Case 2:12-cv-05547-PA/SR Document 1 Filed 06/26/12 Page 1 of 16 Page ID #:1 Robert D. Conaway Bar No #119657 1 LAW OFFICE of ROBERT D. CONAWAY 2012 JUN 26 AM 10: 52 222 East Main Street, Suite 212 Mailing address: PO Box 865 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. Barstow, CA 92312-0865 Phone: (760) 256-0603 Fax: (760) 256-0660 RIVERSIDE rdconaway@gmail.com 5 Attorney for ELISE BROWN, Plaintiff 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 12 05542 10 ELISE BROWN. CASE No. 11 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE 12 AND DECLARATORY RELIEF ٧. 13 [Fourteenth Amendment to United 14 DEBRA BOWEN, Calilfornia States Constitution: 42 USC 1983: Secretary of State Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 USC 1973] 15 16 Defendant. 17 I. THE NATURE OF THE CASE 18 This is an action for declaratory and injunctive relief to enforce 19 the provisions of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution 20 of the United States and 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 ("VRA"), as amended 21 in 1982 or more commonly known of as 42 U.S.C. 1973, and to prevent deprivation under color of state law, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of the 23 rights, privileges and immunities secured by the aforementioned federal 24 constitutional provisions and statute, and more specifically under the VRA's 1982 25 reauthorization held that "minorities had a right [to not just vote] but to elect 26 representatives of their choice", a right, that is now factually impossible in the 27 28

12 13

11

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

upcoming November 2012 election for the vast majority of African Americans in the 8th Congressional District because the Top 2 Primary law has left the field with two candidates for the November election that are openly hostile to the rights and interests of African American voters in the 8th Congressional District even were it not for the significant traditional pro-Democrat voting history of African Americans.

- 2. This action would have not been ripe for adjudication until such time the election results were in and the resulting injury to the rights of African Americans to participate in the general election in the 8th Congressional District contest for Congress were concrete.
- 3. Additionally, this is an action for declaratory to obtain a ruling that California's Proposition 14 entitled the "Top Two Primaries Act [which took effect April 19, 2011] that modified Article II, Section 5 of the California Constitution and Section 6 of Article II of the California Constitution, is unconstitutional as violating ELISE BROWN's rights in the 8th Congressional District in that:
- (a) the first and fourteenth amendment right to freedom of association, which protects the freedom to join and participate in the general election process in furtherance of common political beliefs, which by its nature includes the right to select and be able to vote for party nominees in the general elections [as per United States Supreme Court in Democratic Party of the United States of America v Wisconsin ex rel La Follette, 450 US 107 (1981) and reaffirmed in California Democratic Party v Jones 530 US 567, 573-74 (2000)], the right of qualified voters to cast their votes effectively ["which ranks amongst our most precious freedoms" per Anderson v Celebreeze, 460 U.S. 780, 787-88, quoting Williams v Rhodes, 393 U.S. 23, 30-31] and the right to have ideas compete through general election candidates from each of the parties, is abridged as in the Top Two Primaries Act, the top two candidates present race-hostile policy positions

17 18

15

16

19 20

21 22

23 24 //

25

27

28

26

recognize that anyone had the right to vote other than white males and only counted African Americans as three-fifths of a person under Section 2 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution) and both Craig Imus and Paul Cook not recognizing the right of women to control their reproductive health decisions, both major issues for people of color in general elections such as the one coming up in November. Paul Cook voted against an anti-discrimination bill (AB 1450 which prohibited discrimination against unemployed workers, a class African Americans lead percentage-wise in California, SB 185 which allowed race, ethnicity and gender to be considered in college admission decisions). (b) The retained right to vote in a federal general election for a democrat, a

- practice that has existed all of Plaintiff's adult life and since the first election after California was admitted to the Union, is a substantive due process right protected under the 14th Amendment & Bush v Gore (2000), which recognized that State citizens had rights in federal elections under the substantive due process clause of the United States Constitution, rights now abridged by the conservative-only republican-only general election in the 8th Congressional District./1
- (c) California Election Code Section 8147 authorizes and directs the California Secretary of State to issue certificates of nomination (note nomination is singular) to candidates for Congress, which is contradicted when nomination is of people from the same political party, an enlargement of power under statute.

