.S. 317, 323 (1986).

3 If the moving party meets its initial responsibility, the
4 burden then shifts to the non-moving party to establish the
5 existence of a genuine issue of material fact. Matsushita Elec.
6 Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 585-86 (1986);
7 Oracle Corp., 627 F.3d at 387 (where the moving party meets its
8 burden, "the burden then shifts to the non-moving party to
9 designate specific facts demonstrating the existence of genuine
10 issues for trial"). In doing so, the non-moving party may not rely
11 upon the denials of its pleadings, but must tender evidence of
12 specific facts in the form of affidavits and/or other admissible
13 materials in support of its contention that the dispute exists.
14 Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1)(A).

15 A wrinkle arises when the non-moving party will bear the
16 burden of proof at trial. In that case, "the moving party need
17 only prove that there is an absence of evidence to support the non-
18 moving party's case." Oracle Corp., 627 F.3d at 387.

19 "In evaluating the evidence to determine whether there is a
20 genuine issue of fact," the court draws "all reasonable inferences
21 supported by the evidence in favor of the non-moving party."
22 Walls, 653 F.3d at 966. Because the court only considers
23 inferences "supported by the evidence," it is the non-moving
24 party's obligation to produce a factual predicate as a basis for
25 such inferences. See Richards v. Nielsen Freight Lines, 810 F.2d
26 898, 902 (9th Cir. 1987). The opposing party "must do more than

1 simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the
2 material facts Where the record taken as a whole could not
3 lead a rational trier of fact to find for the nonmoving party,
4 there is no 'genuine issue for trial.'" Matsushita, 475 U.S. at
5 586-87 (citations omitted).

6 **B. Title III (ADA) Discrimination Claim - Elements.**

7 To prevail on his Title III discrimination claim, Chapman must
8 show that (1) he is disabled within the meaning of the ADA; (2) the
9 defendant is a private entity that owns, leases, or operates a
10 place of public accommodation;⁷ and (3) Chapman was denied public
11 accommodations (that is, full and equal treatment) by the defendant
12 because of his disability. Molski v. M.J. Cable, Inc., 481 F.3d
13 724, 730 (9th Cir. 2007), citing 42 U.S.C. §§ 12182(a)-(b);
14 Chapman 2006 WL 1686511 at *7.

15 **ANALYSIS**

16 **I. DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

17 **A. Tracey Snow Declaration.**

18 Defendant supports its summary judgment motion with, among
19 other things, the Declaration of Tracy Snow (Dkt. No. 185), the
20 store manager at the Vacaville store. Plaintiff objects to the use
21 of this declaration because defendant never identified Snow as a
22 person with knowledge during discovery. Although plaintiff does
23 not explain the problem, it would appear that plaintiff therefore
24 never had the opportunity to interview or depose Snow, and thus her

25 ⁷ The first two elements are undisputed in this case. See
26 Chapman 2006 WL 1686511 at *7.

1 Declaration is an unfair surprise to them.

2 Plaintiff is correct. Snow unsurprisingly is not identified
3 in defendant's October 11, 2004 "Initial Disclosures" pursuant to
4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A), because Snow did not yet work there.
5 However, defendant did not identify anyone with knowledge in its
6 initial disclosures, and never supplemented the disclosures to add
7 Snow. On February 21, 2005, defendant answered Interrogatories
8 that clearly asked for the names of persons with knowledge. See
9 Dkt. No. 28-13 at No. 6. Defendant did not provide the name of
10 Snow or anyone else. On May 6, 2005, defendant supplemented its
11 interrogatory responses by stating that it was not aware of any
12 architectural barriers. See Dkt. No. 28-14 at No. 6. However, it
13 did not provide the name of any person with knowledge. Defendant
14 apparently never supplemented its interrogatory responses to
15 identify Snow as a person with knowledge.

16 Defendant did, however, bury deep in its Interrogatory
17 responses, in response to an inquiry about affirmative defenses,
18 that an unidentified "Store Manager" knew about Pier 1's policies.
19 See Dkt. No. 28-13 at No. 12. Certainly, plaintiff should have
20 inquired further and found out that Snow is the store manager. But
21 defendant did not give any indication that she was a percipient
22 witness about the cluttered or uncluttered state of the
23 accessibility counter, and whether the aisles were blocked with
24 merchandise and other materials. However, much of her Declaration
25 is about those matters. Defendant hid this witness - albeit in
26 plain view - by not naming her as a witness in response to any of

1 the interrogatories directed to the basics of plaintiff's
2 affirmative case, where she is the obvious percipient witness, and
3 by including her only in response to the request for information
4 about affirmative defenses.

5 Rule 37(c)(1), Fed. R. Civ. P. provides: "If a party fails to
6 provide information or identify a witness as required by Rule 26(a)
7 or (e), the party is not allowed to use that information or witness
8 to supply evidence on a motion, at a hearing, or at a trial,"
9 unless excused.⁸ Defendant does not dispute that Snow was never
10 previously identified, and in fact, does not address this issue at
11 all. It is unfair to consider the Snow Declaration on this motion,
12 when plaintiff has had no reasonable opportunity to interview,
13 depose, or otherwise conduct discovery of her.

14 Accordingly, plaintiff's motion to strike the Snow Declaration
15 is **GRANTED**.

16 **B. ADA Claims**

17 **1. Obstructions - Counter and Aisles⁹**

18
19 ⁸ The rule does not require a motion. However, on motion, the
20 court may impose alternate sanctions. Fed. R. Civ.
P. 37(c)(1)(A)-(C).

