1 2 3 4	John Y. Igarashi, Esq. (SBN 180118) LAW OFFICES OF JOHN Y. IGARASHI, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 18021 Cowan Irvine, CA 92614 Tel: (949) 667-0150 Attorneys for Plaintiff,	ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California, County of Orange  08/03/2016 at 10:49:30 PM Clerk of the Superior Court
5	HARRÝ BERKOWITZ	By Monique Ramirėz, Deputy Clerk
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER, UNLIMITED	
10	HARRY BERKOWITZ,	) Case No. 30-2016-00867487-CU-BT-CJC Judge Frederick P. Aguirre
11 12	Plaintiff, vs.	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR:  (1) BREACH OF WRITTEN  CONTRACT:
13 14		<ul> <li>CONTRACT;</li> <li>(2) BREACH OF THE IMPLIED</li> <li>COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND</li> <li>FAIR DEALING;</li> <li>(3) INTENTIONAL FRAUD</li> </ul>
15 16 17 18	NICHOLAS "NICK" DELFRANCO, an individual; TOM DELFRANCO, an individual; HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, a Michigan limited liability company; JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 10,	) (DECEIT); ) (4) NEGLIGENT ) MISREPRESENTATION; ) (5) UNJUST ENRICHMENT/ MONEY ) HAD AND RECEIVED; ) (6) UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES; ) (7) TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ) ORDER;
19 20	Defendants.	) (8) PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION; ) (9) WRIT OF ATTACHMENT; AND
21		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL.
<ul><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	Comes now Plaintiff HARRY BERK	OWITZ, who alleges as follows:
24	as follows:	
25	<u>PREFACE</u>	
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	This complaint was not drafted by the plaintiff himself. This complaint was	
28	drafted by counsel, based upon information	and belief of counsel, as to the facts as

understood by counsel, prior to the filing of the action.

Complaints of this type are not required to be verified under Oath and, as such, this Complaint is not verified under Oath.

In compliance with California law, reasonable efforts have been made by counsel to understand the facts at this early stage of pleadings, so that a reasonable effort may be made to apprise defendant(s) generally of counsel's understanding of the facts constituting the elements of the claims made herein.

Nothing in this complaint should be construed as an admission on the part of, or attributable to, the parties themselves.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 1. Plaintiff HARRY BERKOWITZ is an adult individual over 18 years of age.
- 2. Defendant NICHOLAS "NICK" DELFRANCO is an adult individual over 18 years of age, who resides in the County of Orange, State of California. NICK DELFRANCO is a partner with defendant TOM DELFRANCO, in defendant HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC.
- 3. Defendant TOM DELFRANCO is an adult individual over 18 years of age. Plaintiff is informed and believes that TOM DELFRANCO resides in the County of McComb, State of Michigan. TOM DELFRANCO is a partner with defendant NICK DELFRANCO, in defendant HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC. Both NICK DELFRANCO and TOM DELFRANCO were involved in the subject transaction, and both of them made specific representations to plaintiff as to their ability to deliver the products ordered in the subject transaction.
- 4. Defendant HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC is a Michigan limited liability company, having its principal place of business within the County of McComb, State of Michigan.
- 5. Defendant JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., a Delaware corporation, is named not for liability purposes, but as an entity in possession, custody or control of

funds held in the name of HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, which are rightfully owned by Plaintiff. Plaintiff seeks to be declared rightful owner and beneficiary of a constructive trust of those monies. Plaintiff will seek to enjoin and restrain Defendant JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A. from transferring those funds until such time as all of the claims within this Complaint can be fully and completely adjudicated.

- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that DOES 1 through 10 are each responsible in some manner for the events herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by their conduct.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that at all times mentioned each of the Defendants, including DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, were the agents and employees of each of the remaining Defendants except where specified otherwise. In doing the things hereinafter alleged, Defendants acted within the scope and course of such agency. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all times relevant hereto, each of the defendants, including DOES 1 through 10, acted in concert with one another and in furtherance of each other's interests.
- 8. In or about July 2015, plaintiff met with a group of businessmen at the Island Hotel in Newport Beach to discuss a cannabis growing business. Approximately twelve persons attended the meeting.
- 9. The focus of the meeting was a presentation by defendant Nick DelFranco, who represented that he had relocated to Newport Beach from Michigan. Mr. DelFranco further represented himself as having fifteen years of experience in the cannabis growing business, with expertise in all aspects of the business, which included growing, harvesting, and providing wholesale hydroponics equipment. Mr. Defranco represented that he had a warehouse in Mt. Clemens, Michigan for fulfillment of orders for hydroponics equipment. He represented that he and his father Tom DelFranco were partners in the business known as Hydroponics House, LLC, which distributed and supplied hydroponics equipment, and other equipment necessary for horticulture.