^{1/} Districts with two republican "nominees" includes the 31st with Bob Dutton and Gary Miller, leaving top vote getting democratic candidate Pete Aguilar out of the November general election & in the 8th top Democratic vote getter Jackie Conaway will similarly not be in the general election either. Districts where the two top voters are democrats, which could be affected by a decision in this case include the 15th (Eric Stalwell-D), the 30th (Howard Berman-D), 33rd (Chris. David-R), 43rd (Bob Flores-D), 44th (Laura Richardson-D) & the 40th (David Sanchez-D).

II. JURISDICTION

- 4. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked as to the Voting Rights Act under Title 28 of the United States Code, 1331, 1343(3), 1343(4) and 2201, this suit being authorized by Title 42 of the United States Code, 1983.
- 5. The jurisdiction of this Court as to the associational right claims is based on the common law articulated in Democratic Party of the United States of America v Wisconsin ex rel La Follette, 450 US 107 (1981) and reaffirmed in California Democratic Party v Jones [530 US 567, 573-74 (2000)], which recognized that "substantial intrusion into [] associational freedom" occurs when people are deprived of the right to vote for their candidate in the November general election for federal offices.

III. PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff Elise Brown is an African American adult citizen, a long time member of the California Democratic Party, the San Bernardino County Democratic Central Committee by election, the California State Democratic Party's Central Committee, an officer of the Adelanto-Victorville Democratic Club and proceeds in her own behalf and of those person similarly situated.
- 7. Plaintiff desires to participate in the electoral and political process for the House of Representatives and to have her and all those similarly situated persons' votes counted on an equal basis with white citizens of San Bernardino County by being able to vote for a Democratic candidate in the general election.
- 8. Defendant Secretary of State, Deborah Bowen is sued in her official capacity only to the extent of her issuing a certificate of nomination for Congressional races pursuant to State Election Code Section 8147 pursuant to the Top 2 Primary law. As Bowen is the Chief Election Officer of the State of California and has responsibility for the general supervision and administration of the election laws, is responsible to obtain and maintain uniformity in the application and administration of the election laws and issue a certificates of

nomination for congress for each of the top voters for each party.

9. At all relevant times set out herein, defendant was and have been acting under color of the statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs and usages of the State of California.

IV. FACTS

- 10. Plaintiff as a democrat and an African American voter represents a group that predominately votes for Democrats for federal offices in primary and general elections and the registration numbers bears that disparity out. Since 1964 when African Americans voted democratic 82% of the time, 92% of the time in 1968 and with the exception of 1972, 1984 and the 1992 elections, African Americans would continue to give at least 80% of the collective votes to Democrats.
- 11. The 8th Congressional Districts break down as 8% African American, 35% Hispanic, 50% White.
- 12. Pursuant to California's Proposition 14 entitled the "Top Two Primaries Act", which took effect April 19, 2011, modified Article II, Section 5 of the California Constitution and Section 6 of Article II of the California Constitution, effectively deprives African American voters of the right to vote:
- (a) Prohibiting political parties which historically align with African American voters from nominating candidates in a primary;
- (b) Prohibits plaintiff and all those similarly situated from supporting a federal candidate from their own political party of choice in the general election by eliminating their candidate should he or she not be a top two vote getter in the primary;
- (c) Prohibiting the highest Democratic vote getter from representing the democratic party in the November 2012 general election for the first time in 160 years of California and United States history;
 - (d) Creating voter confusion when they see only 2 republicans to vote for,

having come to the polls expecting to have a choice of voting for a democratic candidate of their own choosing;

- (e) Creating a severe restriction upon the exercise of their voting rights in that for the first time, they will have to decide whether to vote at all for a non-democratic candidate;
- (f) Prohibiting write in voters that are Democrats from seeking to participate in the November 2012 election;
- (g) Taking away a fundamental right to be able to vote for a party champion in a federal race in the general election;
- (h) By having only republicans in the general election for a federal office, depriving plaintiff and all those similarly situated of the right to associate by supporting and voting for a Democratic candidate in the general election for Congress;
- (i) By the Secretary of State upholding a law like the Top 2 Primary which compels the citizens to vote in a top two open primary in a district that has a substantial advantage registration-wise for republicans as created by the so-called non-partisan commission, the state is effectively empowering the Republican party by declaring to plaintiff and all those similarly situated, that they no any longer have a right to vote for a democratic candidate of their choice, in effect a state action stripping political choice and are further stripping the people like plaintiff and those similarly situation from having the back-up valve of being able to run a write-in candidate of their choice;
- (j) By having a Top 2 Primary System in a republican registration advantage district, plaintiff and all those similarly situation are coerced to associate with the republican candidates selected, should they wish to exercise their right to vote, by voting for persons that philosophically and politically are diametrically opposed to their interests and views in violation of plaintiff's and those similarly situated's right to NOT associate or not exercising the fundamental right to vote.

