JAMES J. BANKS (SBN 119525)

7

07 SEP 11 PH 4: 16 LEGAL PROCESS #9

Attorneys for Plaintiff **ERIC GRANT** 

(916) 325-1000

BANKS & WATSON Hall of Justice Building

813 6th Street, Suite 400 Sacramento, CA 95814-2403

(916) 325-1004 (facsimile)

CIVIL DIVISION 0115 - 000216725 09/13/2007 11:02:51 AM 07AS04172 - Fee PAID: \$320.00 \$320:00 - Civil New Filing -Superior Court

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

ERIC GRANT,

٧.

Case No.: 07AS94172

Plaintiff.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND FOR QUANTUM MERUIT

JOHN GOEMANS, and ROES 1 through 10, inclusive.

Defendants.

Plaintiff ERIC GRANT (hereinafter "Plaintiff" or "Mr. Grant") alleges against defendants and each of them as follows:

- Mr. Grant is, and at all times mentioned in this complaint was, an individual, resident of 1. the state of California, licensed and admitted to practice law by the State of California and doing business in Sacramento, Sacramento County, California.
- Mr. Grant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant JOHN GOEMANS (hereinaster "Desendant" or "Mr. Goemans") is, and at all times herein mentioned in this complaint was, an individual licensed and admitted to practice law by the State of Hawaii, and that Mr. Goemans is, and at some substantial portion of the times herein mentioned in this complaint was, a resident of the State of California.

(00035039.DOC; 1)

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND FOR QUANTUM MERUIT

- 3. This action is filed to ascertain the Defendants' rights, if any, and the extent of any such rights, to fees for professional legal services provided to persons referred to hereinafter as Jane Doe and John Doe which legal services were substantially performed in the state of California.
- 4. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or otherwise, of the Defendants named herein as ROES 1 through 10, inclusive, are unknown to Mr. Grant, who therefore sues said Defendants under fictitious names. Mr. Grant is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a "ROE" Defendant is responsible in some manner for the events and circumstances described herein, and caused damage to him as alleged herein. Mr. Grant will seek leave to amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
- 5. Mr. Grant is informed and believes and based on that information and belief alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, each Defendant was the agent, servant, and/or employee of each of the other remaining Defendants, and in doing the things alleged herein, was acting within the course and scope of said agency, service, and/or employment to the other Defendants.
- 6. The contingent fee agreement underlying this litigation was made in Sacramento County, and contains a provision fixing venue at Sacramento, California.
- 7. As set forth below with more particularity, in or about 2003, Mr. Grant and Mr. Goemans, as co-counsel, and subsequently only Mr. Grant, represented plaintiffs John Doe and Jane Doe, a minor child and his mother, in federal civil rights litigation initiated in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii. The plaintiffs were designated John Doe and Jane Doe because that litigation was extremely controversial and involved a danger of invasion of privacy, retaliation and physical or mental harm to such a degree that the District Court permitted the plaintiffs to litigate that case using fictitious names. Additionally, the settlement agreement resolving this federal civil rights litigation required all parties and counsel to maintain the confidentiality of the identities of John Doe and Jane Doe. The obligation to maintain that confidentiality is subject to exceptions, one of which may apply here. Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, Mr. Grant refers to these individuals here using fictitious names.

- 8. On or about June 17, 2003, Mr. Grant entered into a written Attorney-Client Engagement Agreement with Jane Doe pursuant to which Jane Doe engaged Mr. Grant and Mr. Grant's law firm, Sweeney & Grant LLP, to represent her in connection with an anticipated lawsuit as next friend for her child, John Doe, against Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate ("KSBE") in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii. The law firm of Sweeney & Grant subsequently assigned its rights in and to the fee agreement referenced above to Mr. Grant. The purpose of the anticipated lawsuit was to seek a declaration from the United States District Court that KSBE's self-described preference for student applicants of native Hawaiian ancestry constituted discrimination on the basis of race in violation of federal civil rights statutes. The anticipated lawsuit would also seek injunctions ordering KSBE to admit applicants to Kamehameha Schools without regard to their race or ancestry and in particular to admit John Doe to a KSBE campus. Finally, the anticipated lawsuit would seek money damages from KSBE. Mr. Grant proceeded to file the litigation against KSBE on the Does' behalf, which litigation is hereinafter referred to as the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation.
- 9. From approximately June, 2003 to May, 2007 defendant Goemans was putative cocounsel with Mr. Grant in representing John Doe and Jane Doe in the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* litigation.
- 10. Mr. Grant is informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges, that Defendant Goemans does not have and has never had any written fee agreement with John Doe or Jane Doe for his retention or for professional services rendered on their behalf in the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* litigation.
- 11. On or about May 11, 2007, the parties in the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation entered into a settlement and general release agreement. Paragraph 7 of the settlement and general release provides that the amount of the settlement and the true names and addresses or any other information identifying John Doe and Jane Doe or their family is and would remain confidential, save and except "when necessary to effectuate the purposes and benefits of the settlement agreement and general release," pursuant to court order, or when necessary to obtain tax, accounting, legal or other professional advice. Although Mr. Grant believes that this complaint is filed to effectuate the purposes and benefits of the settlement agreement and may thus be subject to that exception to the confidentiality

2

3

provision, out of an abundance of caution, he will continue to keep the amount of the settlement and the identities of John and Jane Does confidential until this Court rules on the applicability of the confidentiality provision in this litigation.

