1 2	Amir S. Dibaei (SBN 275798) Law Offices of Amir Sam Dibae 12121 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 525	i				
3	Los Angeles, CA 90025 Telephone: (310) 481-6785 Facsimile: (310) 870-0336		FILED			
5			1AN 2 2010			
6	Respondent in Pro Per		JAN -3 2019 STATE BAR COURT			
7			CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES			
8						
9	BEFORE THE STATE BAR COURT					
10	OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
11	HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES					
12		£ ~				
13	In the Matter of)	Case Nos. 17-O-03848, 17-O-0			
14	AMIR DIBAEI,		RESPONSE TO NOTICE (DISCIPLINARY CHARGE			
15	Member No. 275798,	}				
16	Memoer 110. 275	}				
17	A Member of the State Bar	j				
18		Ś				
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28			kwiktag •	241 071 70		

3

6

5

7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

Respondent Amir Dibaei responds to the Notice of Disciplinary Charges ("NDC") as follows:

1. Respondent admits that he was admitted to the practice of law in the State of California on April 26, 2011, and that he has been a member since that time.

COUNT ONE

2. Respondent objects to the allegations of Paragraph 2 of the NDC on the bases that the allegations are contradicted by readily available evidence and facts. Respondent objects as there is a failure to satisfy the requisite burden of proof to bring this NDC. Respondent objects as the allegations are conclusory, compound and intertwined. Respondent objects as the allegations are being substituted as facts to form unsubstantiated legal conclusions. Rule 5-100 requires conduct to obtain an advantage in a civil dispute. Respondent objects to all allegations dated after the civil dispute in which Respondent allegedly attempted to gain an advantage was dismissed on July 10, 2017. (see Exhibit p* 2). Accordingly, Respondent objects to all allegations dated thereafter as moot. More than half of the allegations contained in the NDC can be dismissed with a simple review of the case summary. Without waiving this objection, Respondent denies each and every allegation contained in the NDC because it is devoid of a single sentence that contains wholly accurate/truthful/substantiated allegations. The majority of these allegations can be disregarded by reviewing a case summary. Respondent denies the entirety of Paragraph 2 as Respondent participated in BC614174 on November 17, 2016 by filing a notice of limited scope representation. (Exhibit p*6). The dates alleged in the NDC are inaccurate and rely on complainant's allegations which are include intentional misrepresentations and omissions. The initial investigation of this matter led to the investigator's conclusion that it should be dismissed. Respondent denies engaging in any of the acts alleged in Paragraph 2, Count One as they fail to explain how they amount to a violation of RPC, rule 5-100. Of the allegations in Paragraph 2(a) through 2(g)—only 2 allegations are within the timeframe of the civil dispute in question.

- 2(a) Respondent denies the allegations presented in Paragraph 2(a). If an attorney advocating for a client is the equivalent of "gaining an advantage in a civil dispute" as defined by Rule 5-100—there could be no meaningful representation. The "email to defendants' counsel and plaintiff's former counsel" alleges Respondent was threatening "them" whomever that may be. Respondent objects to this allegation as it deliberately fails to specify with specificity what transpired. The NDC concludes that the January 6, 2017 email was a violation of Rule 5-100. The allegation lacks specifics to constitute a violation of Rule 5-100. The email referenced in Paragraph 2(a) was an exparte notice. A legitimate, substantiated exparte notice is a correspondence made in the scope of litigation and is within the California Rules of Court Rule 3.1023 and litigation privilege Civil Code § 47. Respondent's correspondence served a legitimate purpose in the furtherance of the litigation.
- 2(b) Respondent cannot admit or deny this allegation as no further correspondences involving Respondent, Defendants' counsel and former Plaintiffs' counsel were had on this date. To the extent such an allegation is made in the NDC: it is denied as privileged as privileged and protected speech. There is no showing made here to differentiate Respondent's advocacy for Plaintiffs' use of speech which is protected and privileged—and that which falls within Rule 5-100 "to obtain an advantage in a civil dispute." Providing notice of an ex parte application is required by the California Rules of Court.
- 2(c) Respondent objects to the allegation in 2(c) as it fails to describe a violation of Rule 5-100. The allegation describes a subjective standard whereby Respondent's conduct is "impliedly threatening" (NDC 2(c)). The language of Rule 5-100 does not allow for a subjective interpretation as such would open the floodgates of potential violations and lacks objectivity. Without waiving said objections, Respondent denies the allegations made in Paragraph 2(c). The only email between Respondent and defendant on June 7, 2017 is sent by Defendant to Respondent and Plaintiffs. As part of a meet and confer regarding discovery deadlines, Defendant writes to Respondent and Respondent's Client stating: "Your obvious attempts to create a paper trail of a false narrative in order to make future false accusations is despicable. As are your threats. You are in violation of State of California Bar Rule 5-100 Threatening Criminal, Administrative, or Disciplinary Charges.

I have filed a complaint this afternoon." This allegation is wholly misplaced. The allegation describes an example of Respondent being victimized in violation of Rule 5-100—not violating the rule by being subject to threats of State Bar complaints. There can be no violation of Rule 5-100 by Respondent as Respondent is not the speaker or communicator.