21 ⁹ Defendant engages in separate discussions of (1) whether the
22 accessible counter is obstructed and (2) whether the aisles are
23 obstructed. The court discusses them together. It is true that
24 the counter and the aisles have separate technical requirements.
25 The accessible counter must be no taller than 36 inches in height,
26 and the aisles must be no narrower than 36 inches in width.
However, Chapman does not challenge whether the technical
requirements are met as to the counter or the aisles. He alleges
that both are obstructed with merchandise, plants and other
materials such that he is unable to use them. The law governing
obstructions does not distinguish between an obstructed counter and
an obstructed aisle. Neither will this court, except where it is

1 The Second Amended Complaint involves defendant's store at
2 2070 Harbison Drive in Vacaville, California. See Plaintiff's
3 Response to Defendant's Statement of Undisputed Facts ("PRDUF") ¶
4 1 (Dkt. No. 186-2). There are two sales counters at the store, and
5 of course, several aisles. One of the counters is designed to be
6 used by Pier 1's wheelchair-bound customers (the "accessible sales
7 counter"). PRDUF ¶ 4;¹⁰ Defendant's Response to Plaintiff's
8 Statement of Undisputed Facts ("DRPUF") ¶ 4.

9 In his complaint, Chapman alleges that he visited the store
10 and encountered an accessible counter and aisles that were
11 "cluttered by merchandise." Complaint ¶¶ 11 & 20. He alleges that
12 this clutter created barriers that prevented him from enjoying full
13 and equal access to the store's facilities, that defendant knew of
14 this state of affairs, that the barriers were not temporary and
15 that Pier 1 refuses to remove the barriers.¹¹ Id. ¶¶ 11-15.

16 ////

17 ////

18 ////

19 _____
20 necessary to do so.

21 ¹⁰ Defendant supports this fact by the Declaration of Tracey
22 Snow which, as discussed below, is stricken. However, Chapman
expressly adopts it as an undisputed fact. PRDUF ¶ 4.

23 ¹¹ The parties engage in some discussion of when the store was
24 built in relation to when the Americans with Disabilities Act was
25 enacted. Those discussions are immaterial because there is no
26 (remaining) claim that any structural aspect of defendant's store
does not comply with the ADA. The only claims are that clutter and
other merchandise obstruct the accessibility counter and the
aisles.

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

a. Mootness

Defendant asserts that on January 30, 2012 the accessibility counter was "completely clear, other than when a customer or an employee places merchandise on the counter that a customer wishes to purchase," and that the aisles were "clear of goods," and navigable by wheelchair. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment ("DSJ") (Dkt. No. 181) at p.5.¹² Therefore, defendant argues, Chapman's entire case is "moot." Id. Defendant's argument is lacking on the facts and frivolous as a legal matter.

(1) The Mootness Argument Is Based Entirely Upon Snow's Stricken Declaration.

Defendant's assertion that the accessibility counter was "completely clear" on January 30th is predicated entirely on Paragraphs 5 and 24 of its Statement of Undisputed Facts, which, in turn, are predicated solely and entirely on the Snow Declaration. Since the Snow Declaration has been excluded from use in this summary judgment, this assertion has no factual basis in the record, and will be disregarded.

(2) The Mootness Argument Fails as a Legal Matter.

For purposes of the legal analysis, the court will assume the accessibility counter was "completely clear" on the one single day defendant asserts it was, January 30, 2012. Defendant argues that plaintiff may not obtain injunctive relief - the only relief

¹² Although defendant does not make it a part of its mootness argument, it also asserts that the aisles and counter were clear on October 28, 2011 and November 9, 2011, when its expert visited the store. See Blackseth Declaration, Report (Dkt. No. 184-1).

1 available under Title III of the ADA - because the accessibility
2 counter was clear on this one, single day. In support of this
3 remarkable position, defendant cites cases that unsurprisingly, do
4 not support it.

5 In Wander v. Kaus, 304 F.3d 856 (9th Cir. 2002), plaintiff
6 sued defendant property owners. Soon after the lawsuit was filed,
7 defendants transferred ownership of the property to new owners,
8 "and no longer had any interest or involvement with the property
9 after that date." Id., 304 F.3d at 858. Because defendants
10 therefore could not possibly provide any relief, plaintiff conceded
11 that his claim for injunctive relief against them had become moot.
12 Id., 304 F.3d at 858. The mooting of Wander does not justify
13 mooting this case based upon Pier 1's tidying up its accessibility
14 counter on a day of its choosing.¹³

15 In Dufresne v. Veneman, 114 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1997) (per
16 curiam), plaintiff sued California to put a stop to the spraying
17 of Malathion pesticide to eradicate the Mediterranean Fruitfly.
18 The case was rendered moot on appeal because the state ended the
19 spraying program entirely, having found that the fruitfly had been
20 completely eradicated. The Ninth Circuit found that the cessation
21 of Malathion spraying was permanent, and that the possibility of
22 its resumption was "too remote to preserve a live case or
23 controversy." Id., 114 F.3d at 955. Defendant here, in contrast,

24

25 ¹³ The clear indication in Wander is that the transfer out of
26 defendant's control was permanent, not done for one day, or for any
limited period of time.

1 makes no showing of any kind that the accessibility counter was
2 permanently clear. Nor does defendant even assert that the counter
3 would not return to a cluttered state ever again.¹⁴

4 In Eiden v. Home Depot USA, Inc., 2006 WL 1490418 (E.D. Cal.
5 2006) (Karlton, J.), this court dismissed as moot the claims
6 relating to those ADA barriers which had been remedied. Id., at
7 *9-10. In that case, the remedial efforts were by their nature,
8 permanent: replaced signage, newly painted "No Parking" signs, new
9 handles on bathroom stall doors, and re-positioning of the toilet
10 paper dispenser. Id. In contrast, defendants' removal of clutter
11 from a counter is by its nature temporary.

12 In Pickern v. Best Western Timber Cove Lodge Marina Resort,
13 194 F. Supp.2d 1128 (E.D. Cal. 2002) (Shubb, J.), plaintiff
14 conceded "as she must, that defendants' latest remedial efforts
15 have rendered her ADA claim for injunctive relief moot." Id., 194
16 F. Supp. at 1130. Once again, as in the previously discussed cases
17 cited by defendant here, defendant in Pickern had made permanent,
18 structural changes to its facility that provided plaintiff with the
19 injunctive relief she sought. That is what made the claims moot,
20 not the temporary removal of a barrier that could easily and
21 quickly return.

