John R. Dunne Assistant Attorney General Brian F. Heffernan Fernando M. Olguin U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division Housing and Civil Enforcement Section P.O. Box 65998 5 Washington, D.C. 20035-5998 (202) 514-8034 Lourdes G. Baird United States Attorney Stan Blumenfeld Assistant United States Attorney 7516 Federal Building 300 N. Los Angeles Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 10 (213) 894-2872 Attorneys for Plaintiff 11 12 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 13 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CIV. No. 91-6255-RMT (GHKx) 17 Plaintiff. CIV. No. 92-3015-RMT (GHKx) 18 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT in 19 PLAZA MOBILE ESTATES, a general partnership; JACK OLOF; EDWARD CIV. No. 92-3015-RMT (GHKx) 20 TAILFORD; JACK JORDAN; JOSEPH SHERMAN; VERNON DAVIS; BRUCE 21 ROBINSON; MADGE ROBINSON, 22 Defendants. 23 The United States of America alleges: 24 This action is brought by the United States on its own 25 behalf and on behalf of Charlotte Suitor, pursuant to §§ 812(0)

14 | 15 |

and 814(a) of the Fair Housing Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3612(o) and 3614(a).

- This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
  U.S.C. § 1345 and 42 U.S.C. §§ 3612(o) and 3614(a).
- 3. Defendant Plaza Mobile Estates is a general partnership that conducts business in Santa Ana, California, in the Central District of California. Defendant Plaza Mobile Estates owns a mobile home park, Plaza Mobile Estates ("Park"), located in Santa Ana, California, in which it leases lots for the placement of mobile homes.
- 4. Defendants Vernon Davis, Jack Olof, Edward Tailford, Joseph Sherman, and Jack Jordan are the general partners of defendant Plaza Mobile Estates.
- 5. Defendants Bruce and Madge Robinson are resident managers of Plaza Mobile Estates Park.
- 6. Lots in the Plaza Mobile Estates Park are dwellings within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 3602(b).

## COUNT I

- 7. Plaintiff realleges and herein incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in the above paragraphs 1 through 6.
- 8. On June 15, 1989, Charlotte Suitor filed a housing discrimination complaint with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), pursuant to section 810(a) of the Fair Housing Act ("Act"), as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 3610(a). In her HUD complaint, Ms. Suitor alleged that on or about May 5, 1989, she was aggrieved by a discriminatory housing practice of

defendants, in that the defendants actively discouraged prospective home buyers, Carl and Marilyn Johnson, from purchasing a mobile home located in Plaza Mobile Estates Park and listed with her brokerage service, because of their familial status, thereby causing the cancellation of the Johnsons' plans to purchase such mobile home and preventing Ms. Suitor from selling a mobile home to a family with children.

- 9. Pursuant to the requirements of 42 U.S.C. §§ 3610(a) and (b), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development ("Secretary") conducted an investigation of the complaint, attempted conciliation without success, and prepared a final investigative report. Based upon the information gathered in this investigation, the Secretary, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 3610(g)(1), determined that reasonable cause exists to believe that discriminatory practices have occurred.
- 10. On April 6, 1992, the Secretary issued a Determination of Reasonable Cause and Charge of Discrimination, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 3610(g)(2)(A), with regard to Ms. Suitor's complaint, charging that defendants engaged in discriminatory housing practices in violation of the Fair Housing Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 et seq.
- 11. On April 21, 1992, defendants, through counsel, elected to have these charges resolved in a federal civil action, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 3612(a).
- 12. By letter dated April 23, 1992, the Secretary, through HUD's regional counsel, authorized the Attorney General to file

this action on behalf of Charlotte Suitor, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 3612(0).

- 13. Defendants made statements intended to discourage the Johnsons from purchasing a mobile home in the Plaza Mobile Estates Park on the basis of familial status, published and enforced rules and regulations that indicate a preference, limitation and discrimination on the basis of familial status, and interfered with the efforts of Ms. Suitor to aid the Johnsons in the exercise or enjoyment of the rights granted by 42 U.S.C. § 3604.
- 14. In taking the actions described in Paragraph 13 above, defendants have:
  - a. Discriminated against persons in the terms, conditions and privileges of rental of a dwelling, and in the provision of services and facilities in connection therewith, because of familial status, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 3604(b);
  - b. Made and published statements with respect to the rental of a dwelling indicating a preference, limitation and discrimination based on familial status, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 3604(c); and
  - c. Interfered with the efforts of Ms. Suitor to aid Carl and Marilyn Johnson in the exercise or enjoyment of the rights granted by 42 U.S.C. § 3604, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 3617.

15. The defendants' unlawful conduct has denied Ms. Suitor the right to sell a home listed with her brokerage service to a willing purchaser without discrimination and caused her other damages in the form of economic loss and emotional distress.

16. The discriminatory actions of defendants were intentional, willful, and taken in disregard for the rights of Charlotte Suitor.

## COUNT II

17. Plaintiff realleges and herein incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in the above paragraphs 1 through 16.

18. Since the effective date of the 1988 amendments to the Fair Housing Act making discrimination on the basis of familial status unlawful, defendants have adopted and implemented policies designed to preclude, limit and discourage families with children from residing at the Plaza Mobile Estates complex. Pursuant to this policy, defendants have published and enforced rules and regulations governing occupancy in defendants' complex that indicate a preference, limitation and discrimination on the basis of familial status. Further, defendants' policy has subjected all families with children who live in the complex to harassment and disparate treatment on the basis of familial status.

- 19. Through the polices described in the preceding paragraph, defendants have:
  - a. Discriminated against persons in the terms, conditions and privileges of rental of a dwelling, and in the provision of services and facilities in connection there-

with, because of familial status, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 3604(b); and

- b. Made and published statements with respect to the rental of a dwelling indicating a preference, limitation and discrimination based on familial status, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 3604(c).
- 20. The conduct of the defendants described above in paragraphs 18 and 19 constitutes:
- a. A pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of the rights granted by the Fair Housing Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seg.; and
  - b. A denial of rights to a group of persons, which denial raises an issue of general public importance.
- 21. Victims of defendants' discriminatory practices are aggrieved persons as defined in 42 U.S.C. § 3602(i). These persons have suffered actual injury from the loss of their right to equal opportunity in housing and have suffered other damages in the form of economic loss and emotional distress.
- 22. The unlawful conduct of defendants was intentional, willful, and taken in disregard for the rights of others.

WHEREFORE, the United States prays that the Court enter an order that:

1. Declares that the discriminatory housing practices of defendants, as set forth above, violate the Fair Housing Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601-3619;

- 2. Enjoins defendants, their agents, employees, and successors, and all other persons in active concert or participation with any of them, from discriminating on account of familial status against any person in any aspect of the lease or rental of a dwelling;
- 3. Awards damages in an amount that will fully compensate Charlotte Suitor for the injury occasioned by the denial of her right described above and for the economic loss and emotional distress caused by defendants' discriminatory conduct, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 3612(o)(3) and 3613(c);
- 4. Awards punitive damages to Charlotte Suitor pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 3612(o)(3) and 3613(c).
- 5. Awards appropriate monetary relief, including compensatory and punitive damages, to all other persons aggrieved by defendants' pattern and practice of discrimination, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §3614(d)(1)(B); and
- 6. Assesses a civil penalty against defendants in an amount of money authorized by 42 U.S.C. §3614(d)(1)(C), in order to vindicate the public interest.

20035-5998