- 2(d) Respondent objects to the allegation in 2(d) as it fails to describe a violation of Rule 5-100. The allegation describes a subjective standard whereby Respondent's conduct is "impliedly threatening" (NDC 2(d)). The language of Rule 5-100 does not allow for a subjective interpretation as such would open the floodgates of potential violations and lacks objectivity. Without waiving said objections, Respondent denies this allegation in its entirety as no correspondences between Respondent and Defendant took place on this date except that sent by Defendant referenced in 2(c).
- 2(e) Respondent objects to the allegation in 2(e) as it fails to describe a violation of Rule 5-100. The allegation describes a subjective standard whereby Respondent's conduct is "impliedly threatening" (NDC 2(e)). Respondent denies the entirety of the allegation. Rule 5-100 requires the ulterior motive of gaining an advantage in a civil dispute. Here, the civil dispute in question ended 2-months prior.
- 2(f) Respondent denies the entirety of the allegation as its serves to completely undermine the very violation for which it is offered. Moreover, the civil dispute in question ended 3-months after to the date of this allegation. Respondent expressly identifies Defendant's counsel as having filed a "frivolous bar complaint" and Respondent continues to expressly reassure Defendant's former counsel that Respondent would not present attorney disciplinary charges against him. Respondent cannot admit or deny any further portions of this allegation as the statement made by Respondent reads: "I see no need to involve the Judicial Counsel or State Bar to conduct their own administrative investigation. Given your recent history I hope you will understand that this is actually me extending an Olive Branch and not another alleged violation of the rules of professional conduct. But, if you want to go running to the State Bar with a complaint: I will be glad to detail the allegations and supporting evidence I have therefore." This would appear to be the exact opposite of a violation of Rule 5-100.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

COUNT TWO

3. Respondent objects to the allegations of Paragraph 3 of the NDC on the bases that they are conclusory, compound and intertwined with legal conclusions. Without waiving this objection, Respondent denies the entirety of Paragraph 3. Respondent sent several emails on July 31, 2017 to Toni Kilicoglu Toni Kilicoglu, the defendant and opposing party in Creative Asset Partners, Inc. v. Toni Kilicoglu, Los Angeles Superior Court case no. 17R00619. Respondent admits that one of these emails states "Judgment recorded. You better show up to court or they will issue your warrant." Respondent denies that his statements in that email constituted a threat to present criminal charges against Kilicoglu to gain an unfair advantage in a civil suit in willful violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 5-100(A). Respondent asserts that his statement regarding the issuance of a warrant was in reference to a bench warrant that would be issued by the court if Kilicoglu failed to appear, and was in no way a reference to criminal prosecution. Respondent asserts that he was simply informing Kilicoglu of the potential consequences if he failed to appear as he requested to retain new counsel. Respondent's email was in reference to California Code of Civil Procedure section 708.170(a)(1), which provides: "If an order requiring a person to appear for an examination was served by a sheriff, marshal, a person specially appointed by the court in the order, or a registered process server, and the person fails to appear: The court may (A) Pursuant to a warrant, have the person brought before the court to answer for the failure to appear and may punish the person for contempt [or] (B) Issue a warrant for the arrest of the person who failed to appear as required by the court order, pursuant to Section 1993."

COUNT THREE

4. Respondent objects to the allegations of Paragraph 4 of the NDC on the basis that they are conclusory, compound and intertwined with legal conclusions. Without waiving this objection, Respondent admits in part and denies in part the allegations of Paragraph 4. Respondent admits that on July 31, 2017, he sent an email to Toni Kilicoglu, the defendant and opposing party to Respondent's client in *Creative Asset Partners, Inc. v. Toni Kilicoglu*, Los Angeles Superior

23

24 25

26

27 28

Court case no. 17R00619, in which he stated, "Judgment recorded. You better show up to court or they will issue your warrant." Respondent admits that no proceeding had been instituted for Kilicoglu's arrest did Respondent ever communicate, threaten or imply same. Respondent asserts that his statements in his July 31, 2017 email did not represent that proceedings for Kilicoglu's arrest had been initiated, but rather that the court would issue a warrant if Kilicoglu failed to appear, as provided under California Code of Civil Procedure section 708.170(a)(1). Respondent denies that his statements in his July 31, 2017 were false and misleading and denies that no judgment had been entered. There had been 3 judgments entered at that time. 1 for possession; 1 for damages; and 1 for Attorney's fees. (See Exhibit p*23, 20). As evidenced by the case summary, Respondent's summary judgment motion was granted on April 7, 2017, almost four months before the July 31, 2017 email to Kilicoglu, the court granted Creative Asset Partners, Inc.'s motion for summary judgment and entered a judgment against Toni Kilicoglu for possession and damages in the form of unpaid rent; on July 3, 2017, the Court awarded reasonable attorney's fees of approximately \$20,000 for value of services from February 8 through April 7, 2017. Respondent denies that July 31, 2017 email to Kilicoglu was a misrepresentation involving an act of moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106; Respondent denies that the allegations contained in Paragraph 4, Count Three are accurate statements of fact.

Respondent objects to Paragraph 5 as it is a misstatement of law. To the extent that 5. Paragraph 5 includes allegations—those allegations are conclusory and intertwined with legal conclusions. Without waiving this objection, Respondent denies that he made a misrepresentation as a result of gross negligence and further objects as the request for such discipline is per se barred.

COUNT FOUR

Respondent objects to the allegations of Paragraph 6 of the NDC on the basis that 6. they are conclusory, compound and substitute evidence with a narrative to reach unsubstantiated legal conclusions. Without waiving this objection, Respondent denies the allegations of Paragraph 6. Respondent denies any violation of Business and Professions Code § 6106 or engaging in abusive or coercive conduct in collecting a debt greater than the judgment. Respondent vehemently

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

denies and takes offense to any allegations of acts/omissions involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption. Assuming, en arguendo, that Respondent admitted to all of the allegations under Count Four [Paragraph 6(a) through 6(c)], Respondent would still not be found to have violated §6106. The allegations against Respondent do not cite to any evidence and fail to meet the clear and convincing standard necessary to subject Respondent to this embarrassment before the Judiciary; the State Bar; Respondent's colleagues; Respondent's clients and Respondent's practice.