22 The legal principle that defendant invokes is "voluntary
23 compliance." However, "a defendant claiming that its voluntary

24
25 ¹⁴ The court could eliminate much of its civil and criminal
26 calendar if it adopted defendant's view that a lawsuit must be
dismissed as moot if defendant can show that it did not violate the
law on a single day of its own choosing.

1 compliance moots a case bears the formidable burden of showing that
2 it is absolutely clear the allegedly wrongful behavior could not
3 reasonably be expected to recur." Friends of the Earth, Inc. v.
4 Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc.. 528 U.S. 167, 190
5 (2000). Defendant has clearly not met such a burden here. To the
6 contrary, defendant's argument demonstrates one aspect of the
7 recurrence problem that plaintiff himself complains about: that
8 customers place items on the accessible counter and leave them
9 there while shopping.¹⁵ DSJ at p.5. It hardly demonstrates the
10 unlikelihood of recurrence to affirmatively assert that customers
11 use the accessibility counter as a storage location while they go
12 about their shopping, leaving the wheelchair bound customers either
13 to wait for them to finish shopping, clear the items away if they
14 can, or wait patiently until an employee or other customer comes
15 along who can clear the counter for them.

16 Defendant further asserts that "A request for prospective
17 injunctive relief can be mooted by a defendant's voluntary
18 cessation of challenged activity." DSJ at p.5. That is, at best,
19 an incomplete statement of what the law is, as made clear by
20 DeFunis v. Odegaard, 416 U.S. 312 (1974) (per curiam),¹⁶ one of the
21

22 ¹⁵ Whether this conduct renders the counter in violation of
23 the ADA is another matter, which will be discussed below.

24 ¹⁶ Defendant also cites U.S. Parole Comm'n v. Geraghty, 445
25 U.S. 388, 397 (1980) in support of its mootness argument, but
26 without any explanation. The court does not see any connection
between Geraghty and this case. Geraghty addressed whether a class
action became moot upon the expiration of the claim of the named
plaintiff.

1 cases defendant cites for his mootness argument:

2 There is a line of decisions in this Court standing for
3 the proposition that the voluntary cessation of
4 allegedly illegal conduct does not deprive the tribunal
5 of power to hear and determine the case, i.e., does not
6 make the case moot.

7 DeFunis, 416 U.S. at 318 (citations and internal quotation marks
8 omitted) (emphasis added). "Voluntary cessation" is relevant only
9 if:

10 it could be said with assurance that there is no
11 reasonable expectation that the wrong will be repeated.
12 Otherwise, [the] defendant is free to return to his old
13 ways, and this fact would be enough to prevent mootness
14 because of the public interest in having the legality of
15 the practices settled.

16 Id. (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).¹⁷
17 Defendant's remaining mootness cases similarly do not support its
18 argument.¹⁸

19 Moreover, Chapman has made a sufficient showing that the
20 clutter is a recurring condition, and that it has not voluntarily
21 ceased. Below is Chapman's recounting of his visits to the store,

22 ¹⁷ In any event, "voluntary cessation" is not what occurred in
23 DeFunis: "mootness in the present case depends not at all upon a
24 'voluntary cessation' of the admissions practices that were the
25 subject of this litigation. It depends, instead, upon the simple
26 fact that DeFunis is now in the final quarter of the final year of
his course of study, and the settled and unchallenged policy of the
Law School is to permit him to complete the term for which he is
now enrolled." DeFunis, 416 U.S. at 318.

¹⁸ See San Lazaro Ass'n, Inc. v. Connell, 286 F.3d 1088 (9th
Cir.), cert. denied, 537 U.S. 878 (2002) (plaintiff's case against
California became moot when it voluntarily cancelled its license
and thus rendered itself ineligible to receive the benefits sought
by the lawsuit); H.C. ex rel. Gordon v. Koppel, 203 F.3d 610 (9th
Cir. 2000) (action seeking to disqualify a judge was rendered moot
when the judge "concluded her temporary assignment").

1 and the recurrent obstructions he encountered there:

- 2 1. February 1, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 7; Chapman Depo. pp. 29-
3 33):¹⁹
4 aisles blocked as shown in Exhibit A.
5 accessibility counter cluttered.
- 6 2. February 7, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 8):
7 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 8 3. February 14, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 9):
9 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
10 accessibility counter cluttered as shown in Exh. A.
- 11 4. March 6, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 10):
12 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 13 5. April 29, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶¶ 11):
14 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 15 6. May 2, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 12):
16 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 17 7. June 30, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 13):
18 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 19 8. October 29, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 14):
20 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 21 9. November 23, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 18):
22 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 23 10. January 9, 2012 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 19):
24 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 25 11. February 9, 2012 (Chapman Decl. ¶¶ 21-24):
26 aisles blocked.
accessibility counter cluttered as shown in Exh. B.

21 Thus, even though the counters and aisles were eventually
22 cleared for Chapman, his subsequent visits to the store showed that
23 the aisles and occasionally the accessible counter were again

24 ¹⁹ Also, PRDUF ¶ 11, 14. Exhibit A (Dkt. No. 187), consists
25 of photographs of the obstructions that, according to Chapman's
26 Declaration, he took himself before leaving the store. Chapman's
Deposition is Dkt. No. 202-4.

1 obstructed. Chapman's evidence clearly shows that the obstructed
2 aisles and cluttered accessibility counter are a recurrent
3 situation. Defendant asserts that the encountered merchandise was
4 "temporary" or "movable," but does not contest that Chapman
5 encountered them.