- The Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation settlement included the payment of monetary 12. damages to the plaintiffs therein and the Kamehameha Schools defendant-trustees funded the settlement.
- Thereafter, a dispute arose between Mr. Grant and John Doe and Jane Doe over the 13. amount of attorneys' fees which Mr. Grant was owed under the fee agreement with the Does.
- In late May 2007, Mr. Grant and John Doe and Jane Doe settled the fee dispute, agreeing 14. that the attorneys' fee to be paid to Mr. Grant would be 40% of the settlement proceeds from the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation. Thereafter Jane Doe and John Doe repudiated the settlement.
- In June 2007, Mr. Grant initiated litigation against Jane Doe and John Doe in the United 15. States District Court for the Eastern District of California, styled Eric Grant v. John Doe and Jane Doe, Case No. 2:07-CV-01087-GEB-EFB to among other things enforce the settlement described in paragraph 14. In early September of 2007, Mr. Grant and John Doe and Jane Doe entered into a written settlement agreement resolving their dispute over the payment to Mr. Grant of the disputed attorneys' fees. The settlement agreement also confirms that the attorneys' fee to be paid to Mr. Grant would be 40% of the settlement proceeds from the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation.
- Defendant Goemans has made demands on Mr. Grant and/or Jane Doe and/or John Doe 16. for fees he claims are due him for professional legal services allegedly provided to the Doe plaintiffs in the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation. Mr. Grant and the Does assert that at most Mr. Goermans has a quantum meruit claim as to the attorneys' fee agreed to in the settlement described in paragraph 15 above.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## (Declaratory Relief)

- 17. Mr. Grant repeats and incorporates by this reference as though set forth at length herein each of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 16, inclusive.
- Mr. Grant is informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges, that 18. Mr. Goemans has threatened to initiate litigation against Jane Doe and/or John Doe for attorneys' fees

(00035039.DOC; 1)

he claims he is entitled to recover from them for professional legal services he allegedly provided on their behalf in the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation.

- 19. Mr. Grant is informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges, that Mr. Goemans has made these demands on Jane Doe and/or John Doe in spite of having actual knowledge of the settlement and payment of fees as described in paragraph 15 above.
- 20. Mr. Grant, John Doe and Jane Doe claim and contend that the attorneys' fees, constituting 40% of the of the settlement proceeds from the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* litigation, paid to Plaintiff Grant pursuant to the settlement described hereinabove is the full and total amount of attorneys' fees owed to attorneys Grant and/or Goemans as a result of legal representation of the Does' interests in the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* litigation. Mr. Grant has standing to assert the Does' claims and contentions in this regard because John Doe and Jane Doe have assigned him the right to do so.
- An actual and justiciable controversy has arisen and now exists between the parties to this litigation as to the total amount and payment source of attorneys' fees owed for the legal representation of John Doe's and/or Jane Doe's interests in the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* litigation.
- 22. Mr. Grant desires a judicial declaration that Defendant Goemans' rights and entitlement to attorneys' fees, if any, as compensation for legal services allegedly rendered on behalf of John Doe and/or Jane Doe in the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* litigation is or will be payable solely from the 40% of the settlement proceeds paid to Mr. Grant as a result of his settlement with John Doe and Jane Doe and that Defendant Goemans cannot recover any additional fees from Jane Doe or John Doe for any such professional services.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as set forth below.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

## (Quantum Meruit)

- 23. Mr. Grant repeats and incorporates by this reference as though set forth at length herein each of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 22, inclusive.
- 24. Mr. Grant is informed and believes and based on such information and belief alleges, that Defendant Goemans claims and contends that he provided professional legal services to John Doe and

{00035039.DOC; 1}

Jane Doe and/or incurred costs on their behalf and for their benefits in connection with the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation. Although Mr. Goemans has no written fee agreement with Jane Doe or John Doe, he claims and contends that the alleged professional legal services rendered to them and/or the costs incurred on their behalf were performed and provided at their specific requests and with the promise that he would be paid the reasonable value of such services provided and costs incurred.