- 7. Respondent denies the alleged violations of Rule 5-100 and agrees that if true—such conduct is abhorrent and unbecoming of an officer of the Court. Respondent's subjective opinons are of no legal consequence nor does an unsubstantiated opinion constitute law. The allegations, even if true, do not constitute a violation of §6106. It has long been established in California's judicial system that a violation of B & P § 6106 requires an intent to mislead. Contrary to the allegations: gross negligence is not included within any definition of intentional misrepresentation. Respondent is the party that is being victimized. 18-months ago these allegations were rejected after a State Bar inquiry.
- 8. Count Three and Count Four rely on a factual assertion that "no judgment had been entered." This is the bases upon which Respondent is accused of acting with an intent to mislead. At no point in the 18-months has there ever been the allegation that "no judgment had been entered" presented to Respondent. More importantly: Respondent has never seen this allegation used as support to prove Respondent's dishonesty or morality.
 - 9. The law is clear: to have a violation of § 6106 there must be an intent to mislead.
- 10. Respondent's communications were not done with an intent to mislead. Why? Because a judgment had been entered prior to July 31, 2017. In fact, 3-judgments had been entered at the time of Respondent's alleged conduct. It would take less than a minute to investigate the online case summary to verify same.
- 11. Respondent denies and has evidence to prove that the allegations presented herein are selectively chosen quotations; forged evidence; and the result of an investigation that either intentionally or by virtue of gross negligence misrepresented material facts giving rise to this NDC. Respondent has been the one victimized by a violation of Rule 5-100.

Count Three and Four are Communications within the Litigation Privilege

- 12. Respondent will present evidence to prove the allegations made in the NDC are false. But if Respondent did not have such evidence—there would still be no grounds to pursue these claims based on these allegations.
- 13. The allegations made in the NDC are subject to the litigation privilege Civil Code § 47. When it comes to debt collect and Respondent's "moral turpitude, dishonesty [and] corruption," the law in California could not be more clear. *Drum v. Bleau, Fox & Associates* 107 Cal.App.4th 1009 (2003) addresses this precise issue. In *Drum*, a law firm was subject to an abuse of process claim for wrongfully executing a levy. The second district court of appeals ruled that the litigation "privilege protected communication, not conduct, and the law firm's levy constituted conduct." Since 2003, 101 California Federal and State cases have published opinions extending the protection. In 2006, the California Supreme Court extended the privilege to noncommunicative acts that are "necessarily related to communicative conduct, so long as gravamen of action is communicative acts." *Rusheen v. Cohen* 37 Cal.4th 1048 (2006).
- 14. Respondent's alleged communications are not a violation of § 6106; the Rosenthal Act; the FDCPA or any other alleged act of Moral Turpitude or Coercive Act.
- 15. Moreover, Respondent Denies attempting to collect a debt greater than the judgment against Kilicoglu. That is a narrative. Respondent's communications were an attempt to settle all claims arising out of the Court's 3 judgments—including an expressed finding of fraud which would allow further claims against Toni Kilicoglu. The Court granted judgment against Toni Kilicoglu for all unpaid rents from February through the execution of the writ of possession. On July 3, 2017 the Court awarded \$20,000 for reasonable attorney's fees as of April 7, 2017. Respondent and his Client were entitled to recovery all attorney's fees, costs and unpaid rents post-judgment as well.
- 16. The NDC states that the judgment against debtor was approximately \$25,000. That would be the judgment amount as of April 7, 2017. Respondent is entitled to recovery all damages, costs and fees *post-judgment* as well which would be from April 7, 2017 through the hearing date on the motion for Attorney's fees.

17. The Court awarded approximately \$20,000 in attorney's fees and costs from February through April 7, 2017. The Court awarded approximately \$5,000 in unpaid rent as of April 7, 2017. The judgment was \$25,000 in April 2017—not July 2017 after dozens of additional hearings; filings; appearances; applications; writs; correspondences; attempts to conduct a judgment debtor exam etc. The Judgment at the time referenced in the NDC would include attorney's fees, costs and unpaid rents incurred between April 2017 and July 2017.

12

13

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

COUNT 4

- 18. Respondent denies only sending 3 emails to Debtor on July 20, 2017 and also denies only sending one email on July 31, 2017, to Debtor as described in Paragraph 6 of the NDC. Respondent objects as all discussions were settlement discussions and thereby are not subject to judicial scrutiny or review. Respondent also denies any attempt to collect a wrongful amount as evidenced by the memorandum of costs post judgment served after negotiations with Kilicoglu fell apart. Respondent denies that he committed a coercive act amounting to moral turpitude in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106 by sending emails to Kilicoglu on July 20. 2017 and July 31, 2017, seeking to collect on a judgment entered against Kilicoglu.
- 19. Respondent objects to the assertions in Paragraph 7 of the NDC on the ground that no allegation of fact is contained therein, and the allegations are conclusory and intertwined with legal conclusions. Without waiving this objection, Respondent denies that he made a misrepresentation as a result of gross negligence.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to State Sufficient Facts)

Count 1 of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges fails to state sufficient facts to state a basis for discipline. An ex parte notice cannot be grounds for a violation of Rule 5-100 when it is specifically required by the California Rules of Court. The content of the email is within the litigation privilege just the State Bar Complaint against Respondent are privileged communications.