6 Chapman's lawsuit is not moot.

7 **b. Temporary and movable nature of the clutter.**

8 **(1) Movable barriers - the law.**

9 Defendant claims as a legal matter that "[t]he DOJ's
10 commentary on its regulations, as well as its technical assistance
11 materials echo the point that the ADA does not apply to temporary
12 or movable obstructions." Dkt. No. 181 at p.6 (ECF 13). In fact,
13 nothing in the DOJ's (Attorney General's) commentaries or its
14 technical assistance materials - nor in the ADA itself, its
15 implementing regulations or the ADA Accessibility Guidelines
16 ("ADAAG"), issued by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers
17 Compliance Board (the "Access Board")²⁰ - state or imply that

18
19 ²⁰ The Access Board plays a critical role in implementing the
Act:

20 Congress mandated that the Attorney General's
21 regulations "be consistent with the minimum guidelines
22 and requirements issued by the Architectural and
23 Transportation Barriers Compliance Board," 42 U.S.C. §
24 12186(c), commonly referred to as the "Access Board."
25 The Access Board is an independent federal agency
26 29 U.S.C. § 792(a)(1). The Board is directed to
establish "minimum guidelines and requirements for the
standards issued" under Title III of the ADA, 29 U.S.C.
§ 792(b)(3)(B), and to "develop advisory information
for, and provide appropriate technical assistance to,
individuals or entities with rights or duties under
regulations prescribed" under Title III, 29 U.S.C. §

1 "movable obstructions" cannot violate the ADA. To the contrary,
2 the DOJ's commentary on its regulations states just the opposite.
3 In proposing the implementing regulations, the commentary states:

4 Section 36.211 ... recognizes that it is not sufficient
5 to provide features such as accessible routes ... if
6 those features are not maintained in a manner that
7 enables individuals with disabilities to use them. ...
8 "[A]ccessible" routes that are obstructed by furniture,
9 filing cabinets, or potted plants are neither
10 "accessible to" nor "usable by" individuals with
11 disabilities.

12 56 Fed. Reg. 7,452, 7,464 (February 22, 1991) (Notice of Proposed
13 Rule-making).²¹ From the very beginning, then, the Attorney
14 General recognized that it was not sufficient to have facilities
15 that are accessible in name only. They must be maintained in a
16 condition that allows a disabled person to actually use them. In
17 promulgating the final implementing regulations, the Attorney
18 General again expressed those concerns:

19 The requirement to remove architectural barriers
20 includes the removal of physical barriers of any kind.
21 For example, § 36.304 requires the removal, when readily
22 achievable, of barriers caused by the location of
23 temporary or movable structures, such as furniture,
24 equipment, and display racks.

25 792(b)(2). In sum, the Board establishes "minimum
26 guidelines" for Title III, but the DOJ promulgates its
own regulations, which must be consistent with-but not
necessarily identical to-the Board's guidelines.

27 Miller v. California Speedway Corp., 536 F.3d 1020, 1024-25 (9th
28 Cir. 2008), cert. denied, 555 U.S. 1208 (2009).

29 ²¹ The U.S. Attorney General is the principal regulator that
30 implements the Act. Miller, 536 F.3d at 1024 ("The ADA directs the
31 Attorney General to 'issue regulations ... that include standards
32 applicable to facilities' covered by Title III").

1 56 Fed. Reg. 35,544, 35,568 (July 26, 1991) (Final Rule).

2 Defendant makes much of its assertion that plaintiff could
3 have removed the obstructing merchandise on the accessible counter
4 himself, but that he chose not to. PRDUF ¶¶ 12-13 (Dkt. No. 186-
5 2). Plaintiff asserts that this is irrelevant, since it is
6 defendant's obligation to make its store accessible, not the
7 disabled plaintiff's. Id. Plaintiff is correct, as the DOJ's
8 commentaries - and the ADA itself - refer to an obligation that
9 defendant bears.²² It is not the responsibility of disabled,
10 wheelchair-bound customers like Chapman to move furniture,
11 equipment and display racks so that they can use defendant's
12 facility, even if those things are "temporary and movable."

13 Even if defendant's assertion were relevant, defendant grossly
14 mis-characterizes Chapman's testimony in this regard. Defendant
15 is correct that Chapman's own testimony shows that it was possible
16 for a store employee to move the items, and that the items were not
17 physically too heavy for Chapman to move. But the testimony
18 clearly explains, a few lines later in the transcript, that Chapman
19 did not move them because he feared that doing so, from his
20 wheelchair, could cause them to fall on the floor. See Chapman
21 Deposition (Dkt. 202-4) at p.32-33 ("As I recall, the counter was
22 full. If I were to put my items on the counter, those items had
23 a great possibility of falling to the floor, ma'am"). If Pier 1

24
25 ²² The cited regulation states that "[a] public accommodation
26 shall remove architectural barriers ... [including] rearranging ...
furniture." 28 C.F.R. § 36.304(a) & (b)(4). It does not state
that disabled persons in wheelchairs shall remove those barriers.

1 means to argue that it is in compliance with the ADA by forcing
2 wheelchair-bound patrons to clear the accessibility counter
3 themselves, at the risk of having the cluttering material fall to
4 the floor - or on top of themselves - the court rejects the
5 argument.

6 Apart from claiming that the ADA requires disabled customers
7 to move barriers out of the way in order to shop at its store, Pier
8 1 claims that disabled customers can rely upon store clerks to
9 clear the accessibility counter. Among the ADA's purposes however,
10 is to eliminate the stereotype of the helpless disabled person
11 completely reliant on the assistance of able-bodied persons to come
12 to their rescue, not to reinforce it.²³ The disabled community
13 fought for, and earned, the right to have stores remove barriers
14 so that disabled customers could use those facilities
15 independently. This court will not reduce Chapman to the need to
16 beg for assistance or to rely upon the hoped-for existence of a
17 kindly store clerk who happens to be in a mood to be helpful.
18 Defendant's obligation is to ensure that the accessibility counter
19 and the aisles are clear. When it fails to do so, it is in
20 violation of the ADA. It may not rely upon assertions that its
21 store clerks are kind and helpful and would eventually clear the
22 barriers that should not be there in the first place.

23 ////

24 ²³ See, e.g., 42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(5) ("individuals with
25 disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination,
26 including ... overprotective rules and policies").