///

///

- 10. Plaintiff was planning to build a licensed cannabis growing facility in Denver, Colorado. After several meetings with Nick DelFranco, plaintiff informed Mr. DelFranco that he was about to order horticulture equipment for the new facility, and had a list of the specific hydroponics and other horticulture equipment that plaintiff needed.
- 11. Mr. DelFranco asked if he could bid the against the price that plaintiff had received. Plaintiff provided the material list, without prices, so that defendant could bid.
- 12. Mr. DelFranco's bid did in fact come in lower than the price quoted from the other equipment supplier. The bid was approximately \$122,250.
  - 13. Mr. DelFranco asked for a \$63,250 deposit (roughly half of the bid).
- 14. On or about January 7, 2016, plaintiff handed Mr. DelFranco a cashier's check drawn from a Wells Fargo account in the amount of \$63,250. At Mr. DelFranco's request, plaintiff drove Mr. DelFranco to Chase Bank in Newport Beach, where Mr. DelFranco deposited the check into the Hydroponics House, LLC bank account. A true and correct copy of the cashiers check is attached hereto as Exhibit "1," and incorporated herein by reference.
- 15. The balance due was \$59,000.00, to be paid upon final shipment of the entire order.
- 16. On January 20, 2016, plaintiff received an invoice from Hydroponics House, LLC, reflecting the payment of the \$63,250 deposit. A true and correct copy of the invoice reflecting receipt of the deposit is attached hereto as Exhibit "2," and incorporated herein by reference.
- 17. Defendant shipped four (4) pumps (which were quoted as costing between \$122 and \$240 in the bid), and nothing else. Plaintiff could not do anything with four pumps, and no other equipment. As an aside, the quantity of pumps that were supposed to be shipped was twenty (20).

28 ///

- 18. As weeks and months passed, plaintiff repeatedly requested delivery dates, and defendants repeatedly failed to provide equipment or shipment dates, as they had promised they would do.
- 19. Plaintiff realized that he had been scammed, that defendant had no intention of providing the equipment, and that defendant had absconded with the money.
- 20. In late February 2016, plaintiff canceled the order in writing and after only receiving the four pumps of the total order. Plaintiff requested a return of the full deposit and offered to ship the four pumps back to Michigan.
- 21. However, Mr. DelFranco did not accept return of the four pumps and did not refund the money.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (BREACH OF WRITTEN CONTRACT)

(AGAINST HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, AND DOE DEFENDANTS)

- 22. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 23. Pursuant to contract evidenced by a writing (written bid, cashier's check based upon bid, and invoice), Plaintiff was to turn over to Defendant a \$63,250 deposit, which plaintiff did. Defendant promised and represented that he would use the money to purchase equipment, which would be shipped to plaintiff, the vast majority immediately, one product within 3-5 days, two products within one week, and three products within 4-5 weeks.
  - 24. By not performing as set forth above, Defendant breached the contract.
- 25. Plaintiff performed all conditions, covenants and promises required on his part to be performed under the contract.
- 26. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's actions against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered special damages of \$63,250.

- 27. Plaintiff is further entitled to incidental and consequential damages, in an amount to be proven at time of trial.
- 28. Plaintiff is further entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

#### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

# (BREACH OF THE IMPLIED COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING)

(AGAINST HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, AND DOE DEFENDANTS)

- 29. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 30. At all times herein mentioned, there existed an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing incident to the express contract by and between Plaintiff and Defendant such that:
- (a) Each party would act in good faith and deal fairly toward the other concerning all matters relating to the contract; and
- (b) Neither party would do anything to deprive the other party of the benefits of the agreement.
- 31. Defendant breached and continues to breach the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing by acting as alleged herein. The conduct of Defendant was designed to prevent and in fact prevented Plaintiff from receiving benefits to which he was entitled pursuant to contract.
- 32. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's actions against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered special damages of \$63,250.
- 33. Plaintiff is further entitled to incidental and consequential damages, in an amount to be proven at time of trial.
- 34. Plaintiff is further entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

plaintiff. Instead, Defendants kept the money, and did not perform any of the actions that were supposed to be taken with the money. Despite this fact, and as further evidence of fraud, Defendants have failed and refused to return the money when requested. Said actions on the part of Defendants have caused tremendous financial detriment to Plaintiff.

- 40. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered special damages in excess of \$63,250.
- 41. As a further direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer general damages including but not limited to substantial and enduring emotional distress including humiliation, mental anguish and physical distress, in an amount to be proven at time of trial, in excess of the minimum jurisdictional requirements of this Court.
- 42. Plaintiff is further entitled to incidental and consequential damages, in an amount to be proven at time of trial.
- 43. Plaintiff is further entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be proven at time of trial.
- 44. The aforementioned acts of Defendants were fraudulent, malicious and oppressive. Particularly fraudulent, malicious and oppressive was Defendants' predatory behavior in taking advantage of Plaintiff's trust, and making bald-faced lies about Defendant's ability to deliver equipment. Plaintiff is thus entitled to and herein seeks punitive and exemplary damages from Defendants, in an amount according to proof at trial, to punish Defendants and deter Defendants and others from engaging in similar future conduct.