16

18

17

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Count 2 of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges fails to state facts sufficient to state a basis for discipline. Warning a party in a post-judgement civil proceeding that if they do not show up to court for a judgment debtor examination the court will issue a warrant, does not constitute a threat of bringing criminal charges, as it is the equivalent of seeking a party be held in contempt. See CA Code of Civ. Proc. § 708.170(a) [the court may punish a party for contempt pursuant to a warrant of failure to appear or issue a warrant for arrest for failure to appear.] The official comments to Rule 5-100 provide that "Rule 5-100 is not intended to apply to a member's threatening to initiate contempt proceedings against a party for failure to comply with a court order." If the language that forms the alleged Rule 5-100 threat is not an overt threat to present criminal or administrative charges, there cannot be a Rule 5-100 violation. See Cal. State Bar Formal Op. No. 1991-124: "This committee is unwilling to interpret ambiguous language made in attempts to settle civil disputes as violations of rule 5-100"; see also, Vapnek, Tuft, Peck & Wiener, Cal. Prac. Guide: Professional Responsibility (8:970, The Rutter Group 2016. Therefore, Count Two of the NDC must be dismissed with prejudice.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Duplicative Charges)

The Notice of Disciplinary Charges contains inappropriate, unnecessary, and immaterial duplicative charges. Bates v. State Bar (1990) 51 Cal. 3rd 1056, 1060; In the Matter of Lilley (Rev. Dept. 1991) 1 Cal. SB Ct. Rptr. 476, 585.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Good Faith Reliance Upon the Law)

All of Respondent's admitted conduct was done in reliance upon well-established laws and legal principles, upon which, Respondent had the legal right to rely in conducting his affairs.

1 FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Lack of Materiality) 2 The facts on which some or all of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges are based allege 3 immaterial or irrelevant omissions or statements that do not constitute "misrepresentations" or 4 5 "concealment." 6 7 FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Litigation Privilege) 8 All of the conduct described in the NDC is either not within the scope of Rule 5-100 as there 9 is no civil dispute in which to gain an advantage; or there is no advantage whatsoever to be gained. 10 11 Moreover, all allegations in the NDC are communications which fall within the litigation privilege and therefore cannot be a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct absent a showing of intent. 12 WHEREFORE, Respondent prays that the Court find that Respondent did not commit acts 13 constituting professional misconduct, and that the Notice of Disciplinary Charges be dismissed. 14 15 Respectfully submitted, 16 17 Dated: January 3, 2019 18 19 20 By: Amir Dibaei 21 Respondent in Pro Per 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

PRINT

NEW SEARCH

CASE INFORMATION

Case Information | Register Of Actions | FUTURE HEARINGS | PARTY INFORMATION | Documents Filed | Proceedings Held

Case Number: BC614174

SIFTLY.COM LLC ET AL VS THOMAS PULLIAM

Filing Courthouse: Stanley Mosk Courthouse

Filing Date: 03/17/2016

Case Type: Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/ breach of contract) (General Jurisdiction)

Status: Court-Ordered Dismissal - Other (Other) 07/03/2017

Click here to access document images for this case

If this link fails, you may go to the Case Document Images site and search using the case number displayed on this page

FUTURE HEARINGS

Case Information | Register Of Actions | FUTURE HEARINGS | PARTY INFORMATION | Documents Filed | Proceedings Held

None

PARTY INFORMATION

Case Information | Register Of Actions | FUTURE HEARINGS | PARTY INFORMATION | Documents Filed | Proceedings Held

ABDULLA MOHAMMED I. - Attorney for Plaintiff

DIBAEI AMIR SAM - Attorney for Plaintiff

FIRM DELAROSARIO LAW - Attorney for Defendant

PICARIELLO SALVATORE ESQ. - Attorney for Plaintiff

PULLIAM THOMAS - Defendant

SIFTLY.COM LLC - Plaintiff

STRIEFLER FRANK - Plaintiff

DOCUMENTS FILED

Case Information | Register Of Actions | FUTURE HEARINGS | PARTY INFORMATION | Documents Filed | Proceedings Held

Documents Filed (Filing dates listed in descending order)

Click on any of the below link(s) to see Register of Action Items on or before the date indicated:

12/15/2016 07/19/2016

07/10/2017 Partial Dismissal (with Prejudice)

Filed by Cross-Complainant

07/10/2017 REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL

07/03/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

07/03/2017 Partial Dismissal (with Prejudice)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

97/03/2017 Substitution of Attorney

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

07/03/2017 REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL

07/03/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

04/28/2017 Substitution of Attorney

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

04/28/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY-CIVIL (WITHOUT COURT ORDER)

04/04/2017 SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF SIFTLY.COM, LLC'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

04/04/2017 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

04/03/2017 Writ issued

Filed by Creditor

03/30/2017 ORDER RE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO: FORM INTERROGATORIES; ADMISSIONS; PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS.

03/30/2017 Order

Filed by Court

03/30/2017 Minute Order

03/29/2017 Minute Order

03/23/2017 SLFFLY.COM'S REPLY TO TIMELINESS OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/23/2017 AMENDMENT TO DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTWF SIFTLY.COM, LLC'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/23/2017 SIFTLY.COM'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION

03/23/2017 Order

Filed by Court

03/23/2017 SIFFLY.COM'S REPLY RE: TIMELINESS OF MOTIONS TO COMPEL/MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

03/23/2017 Minute Order

03/22/2017 SIFTLY.COM'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION

03/22/2017 SIFTLY.COM'S REPLY RE: TIMELINESS OF MOTIONS TO COMPEL/MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

03/22/2017 SIFTLY.COM'S REPLY TO TIMELINESS OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/20/2017 Writ-Other Issued

Filed by Creditor

03/16/2017 DEFENDANT & CROSSCOMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S STATUTORY OFFER TO COMPROMISE (C.C.P. 998) TO PLAINTIFF & CROSS-DEFENDANT, SIFTLY.COM, LLC; REQUEST TO ENTER JUDGMENT

03/16/2017 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/16/2017 DEFENDANT & CROSSCOMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S STATUTORY OFFER TO. COMPROMISE (C.C.P. 998) TO PLAINTIFF & CROSS-DEFENDANT, FRANK STRIEFLER; REQUEST TO ENTER JUDGMENT

03/16/2017 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION; ETC

03/15/2017 NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS OR OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION

03/15/2017 Notice of Change of Address or Other Contact Information Filed by Defendant/Respondent

03/14/2017 Proof of Service Personal Service

03/07/2017 SIFTLY.COM, LLC S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES ETC.