- (k) Debra Bowen as the California Secretary of State is to issue under Elections Code Sec. 8147 a certificates of "nomination" (a singular) reference, for each top vote getter for each party, and to issue certificates of nomination for people from the same party, facially contradicts the plain meaning of term.
- 13. The political processes leading to the general election in 2012 and every two years thereafter in San Bernardino County are not equally open to participation by African-Americans, in that African-Americans have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice because of the Top 2 Primary.
- 14. African-Americans in San Bernardino County bear the effects of discrimination in such areas as education, employment and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process.
- 15. In the entire history of San Bernardino County, no African-American has ever been elected to any countywide office and with the Top Two primary, with 8.9% of San Bernardino County being African American, .6% in Inyo County and .3% in Mono County [county-wise numbers per the 2012 Census] and a created 10% registration advantage of Republican over democrat and a nearly 20% decline-to-state budge on top of that, African American voters will have added to their burden the result of having to choose between two conservative republicans that garnered only 30.8% of the vote.

VI. EQUITABLE RELIEF

- 16. There is a real and actual controversy between the parties and the issue is ripe for adjudication. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law other than this action for injunctive and declaratory relief and to deny relief herein, due to the percentage to population of African Americans, will strip African Americans of their associational and other related civil rights as set forth herein for the next decade.
 - 17. Plaintiffs are and will continue to suffer irreparable injury as a result

7

5

12

10

13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

of the acts of Defendant complained of herein and that injury will continue unless declared to be unlawful and enjoined by this Court.

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution 42 U.S.C. §1983

- Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference each of the 16 18. foregoing paragraphs.
- 19. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendant on or about July 13, 2012 will prepare Certificates of Nomination for Congressional candidates under California Election Code Sec. 8147.
- 20. Defendant, acting under color of state law, threatens to deprive Plaintiffs including the individual Plaintiff of their fundamental right to vote.
- Any holding (of using the Top 2 Primary results) results in the denial 21. or abridgment of the right of plaintiff's fundamental right under the 14th Amendment in that Democrats have had the right to have a party representative in the general election for Congress since California joined the Union over 160 years ago. To now abolish that right by State Initiative and allow the Secretary of State to prepare 2 nomination certificates for people from the same political party, violates plaintiff's and all those similarly situated's substantive due process right, right of association and those rights otherwise reserved to the state, but not enumerated in the Bill of Rights.
- 22. Plaintiff and all those similarly situated have always been able to vote for a party champion since the first days of the republic, creating a federal voting right that should not be abridged by State Action under the 14th Amendment and the rationale in Bush v Gore.
- 23. Defendant, acting under color of state law, threatens to violate Plaintiffs' rights to equal protection, due process, and the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the

9

7

12

13

14 15 16

18 19

17

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

United States Constitution in that for the next decade, plaintiff and those similarly situated will not be able to exercise their associational rights by voting for a candidate that shares their concerns and priorities.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §1973

- 24. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporate by reference each of the 22 foregoing paragraphs.
- 25. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §1973, prohibits voting practices and procedures that result in the denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race, color, or linguistic minority status.
- 26. The holding of using the Top 2 Primary results in the denial or abridgment of the right of Plaintiffs to vote on account of race or color in violation of 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. 1973, and these election structures were adopted and have the effect of diluting, minimizing and canceling out the voting strength of African-Americans in violation of the rights of Plaintiffs secured by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States, and 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. 1973 or in resulting dilution, minimizing and canceling out by a reckless disregard of the substantial likelihood of creating a district where a democrat would not be available for an African American to vote for, creating not only a denial of choice and abridgement of associational rights in a federal election.
- 27. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendant will on July 13, 2012 prepare Certificates of Nomination for Congressional candidates under California Election Code Sec. 8147 a system of voting that abridges Plaintiffs' right to vote for the next decade in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in their favor and the following relief:

- (1) Issue a temporary restraining order or such other preliminary injunctive relief as is appropriate prior to the Secretary of State's scheduled preparation of the certificates of nomination on July 13, 2012 so that the court can first decide if California's Proposition 14 entitled the "Top Two Primaries Act [which took effect April 19, 2011] that modified Article II, Section 5 of the California Constitution and Section 6 of Article II of the California Constitution, violates the 1982 Reauthorization of the Federal Voting Rights Act by eliminating from the November 2012 general election the top vote getting democratic candidate;
- (2) Alternatively to No. (1), issue a temporary restraining order or such other preliminary injunctive relief as is appropriate prior to the Secretary of State's scheduled preparation of the certificates of nomination on July 13, 2012 so that the court can decide if California's Proposition 14 entitled the "Top Two Primaries Act [which took effect April 19, 2011] that modified Article II, Section 5 of the California Constitution and Section 6 of Article II of the California Constitution, violates the 1982 Reauthorization of the Federal Voting Rights Act, by abolishing 160 years of voting rights for ALL Californians that they be able to vote in a general election for a candidate from the party they are members of, is unlawful;
- (3) Issue a temporary restraining order or such other preliminary injunctive relief as is appropriate based on the plain reading of Election Code 8147 which refers to nomination certificates in the singular, requiring under historical tradition and the plain meaning of the words, one nomination, for one person from each party that ran;
- (4) Alternatively, issue a temporary restraining order or such other preliminary injunctive relief as is appropriate prior to the Secretary of State's scheduled preparation of the certificates of nomination on July 13, 2012 so that the court can decide if California's Proposition 14 entitled the "Top Two Primaries Act [which took effect April 19, 2011] that modified Article II, Section 5 of the California Constitution and Section 6 of Article II of the California Constitution,

violates the first, fourteen and fifteen amendments of the United States Constitution;

- (5) Enter a declaratory judgment that ELISE BROWN's and all those Democrats similarly situated's rights are violated by California's Proposition 14 entitled the "Top Two Primaries Act" [which took effect April 19, 2011] that modified Article II, Section 5 of the California Constitution and Section 6 of Article II of the California Constitution, violates rights under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act as amended in 1982;
- (5) Enter a declaratory judgment that ELISE BROWN's and all those Democrats similarly situated's rights are violated first, fourteenth and fifteenth amendment right to freedom of association, to cast their votes effectively;
- (6) To restore the previous system that allowed the top vote getter from each party to stand for election in the November 2012 election so to obtain and maintain constitutional uniformity;
- (7) Alternatively, should the court not set this motion and rule on it before the Secretary of State prepares its certificates of nomination for Congressional candidates, that the court, should it rule on the merits in plaintiff's favor, vacate and expunge from the record the certificates of nomination prepared and issued, and issue an order declaring the top voter getter from each party be only issued certificates of nomination for the November 2012 general election.
- (8) To award Plaintiffs the costs and expense of this action together with their reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- (9) To retain jurisdiction of this action and grant to Plaintiff(s) any further relief which may, in the discretion of this Court, be necessary and proper.

DATED: June 25, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

XOBERT D. CONAWAY// Attorneys for Plaintiff, ELISE BROWN

28

27

23

24

25

26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Percy Anderson and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Sheri Pym.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV12- 5547 PA (SPx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

[X]	Western Division		
r1	312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8		
	Los Angeles, CA 90012		

Southern Division
411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Case 2:12-cv-05547-PA-SPy Document 1 Filed 06/26/12 Page 13 of 16 Page ID #:13