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

(2) Temporary barriers - the law.

Defendant also argues that the barriers were only "temporary." It is true that the ADA does not create liability for "isolated or temporary" interruptions in the availability of accessible features. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(b). However, defendant's interpretation of what barriers are "temporary" is not correct. "Temporary" is not meant to exclude only objects like the Statue of Liberty - deliberately placed there, immovable and intended to stay there forever.

"Temporary," as used in this context, is closer to "transitory," that is, an object that is unavoidably placed in the aisle, but with the intention of removing it as soon as possible.²⁴ In 1993, pursuant to Title III's directive, the Attorney General offered further guidance and clarification on temporary and "isolated" obstructions in its Technical Assistance Manual ("TAM").²⁵

Where a public accommodation must provide an accessible route, the route must remain accessible and not blocked by obstacles such as furniture, filing cabinets, or potted plants....[¶] BUT: An isolated instance of placement of an object on an accessible route would not be a violation, if the object is promptly removed.
////

²⁴ "Temporary" can even refer to objects inadvertently blocking access on an isolated occasion, as this court discussed in the previous cross-motions. See Chapman, 2006 WL 1686511 at *9-10.

²⁵ "[P]ursuant to Title III's directive to provide technical assistance to covered entities, the DOJ published a Technical Assistance Manual ('TAM')." Miller, 536 F.3d at 1026, citing 42 U.S.C. § 12206(a), (c)(2)(c).

1 TAM III-3.7000 (www.ada.gov/taman3.html, last viewed by the court
2 on June 22, 2012). The TAM thus recognizes that "isolated or
3 temporary interruptions in access" can be excused even if an object
4 is placed "on an accessible route." But the action is excusable
5 only "if the object is promptly removed." This belies defendant's
6 claim that the object can remain there indefinitely, so long as no
7 disabled person comes by and asks to have it removed. Rather, the
8 route must remain accessible and not blocked.²⁶ It demands that
9 the store maintain itself in such a way that the disabled customer
10 can use its facilities independently.

11 The "temporary" blockages that occur when a store is being re-
12 stocked or items are being moved from one office to another is not
13 prohibited by the ADA. In 2008, the Attorney General clarified
14 this in his commentary to the proposed rules:

15 The Department has noticed that some covered entities do
16 not understand what is required by § 36.211 A
17 common problem observed by the Department is that
18 covered facilities do not maintain accessible routes.
19 For example, the accessible routes in offices or stores
20 are commonly obstructed by boxes, potted plants, display
21 racks, or other items so that the routes are
22 inaccessible to people who use wheelchairs. Under the
23 ADA, the accessible route must be maintained and,
24 therefore, these items are required to be removed. If
25 the items are placed there temporarily – for example, if
26 an office receives multiple boxes of supplies and is
moving them from the hall to the storage room – then §
36.211(b) excuses such "isolated or temporary

23 ²⁶ Maintaining accessible routes would prevent exactly the
24 humiliation that Chapman claims he experienced, according to his
25 Declaration, when the Vacaville store essentially assigned an
26 employee to follow him around clearing obstructions out of his way.
See Chapman Declaration (Dkt. No. 187) ¶¶ 15-22. As noted, the ADA
is not meant to encourage stores to treat the disabled like
helpless children who must be hovered over at every moment.

1 interruptions."

2 73 Fed. Reg. 34,508, 34,523 (June 17, 2008) (Notice of Proposed
3 Rule-making). The Attorney General reiterated this position again
4 in 2010 in explaining why it was declining to make a requested
5 change to Section 36.211 of the implementing regulations:

6 It is the Department's position that a temporary
7 interruption that blocks an accessible route, such as
8 restocking of shelves, is already permitted by existing
9 § 36.211(b), which clarifies that "isolated or temporary
interruptions in service or access due to maintenance or
repairs" are permitted.

10 75 Fed. Reg. 56,236, 56,270 (September 15, 2010) (Commentary to
11 Final Rule).²⁷

12 Thus the Attorney General has made very clear what is meant
13 by "temporary." It is, as noted above, more akin to "transitory,"
14 in that it refers to, for example, boxes temporarily placed in an
15 accessible route while being moved from, say, "the hall to the
16 storage room." Such barriers are "temporary," because they are
17 intended to be cleared as soon as the barrier is created. They are
18 not intended to be placed there - and to stay there - until a
19 disabled customer finds that they are making it impossible to use
20 the facility. In other words, the barrier is not "temporary" if
21 its placement requires a disabled person to interrupt his use of
22 the facility, wander around the facility trying to find a store
23 employee capable of moving the obstruction, and then request that
24 the barrier be removed.

25
26 ²⁷ A commentator had requested that the Rule be amended to
expressly permit restocking of shelves.

1 **(3) Temporary barriers - the facts.**

2 Whether the barriers that Chapman encountered were "isolated
3 or temporary" is a question of fact. Defendant's evidence here is
4 an expert report prepared by Kim R. Blackseth (Dkt No. 184).
5 Plaintiff does not challenge the expert nor the report. Blackseth
6 states: "The aisles throughout the store were the required minimum
7 36 [inches] wide and clear of goods.²⁸ On my site visits, I was
8 able to navigate the aisles in my electric Invacare wheelchair."
9 In addition, defendant cites Chapman's own deposition testimony for
10 the proposition that Chapman was able to navigate the aisles.

11 On this basis, it appears that defendant has met its burden
12 of production on summary judgment. The question is whether Chapman
13 can establish a genuine issue as to this material fact. He easily
14 does so.

15 First, Chapman relies on his own expert, Joe Card. Card's
16 Declaration (Dkt. No. 189), states that he conducted an
17 "inspection" of the store on two separate occasions, May 13, 2005
18 and November 3, 2011. On both occasions, Card encountered aisles
19 that were blocked by merchandise or reduced in width below 36
20 inches. Photographs attached to the 2011 report show blocked
21 aisles, as well as a cluttered counter. (Dkt. No. 183-2). Also,
22 Chapman's deposition testimony is that "there were times that I
23 could not reach or get to certain items, height or not, due to the
24

25 ²⁸ "The minimum clear width of an accessible route shall be 36
26 [inches]." ADAAG 4.3.3, 56 Fed. Reg. 45,584, 45,659 (September 6,
1991, Dept. of Transportation).