03/07/2017 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL RE TIMELY FAX FILING ETC.

03/07/2017 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL RE: COLLUSION BETWEEN PLAINTIFFS' FORMER COUNSEL FORTIS, LLP AND DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL

03/07/2017 PROOF OF SERVICE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/07/2017 AMENDED: DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/07/2017 DECLARATION OF SIFTLU.COM, LLC'S IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

02/06/2017 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

02/06/2017 SIFTLY.COM, LLC'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO: FORM INTERROGATORIES; ADMISSIONS; PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS;

02/06/2017 DECLARATION OF SIFTLY.COM, LLC'S IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

01/19/2017 NOTICE OF RULING AND ENTRY OF ORDER RE; PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

01/18/2017 Minute Order

01/18/2017 ORDER RE: (1) PLAINTIFFS SIFTLY.COM AND STRIEFLER MOTION TO COMPEL DEFENDANT PULLIAM S FURTHER RESPONSES TO ADMISSIONS (2) PLAINTIFFS SIFTLY.COM AND STRIEFLER MOTION TO COMPEL DEFENDANT PULLIAM S FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES (SET 1) (3) PL

01/18/2017 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

01/18/2017 Order

Filed by Court

01/18/2017 PROOF OF SERVICE

01/09/2017 Minute Order

01/05/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

01/05/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

01/04/2017 DEFENDANT & CROSS-COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

01/04/2017 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S AMENDED MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS ETC.

01/04/2017 AMENDED DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT ETC.

01/04/2017 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S AMENDED MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES ETC.

01/04/2017 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS-COMPLAINANT ETC.

01/04/2017 AMENDED DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS-COMPLAINANT ETC.

01/04/2017 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S AMENDED MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION ETC.

Click on any of the below link(s) to see Register of Action Items on or before the date indicated:

TOP 12/15/2016 07/19/2016

12/15/2016 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

12/15/2016 Substitution of Attorney

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

12/15/2016 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

12/13/2016 PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS: MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

12/13/2016 Request for Judicial Notice

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

12/13/2016 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTION

12/13/2016 PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS OBJECTION TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

12/13/2016 Proof of Service

12/07/2016 PROOF OF SERVICE

12/07/2016 STIPULATION TO CONTINUE DISCOVERY MOTION HEARINGS; ORDER

12/07/2016 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/07/2016 Stipulation and Order

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

12/05/2016 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 DEFENDANT & CROSS-COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND FOR SANCTIONS; ETC.

12/05/2016 DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFSD MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES AND FOR SANCTIONS; DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ.; REQUEST FOR \$13,469.00 IN SANCTIONS.

12/05/2016 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES AND FOR SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Memorandum - Other

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Memorandum - Other

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Memorandum - Other

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR SANCTIONS; DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ.; REQUEST FOR \$11,649.00 IN SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 DECLARATION OF DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR SANCTIONS

11/23/2016 NOVEMBER 22, 2016 PROOF OF SERVICE FOR PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

11/23/2016 Declaration

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

11/23/2016 PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO ADMISSIONS;

11/23/2016 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,360.00

11/23/2016 PLAINTIFF'S SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF IT'S COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS SET-1

11/22/2016 PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO ADMISSIONS; ETC.

11/17/2016 MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS; REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS \$5,305.50

11/17/2016 DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF ATTORNEY'S MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL

11/17/2016 AMENDED SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES FOR REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS SET-1

11/17/2016 Miscellaneous-Other

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/17/2016 Declaration

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

11/17/2016 Notice

Filed by Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

11/17/2016 Notice

Filed by Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

11/17/2016 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/17/2016 NOTICE OF LIMITED SCOPE REPRESENTATION; ETC.

11/17/2016 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION, SET-1; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS

11/17/2016 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,088.25

11/17/2016 AMENDED PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,088.25.

11/17/2016 NOTICE OF LIMITED SCOPE REPRESENTATION

11/17/2016 AMENDED SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1

11/17/2016 Proof of Service

11/17/2016 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL

11/16/2016 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL CIVIL

11/14/2016 Motion to Be Relieved as Counsel

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

11/14/2016 DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF ATTORNEY'S MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL CIVIL

11/14/2016 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL CIVIL

11/07/2016 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/07/2016 Proof of Service

11/04/2016 SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

11/04/2016 Miscellaneous-Other

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/04/2016 Motion to Compel

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/04/2016 Motion to Compel

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/04/2016 COMPENDIUM OF EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

11/04/2016 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS

11/04/2016 MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS; REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS \$5,305.50

10/27/2016 SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1

10/27/2016 Minute Order

10/27/2016 Declaration

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 Miscellaneous-Other

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 Motion to Compel

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 Motion to Compel

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 Ex-Parte Application

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 EX PARTE APPLICATION TO EXTEND 45-DAY DEADLINE TO FILE MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES; DECLARATION OF COUNSEL

10/27/2016 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S ASSOCIATE COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,08&25

10/27/2016 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-I; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,088.25.