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION)

(AGAINST NICK DELFRANCO, HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, AND DOE DEFENDANTS)

- 45. Plaintiff realleges and incorporate herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 21, and 36, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 46. When Defendant Nick DelFranco made misrepresentations, as set forth above, he should have known that the statements were false when he made them and/or had no reasonable basis for believing the misrepresentations to be true. In this way, Defendant Nick DelFranco made affirmative, material misrepresentations to Plaintiff.
- 47. Defendants intended to induce Plaintiff to rely on their misrepresentations. Plaintiff did rely on their misrepresentations, by depositing the \$63,250 in Defendants' bank account.
- 48. Plaintiff had no reason to believe Defendant's statements were false and therefore acted in reasonable reliance upon Defendant's statements. Specifically, based upon Defendant's reassurances, Plaintiff provided Defendants with money that was supposedly going to be used for the purchase of equipment that was to be turned over to plaintiff. Instead, Defendants kept the money, and did not perform any of the actions that were supposed to be taken with the money. Despite this fact, and as further evidence of fraud, Defendants have failed and refused to return the money when requested. Said actions on the part of Defendants have caused tremendous financial detriment to Plaintiff.
- 49. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered special damages in excess of \$63,250.
- 50. As a further direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer general damages including but not limited to substantial and enduring emotional distress

including humiliation, mental anguish and physical distress, in an amount to be proven at time of trial, in excess of the minimum jurisdictional requirements of this Court.

- 51. Plaintiff is further entitled to incidental and consequential damages, in an amount to be proven at time of trial.
- 52. Plaintiff is further entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

#### **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (UNJUST ENRICHMENT/MONEY HAD AND RECEIVED)

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 53. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 54. As set forth above, Plaintiff provided money to Defendants for the purpose of purchasing specific hydroponics and related equipment. Defendants agreed to do so. The transaction was a business transaction, from a business supplier, for business hydroponics and related equipment, to be used at Plaintiff's business.
- 55. Defendants did not use the money for the intended purpose, and instead took the money for their own use and benefit, which did not include any use or benefit to Plaintiff.
- 56. Plaintiff demanded return of the money, but Defendants failed and refused to return the money.
- 57. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered special damages in the amount of \$63,250.
- 58. As a further direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions against Plaintiff, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer consequential and incidental damages. Plaintiff is further entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

27 | ///

28 ///

### 

### 

# 

# 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

# 

# 

# 

# 

#### 

#### 

#### **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES - B & P CODE, SECTION 17200)

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 59. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 60. The aforementioned acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute fraudulent, unlawful and unfair business practices within the meaning of <u>Business & Professions Code</u> §17200, and Defendants are therefore liable to Plaintiff under this statute. Pursuant to <u>Business & Professions Code</u> §17205, any recovery for violation of this statute is cumulative and is thus in addition to any other damages recoverable in this complaint. Fraudulent, unlawful and unfair business practices give rise to, among other remedies, restitution and injunctive relief.

### **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST)

(AGAINST HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, and JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.)

- 61. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 62. Plaintiff seeks a constructive trust preventing dissipation of the funds that were deposited into the account of HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, at JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., for the specific purpose of purchasing hydroponics and related equipment for plaintiff. Imposing the constructive trust will preserve the status quo and allow for a means of the return of Plaintiff's money. Through separate application or
- motion, Plaintiff shall apply for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and writ of attachment to preserve the funds.
- 25 | ///
- 5 | ///
- 7 | ///
  - ///

# 3

### 4

# 5 6

# 7

### 8

#### 10

## 11 12

#### 13

#### 14

### 15

# 16

## 17

## 18 19

# 20

# 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION)

(AGAINST HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, and JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.)

- 63. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 64. Plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunction to prevent the dissipation of the funds that were deposited into the account of HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, at JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., for the specific purpose of purchasing hydroponics and related equipment for plaintiff. Imposing the preliminary injunction will preserve the status quo and allow for a means of the return of Plaintiff's money. Through separate application or motion, Plaintiff shall apply for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and writ of attachment to preserve the funds.

#### **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (WRIT OF ATTACHMENT)

#### (AGAINST HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC)

- 65. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 66. Plaintiff seeks a writ of attachment to prevent dissipation of the funds that were deposited into the account of HYDROPONICS HOUSE, LLC, at JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., for the specific purpose of purchasing hydroponics and related equipment for plaintiff. Issuance of the writ of attachment will preserve the status quo and allow for a means of the return of Plaintiff's money. Through separate application or motion, Plaintiff shall apply for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and writ of attachment to preserve the funds.