1 aisles being blocked, ma'am" (at 52).

2 Second, Chapman's declaration, recounted above, provides
3 sufficient admissible evidence, including photographs of blocked
4 aisles and a cluttered accessibility counter, to create a triable
5 issue of fact on whether he encountered barriers in the store and
6 whether they were "isolated or temporary." Accordingly, plaintiff
7 has met his burden to show that there is a genuine issue as to
8 whether the accessibility counter and aisles were obstructed, and
9 whether the obstruction was "isolated or temporary."

10 **C. State Claims**

11 **1. Disabled Persons Act and the Unruh Act**

12 Defendant seeks summary judgment on plaintiff's claims under
13 the California Disabled Persons Act and under the Unruh Act because
14 plaintiff "cannot establish any violation of applicable federal or
15 state accessibility standards." As discussed above, there is a
16 genuine dispute about this, and accordingly defendant's motion for
17 summary judgment on these state claims will be denied.

18 **2. Health & Safety Code.**

19 Defendant seeks summary judgment on plaintiff's claim under
20 the California Health & Safety Code and the Gov't Code because
21 plaintiff "cannot establish any violation of state accessibility
22 standards." Defendant notes that plaintiff has made no defense of
23 this claim in his opposition and does not seek summary judgment on
24 the claim in his cross-motion, and argues that it is therefore
25 "abandoned." Dkt. No. 193 at p.15 (ECF 19). Defendant's cited
26 Ninth Circuit authority, Novato Fire Protection Dist. v. U.S., 181

1 F.3d 1135 (9th Cir. 1999) cert. denied, 529 U.S. 1129 (2000) does
2 not support this proposition. It holds only that issues not
3 raised before the district court are waived on appeal.

4 On the merits, defendant failed to meet its initial burden on
5 summary judgment with respect to this claim, since it argues solely
6 that the obstructions plaintiff encountered were "temporary." As
7 discussed above, defendant's argument is based upon its incorrect
8 view of what obstructions are "temporary." Accordingly,
9 defendant's motion for summary judgment is denied as to this claim,
10 notwithstanding plaintiff's unexplained silence.

11 **IV. ANALYSIS - PLAINTIFF'S CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

12 Plaintiff cross-moves for summary judgment. It is plaintiff's
13 initial burden to show that there are no material facts genuinely
14 in dispute, and that he is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

15 Plaintiff's evidence, as discussed above, makes a sufficient
16 showing that on numerous occasions, he encountered barriers that
17 interfered with his ability to use and enjoy the facilities on an
18 equal footing with non-disabled customers. He encountered aisles
19 that were blocked with merchandise, and he encountered
20 accessibility counters that were cluttered with merchandise, as
21 follows:

- 22 1. February 1, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 7; Chapman Depo. pp. 29-33)
23 (Vacaville store):²⁹
aisles blocked as shown in Exhibit A.

24
25 ²⁹ Also, PRDUF ¶ 11, 14. Exhibit A (Dkt. No. 187), consists
26 of photographs of the obstructions that, according to Chapman's
Declaration, he took himself before leaving the store. Chapman's
Deposition is Dkt. No. 202-4.

- 1 accessibility counter cluttered.
- 2 2. February 7, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 8) (Vacaville store):
3 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 4 3. February 14, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 9) (Vacaville store):
5 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
6 accessibility counter cluttered as shown in Exh. A.
- 7 4. March 6, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 10) (Vacaville store):
8 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 9 5. April 29, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶¶ 11) (Vacaville store):
10 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 11 6. May 2, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 12): (Vacaville store):
12 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 13 7. June 30, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 13) (Vacaville store):
14 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 15 8. October 29, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 14) (Vacaville store):
16 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
- 17 9. November 2, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 31):³⁰
18 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 19 10. November 3, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 32):³¹
20 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 21 11. November 4, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 33):³²
22 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 23 12. November 4, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 34):³³

24 ³⁰ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 6245
25 Sunrise Boulevard, Sacramento, California. Plaintiff asserts that
26 he offers evidence of other stores solely to impeach Pier 1's claim
that the blockages he encountered at Vacaville were an isolated
phenomenon. Defendant has not objected to the evidence regarding
these other stores.

³¹ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 1101
Galleria Boulevard, Roseville, California.

³² This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 6245
Sunrise Boulevard, Sacramento, California.

³³ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 3641
North Freeway Boulevard, Sacramento, California.

- 1 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 2 13. November 9, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 35):³⁴
3 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 4 14. November 9, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 36):³⁵
5 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 6 15. November 9, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 37):³⁶
7 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 8 16. November 22, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 38):³⁷
9 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 10 17. November 22, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 39):³⁸
11 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 12 18. November 22, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 40):³⁹
13 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
- 14 19. November 23, 2011 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 18) (Vacaville Store):⁴⁰
15 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.
16 accessibility counter cluttered.
- 17 20. January 9, 2012 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 19) (Vacaville store):
18 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. A.

19 ////

20 ³⁴ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 6245
21 Sunrise Boulevard, Sacramento, California.

22 ³⁵ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 1101
23 Galleria Boulevard, Roseville, California.

24 ³⁶ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 3641
25 North Freeway Boulevard, Sacramento, California.

26 ³⁷ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 6245
Sunrise Boulevard, Sacramento, California.

³⁸ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 1101
Galleria Boulevard, Roseville, California.

³⁹ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 3641
North Freeway Boulevard, Sacramento, California.

⁴⁰ Also, PRDUF ¶ 15, 17-19.