10/03/2016 Answer to Cross-Complaint

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/03/2016 PLAINTFFS AND CROSS-DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO CROSS-COMPLAINT.

09/23/2016 CIVIL DEPOSIT

09/16/2016 Stipulation

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff); Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

09/16/2016 STIPULATION TO ACCEPT ELECTRONIC SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS

09/13/2016 CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

09/13/2016 Case Management Order

Filed by Court

09/13/2016 Minute Order

09/13/2016 NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE RULING

09/12/2016 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

09/12/2016 Amended Answer

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

09/12/2016 CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

09/09/2016 CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

09/09/2016 Case Management Statement

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

08/16/2016 Minute Order

08/16/2016 CROSS-COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR: 1. BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY; ETC

08/16/2016 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S ANSWER TO THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

08/16/2016 Cross-Complaint

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

08/16/2016 Answer to First Amended Complaint

Filed by Defendant/Respondent

07/28/2016 Notice

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff); Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

07/28/2016 REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT

07/28/2016 NOTICE OF CONTINUED CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

07/28/2016 Request for Entry of Default / Judgment

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

Click on any of the below link(s) to see Register of Action Items on or before the date indicated:

TOP 12/15/2016 07/19/2016

07/19/2016 Minute Order

07/12/2016 Request for Entry of Default / Judgment

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

07/12/2016 REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT

06/21/2016 Minute Order

06/17/2016 Case Management Statement

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

06/17/2016 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

06/17/2016 CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

06/17/2016 PROOF OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

05/23/2016 First Amended Complaint

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

05/23/2016 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

05/09/2016 Notice of Change of Address or Other Contact Information

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff); Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

05/09/2016 NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS OR OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION

04/21/2016 NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

04/21/2016 Notice of Case Management Conference

Filed by Clerk

03/25/2016 Minute Order

03/21/2016 PEREMPTORY CHALLENGE BY PLAINTIFFS SIFTLY.COM LLC AND FRANK STRIEFLER PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 170.6; DECLARATION OF SALVATORE PICARIELLO

03/21/2016 Challenge To Judicial Officer - Peremptory (170.6)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

03/17/2016 COMPLAINT FOR: (1) BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY; ETC

03/17/2016 SUMMONS

03/17/2016 Complaint

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff); Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

Click on any of the below link(s) to see Register of Action Items on or before the date indicated:

TOP 12/15/2016 07/19/2016

PROCEEDINGS HELD

Case Information | Register Of Actions | FUTURE HEARINGS | PARTY INFORMATION | Documents Filed | Proceedings Held

Proceedings Held (Proceeding dates listed in descending order)

09/05/2017 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Jury Trial

08/24/2017 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Final Status Conference

03/30/2017 at 1:30 PM in Department 32

Court Order (Court Order; Court makes order) -

03/29/2017 at 08:36 AM in Department 32

Hearing on Motion for Reconsideration - Held - Taken under Submission

03/23/2017 at 00:00 AM in Department 1

(Order ReRelated Cases; Court makes order) -

01/18/2017 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

(Motion to Compel; Denied) -

01/09/2017 at 08:36 AM in Department 32

Hearing on Motion to be Relieved as Counsel (Motion to be Relieved as Counsel; Off Calendar) -

12/16/2016 at 08:36 AM in Department 32

(Motion to Compel; Continued by Stipulation) -

10/27/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Ex-Parte Proceedings (Ex Parte Motion; Denied) -

09/13/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Case Management Conference (Conference-Case Management; Trial Date Set) -

08/16/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Case Management Conference (Conference-Case Management; Continued by Court) -

07/19/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Case Management Conference (Conference-Case Management; Continued by Court) -

06/21/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Case Management Conference (Conference-Case Management; Continued by Court) -

03/25/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 52

Unknown Event Type - Held - Motion Granted

REGISTER OF ACTIONS

Case Information | Register Of Actions | FUTURE HEARINGS | PARTY INFORMATION | Documents Filed | Proceedings Held

Register of Actions (Listed in descending order)

Click on any of the below link(s) to see Register of Action Items on or before the date indicated: 01/05/2017 09/09/2016

09/05/2017 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Jury Trial

08/24/2017 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Final Status Conference

07/10/2017 REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL

07/10/2017 Partial Dismissal (with Prejudice)

Filed by Cross-Complainant

07/03/2017 REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL

07/03/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

07/03/2017 Partial Dismissal (with Prejudice)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

07/03/2017 Substitution of Attorney

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

07/03/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

04/28/2017 Substitution of Attorney

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

04/28/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY-CIVIL (WITHOUT COURT ORDER)

04/04/2017 SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF SIFTLY.COM, LLC'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

04/04/2017 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

04/03/2017 Writ issued

Filed by Creditor

03/30/2017 at 1:30 PM in Department 32

Court Order (Court Order; Court makes order) -

03/30/2017 ORDER RE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO: FORM INTERROGATORIES; ADMISSIONS; PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS.