- 25. Mr. Goemans has demanded fully one-half of the 40% of the settlement proceeds from the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation previously paid to Plaintiff Grant as his fees and/or costs for the professional legal services he claims he provided to John Doe and/or Jane Doe in the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation.
- 26. Mr. Grant claims and contends that Defendant Goemans' services were of little, if any, benefit to John Doe and/or Jane Doe (or to Mr. Grant) in the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* litigation.
- 27. Mr. Grant further claims and contends that Defendant Goemans, in derogation of his professional duties of loyalty and confidentiality, has engaged in misconduct in connection with his putative representation of John Doe and/or Jane Joe, such that any monetary claim arising out of such representation that might be asserted by Defendant Goemans against Mr. Grant and/or John Doe and/or Jane Doe would be subject to a complete defense under the doctrine of unclean hands. Mr. Grant has therefore refused to pay Defendant Goemans' fee demand. In addition to standing in his own right, Mr. Grant has standing to assert that affirmative defense because John Doe and Jane Doe have assigned to Mr. Grant their rights, title and interest in and to any claims or defenses arising from their fee agreement by and between them and Mr. Grant.
- An actual and justiciable controversy has arisen and now exists between the parties to this litigation as to the amount, if any, of the attorneys' fees and/or costs to which Defendant Goemans is entitled for his putative legal representation of John Doe's and/or Jane Doe's interests in the Doe v. Kamehameha Schools litigation.
- 29. Mr. Grant desires a judicial declaration as to the amount, if any, of the attorneys' fees and/or costs to which Defendant Goemans is entitled for his putative legal representation of John Doe's and/or Jane Doe's interests in the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* litigation.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND FOR QUANTUM MERUIT

(AVISO AL DEMANDADO): JOHN GOEMANS, and ROES 1 through 10, inclusive, 07 SEP 11 PM 4: 16 LEGAL PROCESS #9 YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): ERIC GRANT You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court. There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y blenes sin más advertencia. Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios iegales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales The name and address of the court is: CASE NUMBER! (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Superior Court, County of Sacramento 720 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): (SBN 119525) Tel: (916) 325-1000 Fax: (916) 325-1004 BANKS & WATSON 813 Sixth Street, Suite 400 Sacramento, CA 95814 DATE: Clerk, by SEP 1 1 Deputy (Secretario) (For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).) (Adjunto) (Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)). NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served \_\_\_\_ as an individual defendant. as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify): 3. [...] on behalf of (specify): CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.70 (conservatee) CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) CCP 416.90 (authorized person) other (specify): by personal delivery on (date): rm Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 465 JM-100 [Rev January 1, 2004] SUMMONS

(CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

"JUAMES J. BANKS (SBN 119525)	arthinisisishen or territo (1991), ink v. istores i sandi attribute indistribute and annum	The Control of the Co
BANKS & WATSON		
813 Sixth Street, Suite 400	1	
Sacramento, CA 95814	,	TENDARCENY
		ILIMOUK2FR0
TELEPHONE NO.: (916) 325-1000	FAX NO.: (916) 325-1004	
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff		07 SEP 11 PM 4: 16
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SE	cramento	
SIREET ADDRESS: // Ninth Street		LEGAL PROCESS #9
MAILING ADDRESS:		
CITYAND ZIP CODE: Sacramento, CA 9	5814	]
BRANCH NAME:		· .
CASE NAME: ERIC GRANT v. JOH through 10, inclusive	N GOEMANS and ROES 1	
Fritogdi IO, IllCIUSIVE		
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE UNTERASO 4172
X Unlimited Limited (Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	U/ASU41/4
(Amount (Amount demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defenda	ant Judge:
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT;
Items 1-6 be	low must be completed (see jestruction	DEPT;
1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:		
Auto Tort	Contract	_
Auto (22)		Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation
Uninsured motorist (46)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)
{ ·····	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	above listed provisionally complex case
		types (41)
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	
Intellectual property (19)		RICO (27)
Professional negligence (25)	Drugs (38)	X_ Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
	Judicial Review	Miscellaneous Civil Petition
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	1 Strot petition (not specified 800Ve) (43)
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	
2. This case is is X is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:		
The state of the s		
b. Extensive motion practice raising difficulting and the second		
Line in the indicate practice raising uniquit of novel e I Contrinstion with related actions nonding to the		
in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court		
of the state of th		
The state of the s		
1. Number of courses of auties (see also as	and the state of t	cuaratory or injunctive relief c punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): Two.		
5. This case is is X is not a class	action suit.	
5. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form 044 a.s.)		
Date: September 11, 2007		
MAMES J. BANKS (SBN 119525)		
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		$AT \subseteq AT \subseteq$
		ATORE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
· Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the fire	NOTICE	,
<ul> <li>Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result</li> </ul>		
in sanctions.	naro and momentons code). (Cal. Rules (	or Couπ, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.		
	a. of the California Rules of Court your	nist serve a conv of this server = 1
If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all these this is a collection or proceeding.  Indees this is a collection or proceeding.		
Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.		
rm Adopted for Mandatory Use		Page 1 of 2
Judicial Council of California		02 Cat. Rules of Court, rules 2:30:3:220:3:400-3:402:3:740
CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]	Solut	Ons Cat Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10 Plus
	પ્લ	L RAG