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT & CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) Elise Brown	DEFENDANTS Debra Bowen, California Secretary of State
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are represented by the same.) Robert D. Conaway Bar No 119657 [760-256-0603] 222 East Main Street, Suite 212, Barstow CA 92311 Mailing address: PO Box 865, Barstow CA 92312-0865	resenting Attorneys (If Known)
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.)	CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only (Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	PTF DEF PTF DEF izen of This State PTF DEF Incorporated or Principal Place □ 4 □ 4 of Business in this State
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	izen of Another State
Citi	izen or Subject of a Foreign Country 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)	
Model of the proceeding	** **
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes Mo	(Check 'Yes' only if demanded in complaint.)
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes No	MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$ injunction, dec relief & atty fees
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are for 42 USC 1973, Section 2 of Voting Rights Act, 42 USC 1983 [voting rights act, 42 USC 1983]	filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)	of the state of th
	TONGS III
☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 110 Insurance PERSON	TORTS PRISONER LABOR NAL INJURY PERSONAL PETITIONS 710 Fair Labor Standards
□ 410 Antitrust □ 120 Marine □ 310 Air □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 130 Miller Act □ 315 Air	rplane PROPERTY ☐ 510 Motions to Act riplane Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud Vacate Sentence ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt.
□ 450 Commerce/ICC □ 140 Negotiable Instrument Lia	ability ☐ 371 Truth in Lending Habeas Corpus Relations
Ruces/etc.	ssault, Libel & 380 Other Personal 530 General 730 Labor/Mgmt.
□ 470 Racketeer Influenced Enforcement of □ 330 Fee	d. Employers' 385 Property Damage 1 540 Mandamus/ Disclosure Act
and Corrupt Judgment Lia	ability Product Liability Other □ 740 Railway Labor Act
Organizations II LIST Medicare Act	arine Product arine Product □ 422 Appeal 28 USC □ 555 Prison Condition Litigation
C 400 Cable/Set TV Student Loan (Eyel	ability 158 FORFEITURE / 1791 Empl. Ret. Inc.
☐ 355 Mc	otor Vehicle odust Lichility USC 157 Definition of the control of
Evolution Community of	oduct Liability ther Personal CIVIL RIGHTS
□ 875 Customer Challenge 12 Veteran's Benefits Inj	jury M 441 Voting Drug L 830 Patent
	rsonal Injury- ed Malpractice □ 442 Employment □ 625 Drug Related □ 840 Trademark □ 840 Seizure of □ SOCIAL SECURITY
□ 891 Agricultural Act □ 195 Contract Product □ 365 Per	ersonal Injury- mmodations Property 21 USC 861 HIA (1395ff)
l	oduct Liability □ 444 Welfare
AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	jury Product Disabilities - G640 R.R. & Truck (405(g))
□ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 210 Land Condemnation Lia	ability Employment
	IGRATION □ 446 American with □ 660 Occupational □ 865 RSI (405(g)) aturalization □ Jisabilities - □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS
nation Under Equal 240 Torts to Land Ap	pplication Other 690 Other 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff
□ 950 Constitutionality of □ 290 All Other Real Property □ 465 Other	abeas Corpus- lien Detainee ther Immigration □ 440 Other Civil □ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609
	ther Immigration USC 7609 ctions
CV	12 - 05547 Pa CA
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:	

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

JUN 2 6 2012;

Case 2:12-cv-05547-PA-SPy Document 1 Filed 06/26/12 Page 14 of 16 Page ID #:14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: H If yes, list case number(s):	as this action been pro	riously filed in this court and dismissed, i	remanded or closed? ■No □ Yes			
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Ha If yes, list case number(s):	ve any cases been pre	ously filed in this court that are related to	to the present case? VNo Ves			
Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case: Check all boxes that apply) B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.						
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	ne following informat	n, use an additional sheet if necessary.)				
		side of this District; State if other than C ees is a named plaintiff. If this box is ch	California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides.			
County in this District:*			County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
San Bernardino County						
(b) List the County in this District Check here if the government,	t; California County o its agencies or emplo	iside of this District; State if other than C ees is a named defendant. If this box is c	California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. checked, go to item (c).			
County in this District:*		California C	County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Sacramento County						
		tside of this District; State if other than C	California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.			
County in this District:*	ended, and the rooms.		County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
San Bernardino County		Inyo, Mono	0			
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bern Note: In land condemnation cases,	ardino, Riverside, V	ntura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obj	jspo Counties			
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY		//flot Ilen	Date 6/22/2012			
Notice to Counsel/Parties:	The CV-71 (JS-44) C	Why the Indicial Conference of the Unit	ained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings of States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)			
Key to Statistical codes relating to	Social Security Cases					
Nature of Suit Code	e Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of A	ction			
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))				
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)				
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security in Act, as amended.	ncome payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security			
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and U.S.C. (g))	survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42			

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

TATES DISTRICT COURT for the Central District of California Plaintiff(s) ٧. Debra Bowen, California Secretary of State

Defendant(s)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Debra Bowen

California Secretary of State

1500 11th Street

Sacramento CA 9581

A lawsuit has been filed against you

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Robert D. Conaway

> 222 East Main Street, Suite 212, Barstow CA 92311 Mailing address: PO Box 865, Barstow CA 92312-0865

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

JUN 2 6 2012

Date:

Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

was rec	This summons for (name or control of the control of	ne of individual and title, if any)	•				
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the indivi	dual at (place)				
	•		on (date)	; or			
	☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)						
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides						
	on (date) , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or						
	☐ I served the summo	☐ I served the summons on (name of individual)					
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)						
			On (date)	; or			
	☐ I returned the summons unexecuted because						
	Other (specify):						
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00			
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this inform	nation is true.				
Date:		1000000	Server's signature				
			Ç.				
			Printed name and title	- 			
			Server's address				