03/30/2017 Minute Order

03/30/2017 Order

Filed by Court

03/29/2017 at 08:36 AM in Department 32

Hearing on Motion for Reconsideration - Held - Taken under Submission

03/29/2017 Minute Order

03/23/2017 at 00:00 AM in Department 1

(Order ReRelated Cases; Court makes order) -

03/23/2017 Order

Filed by Court

03/23/2017 SIFTLY.COM'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION

03/23/2017 SIFFLY.COM'S REPLY RE: TIMELINESS OF MOTIONS TO COMPEL/MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

03/23/2017 Minute Order

03/23/2017 SLFFLY.COM'S REPLY TO TIMELINESS OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/23/2017 AMENDMENT TO DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTWF SIFTLY.COM, LLC'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/22/2017 SIFTLY.COM'S REPLY RE: TIMELINESS OF MOTIONS TO COMPEL/MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

03/22/2017 SIFTLY.COM'S REPLY TO TIMELINESS OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/22/2017 SIFTLY.COM'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION

03/20/2017 Writ-Other Issued

Filed by Creditor

03/16/2017 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/16/2017 DEFENDANT & CROSSCOMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S STATUTORY OFFER TO. COMPROMISE (C.C.P. 998) TO PLAINTIFF & CROSS-DEFENDANT, FRANK STRIEFLER; REQUEST TO ENTER JUDGMENT

03/16/2017 DEFENDANT & CROSSCOMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S STATUTORY OFFER TO COMPROMISE (C.C.P. 998) TO PLAINTIFF & CROSS-DEFENDANT, SIFTLY.COM, LLC; REQUEST TO ENTER JUDGMENT

03/16/2017 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION; ETC

03/15/2017 Notice of Change of Address or Other Contact Information

Filed by Defendant/Respondent

03/15/2017 NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS OR OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION

03/14/2017 Proof of Service Personal Service

03/07/2017 PROOF OF SERVICE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/07/2017 AMENDED: DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

03/07/2017 DECLARATION OF SIFTLU.COM, LLC'S IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

63/07/2017 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL RE: COLLUSION BETWEEN PLAINTIFFS' FORMER COUNSEL FORTIS, LLP AND DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL

03/07/2017 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL RE TIMELY FAX FILING ETC.

03/07/2017 SIFTLY.COM, LLC S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES ETC.

02/06/2017 SIFTLY.COM, LLC'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO: FORM INTERROGATORIES; ADMISSIONS; PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS;

02/06/2017 DECLARATION OF SIFTLY.COM, LLC'S IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

02/06/2017 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

01/19/2017 NOTICE OF RULING AND ENTRY OF ORDER RE; PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

01/18/2017 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

(Motion to Compel; Denied) -

01/18/2017 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

01/18/2017 Order

Filed by Court

01/18/2017 PROOF OF SERVICE

01/18/2017 Minute Order

01/18/2017 ORDER RE: (1) PLAINTIFFS SIFTLY.COM AND STRIEFLER MOTION TO COMPEL DEFENDANT PULLIAM S FURTHER RESPONSES TO ADMISSIONS (2) PLAINTIFFS SIFTLY.COM AND STRIEFLER MOTION TO COMPEL DEFENDANT PULLIAM S FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES (SET 1) (3) PL

01/09/2017 at 08:36 AM in Department 32

Hearing on Motion to be Relieved as Counsel (Motion to be Relieved as Counsel; Off Calendar) -

01/09/2017 Minute Order

Click on any of the below link(s) to see Register of Action Items on or before the date indicated:

TOP 01/05/2017 09/09/2016

01/05/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

01/05/2017 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

01/04/2017 AMENDED DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT ETC.

01/04/2017 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S AMENDED MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES ETC.

01/04/2017 DEFENDANT & CROSS-COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

01/04/2017 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S AMENDED MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION ETC.

01/04/2017 AMENDED DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT ETC.

01/04/2017 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS-COMPLAINANT ETC.

01/04/2017 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S AMENDED MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS ETC.

12/16/2016 at 08:36 AM in Department 32

(Motion to Compel; Continued by Stipulation) -

12/15/2016 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

12/15/2016 Substitution of Attorney

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

12/15/2016 SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

12/13/2016 Request for Judicial Notice

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

12/13/2016 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTION

12/13/2016 PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS: MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

12/13/2016 PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS OBJECTION TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

12/13/2016 Proof of Service

12/07/2016 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/07/2016 Stipulation and Order

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

12/07/2016 PROOF OF SERVICE

12/07/2016 STIPULATION TO CONTINUE DISCOVERY MOTION HEARINGS; ORDER

12/05/2016 DECLARATION OF DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 Memorandum - Other

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 DEFENDANT & CROSS-COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND FOR SANCTIONS; ETC.

12/05/2016 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES AND FOR SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFSD MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES AND FOR SANCTIONS; DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ.; REQUEST FOR \$13,469.00 IN SANCTIONS.

12/05/2016 DEFENDANT & CROSS- COMPLAINANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR SANCTIONS; DECLARATION OF MARK DELROSARIO, ESQ.; REQUEST FOR \$11,649.00 IN SANCTIONS

12/05/2016 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Memorandum - Other

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Memorandum - Other

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

12/05/2016 Declaration

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

11/23/2016 NOVEMBER 22, 2016 PROOF OF SERVICE FOR PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

11/23/2016 Declaration

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

11/23/2016 PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO ADMISSIONS;

11/23/2016 PLAINTIFF'S SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF IT'S COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS SET-1

11/23/2016 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,360.00

11/22/2016 PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO ADMISSIONS; ETC.

11/17/2016 AMENDED SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES FOR REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS SET-1

11/17/2016 Miscellaneous-Other

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/17/2016 Declaration

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

11/17/2016 NOTICE OF LIMITED SCOPE REPRESENTATION

11/17/2016 AMENDED SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1

11/17/2016 Proof of Service

11/17/2016 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL

11/17/2016 MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS; REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS \$5,305.50

11/17/2016 DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF ATTORNEY'S MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL

11/17/2016 NOTICE OF LIMITED SCOPE REPRESENTATION; ETC.