- 1 21. January 27, 2012 (Chapman Decl. ¶ 41):⁴¹
2 aisles blocked as shown in Exh. B.
3 accessibility counter cluttered with a large Easter Basket.
- 3 22. February 9, 2012 (Chapman Decl. ¶¶ 21-24) (Vacaville store):
4 aisles blocked.
5 accessibility counter cluttered as shown in Exh. B.

5 Plaintiff has thus met his burden of establishing that Pier
6 1 failed to maintain its stores in a manner that complied with the
7 ADA and its implementing regulations. Unless defendant can show
8 that there is a genuine issue of material fact here, plaintiff will
9 be entitled to a judgment on his ADA claims. Defendant offers four
10 arguments to meet this burden, none of which raises a genuine issue
11 of material fact, or otherwise rebut plaintiff's factual or legal
12 showing.

13 **A. ADA Claim.**

14 **1. The Aisles and Counters Were Clear When Defendant's**
15 **Expert Visited.**

16 Defendant offers the Declaration and Expert report of Kim R.
17 Blackseth (Dkt. No. 184), as evidence that "the sales counter is
18 currently clear and has been clear in the past."

19 Blackseth's Declaration asserts that on his visits to Pier 1,
20 she "frequently" observed compliant aisles, and "frequently had no
21 problem navigating the aisles in my wheelchair." Blackseth Decl.
22 ¶ 12. On its own, this Declaration, by stating what "frequently"
23 happened, seems to be saying that on other - perhaps less frequent
24 - occasions, the aisles were blocked, and that navigation was not

25
26 ⁴¹ This paragraph refers to the Pier 1 store located at 3641
North Freeway Boulevard, Sacramento, California.

1 a simple matter. In any event, the Declaration does not create a
2 genuine dispute.

3 Blackseth's report (Dkt. No. 184-1), asserts that on October
4 28, 2011 and November 9, 2011, he visited the Vacaville store and
5 found that, on those days, the accessible counter was clear of
6 goods and the aisles were clear. Id. The report was supported by
7 photographs showing a clear accessibility counter, and three (3)
8 clear aisles.⁴² This report, however, does not contradict
9 plaintiff's sworn declaration and deposition testimony that this
10 same store had a cluttered accessibility counter and/or blocked
11 aisles on the days that he visited it - February 1, 7 and 14, 2011,
12 March 6, 2011, April 29, 2011, May 2, 2011, June 30, 2011, October
13 29, 2011, November 23, 2011, January 9, 2012 and February 9, 2012.
14 Neither the ADA nor its implementing regulations is concerned with
15 keeping a store accessible on the two days out of the year that it
16 is visited by its expert witness. It is concerned with keeping the
17 facility accessible for the store's disabled customers, whenever
18 they might visit.

19 Defendant's first argument does not raise a genuine issue as
20 to any material fact, nor does it rebut plaintiff's entitlement to
21 summary judgment.

22 **2. The Accessibility Counter Was Clear in 2004.**

23 Defendant, in its Reply, asserts that plaintiff did not
24

25 ⁴² From the photographs themselves, it can be seen that the
26 store has more than three aisles. However, the report contains no
photographs of those other aisles.

1 complain of a cluttered accessibility counter in 2004, and that he
2 improperly complains of it now. It apparently refers to the
3 following statement by plaintiff:

4 Unlike barriers of concrete and steel, Pier 1's mootness
5 defense is based entirely on their promise that the
6 merchandise blocking the aisles and counter, which
7 existed in 2004 and continue to exist in 2012 ... were
8 removed and will not return in the future. Yet,
9 Chapman's photographs taken the day before this motion
10 was filed ... clearly shows merchandise blocking the
11 accessible routes.

12 Dkt. No. 186-1 at p.8 (emphasis in text). Defendant apparently
13 objects to plaintiff's insertion of the words "and counter" in the
14 above quotation as it relates to 2004. The court does not
15 understand plaintiff to be making a retroactive argument about the
16 accessibility counter, and if he is, the court will not credit it.

17 However, as to the claims that plaintiff is making - the
18 aisles were blocked from 2004 forward, and the accessibility
19 counter was cluttered during some of his 2011 and 2012 visits -
20 defendant's argument does not create a genuine issue or otherwise
21 rebut plaintiff's entitlement to summary judgment.

22 **3. The Obstructions Were "Movable" and not "Permanent."**

23 Defendant argues that no violation of the ADA can occur if a
24 disabled, wheelchair-bound customer can move the obstruction, or
25 if a store employee happens by who can move it. Dkt. No. 193 at
26 p.8-9. As discussed above, this is an incorrect interpretation of
the law. The legal obligation to maintain the store so that it is
accessible to its customers rests with Pier 1, not the disabled,
wheelchair-bound customers, and not to the off-chance that an

1 employee will happen by who is strong enough to move the
2 obstruction.⁴³

3 Defendant's incorrect legal interpretation cannot defeat
4 plaintiff's entitlement to summary judgment.

5 **4. The Cluttered Counters Were Usable.**

6 Defendant relies upon the photographs taken by plaintiff's
7 expert, Joe Card, to assert that plaintiff could use the cluttered
8 counter because there was enough free space available. Even if
9 this were true, however, it does not contradict the other
10 photographs taken by plaintiff that show a cluttered accessibility
11 counter. Nor does it dispute plaintiff's testimony that he could
12 not use the counter - which he encountered on a different day than
13 depicted in the Card Exhibits - until the clutter was moved. In
14 short, plaintiff has provided evidence, including photographs
15 showing cluttered accessible counters, and defendant has not
16 responded to that evidence.⁴⁴

17

18 ⁴³ Defendant relies heavily upon the stricken Snow Declaration
19 for its assertion that the aisle blockages were movable. Snow
20 repeats over and over again that the obstructions - which she does
21 not deny were present - were "movable merchandise." Even if the
22 Declaration were considered on this motion, it would not help
23 defendant's case since, as discussed above, it is immaterial that
24 a wheelchair-bound customer could move the obstructions out of the
25 way.

26 ⁴⁴ Defendant also relies upon the Snow Declaration, which the
27 court has excluded from consideration here. However, even that
28 Declaration only addresses one single instance where plaintiff
29 asserts that he could not use the accessible counter because of
30 clutter. Even if the Declaration were considered on this motion,
31 it would only put that single event in genuine dispute, but the
32 remaining evidence of unusable counters would be as uncontested as
33 they are now.

1 Defendant cites Kohler v. Flava Enterprises, Inc., 826 F.
2 Supp.2d 1221 (S.D. Cal. 2011), in support of its argument that the
3 counter was usable. In Kohler, the plaintiff submitted a single
4 photograph that showed only "a few items on the counter, and it
5 does not appear that these items would prevent him from using the
6 lowered counter to purchase merchandise." Id., 826 F. Supp.2d at
7 1228. Those are not the facts before this court. Here, plaintiff
8 has submitted declarations and deposition testimony - unrefuted by
9 defendant - that the clutter on the accessibility counter prevented
10 him from using the counter, and that he was able to use the counter
11 only after those items were moved.

12 Defendant has therefore failed to create a genuine dispute as
13 to the usability of the accessible counter.

14 **5. The Clutter Was "Temporary."**

15 Defendant relies on its legal argument that the clutter - as
16 to the counter and the aisles - was "temporary" because a store
17 employee eventually moved the clutter so that plaintiff could
18 navigate the aisle or make his purchase. As discussed above,
19 however, this is not "temporary" as that term applies to the ADA
20 and its implementing regulations. As discussed above, temporary
21 does not mean that the obstructions are placed there, and stay
22 there, until a disabled person complains about them. Temporary
23 means "in transit," in the sense that the obstacles are placed in
24 the aisle while being moved from one place to another.⁴⁵

25
26 ⁴⁵ The court does not rule that "in transit" or "transitory"
is the only concept that can encompass the definition of

1 Defendant relies heavily upon Dodson v. Dollar Tree Stores,
2 Inc., 2006 WL 2084738 *3 (E.D. Cal. 2006) (England, J.), for the
3 proposition that merchandise in the aisles are "temporary" and do
4 not violate the ADA.⁴⁶ However Dodson does not stand for this
5 proposition. In Dodson, the court credited trial testimony that
6 "the only impediments" in the aisles "were related to ongoing
7 merchandise stocking."⁴⁷ Accordingly, Dodson stands for the
8 proposition that this court has already set forth above, that
9 "temporary" obstructions are those that are "in transit," not those
10 that are sitting there waiting for a disabled person to encounter
11 them.

12 Defendant has failed to create a genuine issue on the
13 "temporary" status of the aisle blockages or the disability counter
14 clutter.

15 ////

16 _____
17 "temporary." It is however, the one concept that appears
18 consistently in the Attorney General's commentary. The court
19 certainly would have considered other definitions if defendant had
20 offered them. However, the court rejects defendant's implicit
21 definition - that obstacles that block the store aisle or prevent
22 use of the accessibility counter are "temporary" so long as they
23 are moved after the disabled person encounters them.

24 ⁴⁶ The remainder of defendant's cases along these lines are
25 discussed above in the Mootness section.

26 ⁴⁷ That Dodson testimony came from Kim Blackseth, defendant's
expert here. However, in this case, Blackseth does not assert in
his expert report, nor in his declaration, that the obstructions
were related to ongoing merchandise stocking. To the contrary, he
offers no explanation for the obstructions, because he did not
observe any during his visits. Even the Snow Declaration, which
the court is not considering in any event, did not ascribe the
aisle blockages to merchandise stocking. Rather, Snow focused on
her assertion that the obstructions were "movable."

1 **B. STATE CLAIMS**

2 Plaintiff's claims under the Disabled Persons Act and the
3 Unruh Act are established if a violation of the ADA is established.
4 Accordingly, a summary judgment for plaintiff on his ADA claim
5 requires a summary judgment on these state claims as well.

6 **V. CONCLUSION**

7 Defendant, on its summary judgment motion, relied upon failed
8 arguments that obstructions in its store did not violate the ADA
9 because they were eventually moved after plaintiff encountered
10 them, and because plaintiff himself could have moved them
11 (notwithstanding the risks to his well-being and dignity). It also
12 relied upon failed factual assertions that its aisles and
13 accessibility counter were not obstructed on dates when its expert
14 witness visited, or the one day its store manager saw Chapman in
15 the store.

16 On plaintiff's summary judgment motion, he established,
17 without dispute, that on numerous occasions, Pier 1's aisles were
18 blocked and that its accessibility counter was cluttered. He
19 established that he was prevented from using these facilities until
20 the obstructions were eventually cleared away.

21 For the reasons set forth above:

22 1. The Snow Declaration is **EXCLUDED** from consideration on
23 this motion;

24 2. Defendant's motion to preclude plaintiff's cross-motion
25 as untimely, is **DENIED**;

26 /////

1 3. Defendant's motion to strike portions of the Chapman
2 Declaration is **DENIED**;

3 4. Defendant's motion for summary judgment is **DENIED** in its
4 entirety;

5 5. Plaintiff's cross-motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**
6 as to the ADA claim, the Disabled Persons Act claim and the Unruh
7 Act claim.⁴⁸

8 6. Plaintiff shall submit a Proposed Judgment of Permanent
9 Injunction no later than fourteen (14) days from the date of this
10 order, and defendant shall file its response, if any, no later than
11 seven (7) days from plaintiff's filing.

12 7. The Pretrial Conference date of September 4, 2012 at 1:30
13 p.m. is hereby **CONFIRMED**. The court notes that the remaining
14 issues in the case are plaintiff's demand for damages under his
15 state claims, and the unresolved Health & Safety Code and Gov't
16 Code claim.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: June 27, 2012.

19

20

21

22

23

24



LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

25

26

⁴⁸ As best the court can tell, plaintiff has not sought summary judgment on his Health & Safety Code and Gov't Code claim. To the degree plaintiff seeks summary judgment on this claim, it is **DENIED**.