11/17/2016 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION, SET-1; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS

11/17/2016 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,088.25

11/17/2016 Notice

Filed by Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

11/17/2016 AMENDED PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,088.25.

11/17/2016 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/17/2016 Notice

Filed by Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

11/16/2016 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL CIVIL

11/14/2016 DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF ATTORNEY'S MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL CIVIL

11/14/2016 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL CIVIL

11/14/2016 Motion to Be Relieved as Counsel

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

11/07/2016 Proof of Service

11/07/2016 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/04/2016 COMPENDIUM OF EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

11/04/2016 Motion to Compel

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/04/2016 Motion to Compel

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/04/2016 Miscellaneous-Other

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

11/04/2016 DECLARATION OF COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS

11/04/2016 MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS; REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS \$5,305.50

11/04/2016 SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES

10/27/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Ex-Parte Proceedings (Ex Parte Motion; Denied) -

10/27/2016 SEPARATE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1

10/27/2016 Miscellaneous-Other

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S ASSOCIATE COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-1; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,08&25

10/27/2016 EX PARTE APPLICATION TO EXTEND 45-DAY DEADLINE TO FILE MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES; DECLARATION OF COUNSEL

10/27/2016 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES SET-I; REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,088.25.

10/27/2016 Minute Order

10/27/2016 Declaration

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 Ex-Parte Application

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 Motion to Compel

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/27/2016 Motion to Compel

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/03/2016 Answer to Cross-Complaint

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

10/03/2016 PLAINTFFS AND CROSS-DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO CROSS-COMPLAINT.

09/23/2016 CIVIL DEPOSIT

09/16/2016 STIPULATION TO ACCEPT ELECTRONIC SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS

09/16/2016 Stipulation

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff); Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

09/13/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Case Management Conference (Conference-Case Management; Trial Date Set) -

09/13/2016 NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE RULING

09/13/2016 Minute Order

09/13/2016 Case Management Order

Filed by Court

09/13/2016 CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

09/12/2016 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

09/12/2016 CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

09/12/2016 Amended Answer

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

Click on any of the below link(s) to see Register of Action Items on or before the date indicated:

TOP 01/05/2017 09/09/2016

09/09/2016 Case Management Statement

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

09/09/2016 CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

08/16/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Case Management Conference (Conference-Case Management; Continued by Court) -

08/16/2016 Cross-Complaint

Filed by Thomas Pulliam (Defendant)

08/16/2016 Minute Order

08/16/2016 Answer to First Amended Complaint

Filed by Defendant/Respondent

08/16/2016 DEFENDANT THOMAS PULLIAM'S ANSWER TO THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

08/16/2016 CROSS-COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR: 1. BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY; ETC

07/28/2016 REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT

07/28/2016 Notice

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff); Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

07/28/2016 Request for Entry of Default / Judgment

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

07/28/2016 NOTICE OF CONTINUED CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

07/19/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Case Management Conference (Conference-Case Management; Continued by Court) -

07/19/2016 Minute Order

07/12/2016 Request for Entry of Default / Judgment

Filed by Plaintiff/Petitioner

07/12/2016 REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT

06/21/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 32

Case Management Conference (Conference-Case Management; Continued by Court) -

06/21/2016 Minute Order

06/17/2016 Case Management Statement

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

06/17/2016 PROOF OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

06/17/2016 Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

06/17/2016 CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

05/23/2016 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

05/23/2016 First Amended Complaint

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

05/09/2016 Notice of Change of Address or Other Contact Information

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff); Frank Striefler (Plaintiff)

05/09/2016 NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS OR OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION

04/21/2016 Notice of Case Management Conference

Filed by Clerk

04/21/2016 NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

03/25/2016 at 08:30 AM in Department 52

Unknown Event Type - Held - Motion Granted

03/25/2016 Minute Order

03/21/2016 PEREMPTORY CHALLENGE BY PLAINTIFFS SIFTLY.COM LLC AND FRANK STRIEFLER PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 170.6; DECLARATION OF SALVATORE PICARIELLO

03/21/2016 Challenge To Judicial Officer - Peremptory (170.6)

Filed by Siftly.com, LLC (Plaintiff)

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Lam employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of Californ

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the above-entitled action; my business address is 12121 Wilshire Blvd. Ste 525 Los Angeles CA 90025

On January 3 2019 I served the following document(s) described as Response to Notice of Disciplinary Charges and Request for Discovery upon the following interested party(ies)

Office of the Chief Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa St. Los Angeles, CA 90017 213-765-1000

M

	(BY MAIL) I am readily familiar with our office's practice for collection and processing
_	of correspondence and other materials for mailing with the United States Postal Service
	and the fact that the correspondence would be deposited in the United States Mail that
	same day in the ordinary course of business. I placed each such envelope for collection
	and mailing at the above business address, following our office's ordinary business
	practices. The envelope(s) will be deposited in the United States Mail on this date, in the
	ordinary course of business.
	(DV EACSIMILE) I transmitted the document identified shove to a facsimile

(BY FACSIMILE) I transmitted the document identified above to a facsimile machine(s) maintained by the person(s) on whom it is served at the telephone number for the facsimile machine as last given by that person on any document which he or she has filed in the cause and served on the party making the service. Transmission confirmation attached hereto.

- (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE) I electronically served the documents identified above to the electronic service address above from my electronic service address, and have an electronic record of the service to prove the same.
- (BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I personally delivered such envelope by hand to the residence of the addressee(s).
- (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed this January 3, 2019 at Los Angeles, California.

Amir Dibaei

PROOF OF SERVICE