www.iptrademarkattorney.com FILED KING, HOLMES, PATERNO & BERLINER LLP HOWARD E. KING, ESQ., STATE BAR NO. 077012 BRIAN J. BIRD, ESQ., STATE BAR NO. 081614 10 FEB 22 PH 1:52 1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS, 25TH FLOOR Los Angeles, California 90067-4506 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF: LOS ANGELES E-MAIL: BİRD@KHPBLAW.COM TELEPHONE: (310) 282-8989 4 Facsimile: (310) 282-8903 3Y:__ 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff F. MARC SCHAFFEL PRODUCTIONS, LLC 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 CASE NOV 10-01306-GHK(S) F. MARC SCHAFFEL PRODUCTIONS, 11 LLC, a California limited liability COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES 12 company, BASED ON: **13** Plaintiff, 1. **COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT**; AND VS. 14 2. CONVERSION TMZ PRODUCTIONS, INC., a California corporation; TMZ.com, a 15 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED fictional entity of unknown form; TIME 16 WARNER, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-10, inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 Plaintiff F. MARC SCHAFFEL PRODUCTIONS, LLC ("Schaffel") alleges 21 as follows: 22 THE NATURE OF THIS ACTION 23 1. TMZ broadcast confidential video footage stolen from and without consent of its owner, claiming exemption from copyright laws and immunity from having to reveal the identity of the thief of the footage. TMZ asserts that its status 25 as a "news" provider exempts it from respecting copyrights, permits it to broadcast 26 purloined material, and insulates it from liability for lying about sources of illicitly obtained materials. Relying on these shields, TMZ has disseminated and

3005.063/315094.4

Case 2:10-cv-01306-GHK-SS Document 1 Filed 02/22/10 Page 1 of 13

commercially exploited a confidential stolen video produced and copyrighted by Schaffel which depicts highly private and sensitive thoughts and comments of Debbie Rowe ("Rowe"), the ex-wife of the internationally celebrated entertainer Michael Jackson, concerning her relationship with Michael Jackson and their children.

2. TMZ obtained and broadcast previously unpublished video outtakes of an interview with Rowe which were never intended for public disclosure. The outtakes were taken from Schaffel, the owner of same, without permission of either Schaffel or Rowe. TMZ falsely attributed the source of the video, first claiming on its website that it came from a British network, GMTV, then claiming it came from the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department as the fruit of a search warrant executed on Schaffel in connection with Michael Jackson's child molestation charges, and finally claiming no obligation to reveal the true source of the stolen material.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This action arises, in part, under the United States Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §§101 et seq., based on acts of copyright infringement committed in the United States, as well as under the common law right of conversion under the laws of the State of California. This Court has subject matter question jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1338, and supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims arising under California law pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367, because they flow from a common nucleus of operative facts.
- 4. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b), (c) and 1400(a) because Defendants, and each of them, are subject to personal jurisdiction in this District and a substantial part of the events, acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims herein occurred in this District.

28 || / / /

///

THE PARTIES

5. Schaffel is, and at all times relevant hereto has been, a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

- 6. Schaffel is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant TMZ Productions, Inc. is a California corporation conducting business in the City of Los Angeles, State of California, which operates and does business as TMZ and that the gossip website Defendant "TMZ.com" is, and at all times relevant hereto, was, an entity of unknown type and origin that is, and at all times relevant hereto was, doing business in the City of Los Angeles, State of California. Defendants TMZ Productions, Inc. and TMZ.com are collectively referred to as "TMZ."
- 7. Schaffel is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant Time Warner, Inc. ("Time Warner") is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in New York, New York conducting business in the City of Los Angeles, State of California.
- 8. Schaffel is presently unaware of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Schaffel will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of such fictitiously named Defendants when the same have been ascertained. Schaffel is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged herein and that Schaffel's damages were proximately caused by their conduct. Hereinafter, all Defendants including Doe Defendants will sometimes be referred to collectively as "Defendants." For convenience, each reference to a named Defendant herein shall also refer to the Doe Defendants, and each of them.
- 9. Schaffel is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at all material times Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, employees, partners,

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

joint venturers, co-conspirators, owners, principals, and employers of the remaining Defendants, and each of them, are, and at all times herein mentioned were, acting within the course and scope of that agency, employment, partnership, conspiracy, ownership or joint venture. Schaffel is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the acts and conduct alleged herein were known to, and authorized or ratified by, the officers, directors, and managing agents of Defendant corporations or business entities, and each of them.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS

- 10. Schaffel is the owner of a work entitled "Debbie Rowe Interview Produced and Directed by F. Marc Schaffel in Calabasas, California" ("Interview"), compiled and produced by F. Marc Schaffel in 2003 and consisting of an interview of Rowe, outtakes and other interactions with Rowe. Portions of the Interview were broadcast around the world in 2003. Other portions of the Interview were private, confidential and were never meant to be publicly released without the joint consent of Schaffel and Rowe (the "Confidential Outtakes").
- Michael Jackson was indicted by the District Attorney, County of Santa Barbara, on charges of child molestation in December 2003. As part of the investigation, on or about January 31, 2004, the Santa Barbara County Sheriff ("County Sheriff") obtained and executed upon a search warrant on Schaffel's home. The search warrant itself specified that upon seizure, any property was to be kept in custody pending further order of the Court. Among the things seized were various videotapes and computer hard drives, some of which included the Interview. On November 1, 2005, the County Sheriff returned to Schaffel what was represented by the County Sheriff to be all of the property seized pursuant to the warrant. Schaffel has never conveyed or released the Confidential Outtakes to anyone.
- 12. On July 20, 2009, TMZ broadcast the Confidential Outtakes portions of the Interview which consisted of a casual and jocular conversation between an interviewer and Rowe joking about using sedation to combat stage fright that was

BERLINER LLP

5

8 9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

never intended to be publicly disclosed unless Schaffel and Rowe consented thereto. Schaffel and Rowe were stunned and distressed that TMZ, in a misguided attempt at gallows humor, broadcast the Confidential Outtakes, attempting to tie a 2003 joke by Rowe about drug use to Mr. Jackson's tragic 2009 death from a drug overdose.

- Immediately upon airing of the Confidential Outtakes, Schaffel and 13. Rowe demanded that the Confidential Outtakes be removed from any further dissemination and that TMZ's source for the Confidential Outtakes be provided. On July 24, 2009, TMZ removed the Confidential Outtakes from further broadcast and agreed to provide the source for the video. TMZ then identified the source of the Confidential Outtakes as the County Sheriff. After the County Sheriff vehemently denied being the source of the Confidential Outtakes for TMZ, on July 30, 2009, TMZ retracted its prior statement, and stated that the Confidential Outtakes had been obtained from another third party source which TMZ refused to identify.
- 14. Thus, six (6) years after the Interview had been completed, and notwithstanding the Confidential Outtakes were to remain private and confidential and to be released only upon the joint consent of Schaffel and Rowe, not only had TMZ wrongfully broadcast the Confidential Outtakes, but repeatedly lied about the source that had provided the Confidential Outtakes.
- 15. Schaffel has spent considerable time and effort in developing its standing as a producer in the entertainment industry. Through years of hard work, Schaffel has developed skill, reputation and notoriety so as to create considerable value in Schaffel. Schaffel has also provided and stood by assurances to its subjects that they could rely upon representations that its productions would remain private and confidential where agreed to. The broadcast by TMZ of the Confidential Outtakes has diminished the ability of Schaffel to attract subjects for production in the entertainment industry and has diminished the ability of Schaffel to license, distribute, or otherwise exploit the Confidential Outtakes in the event Schaffel and Rowe consented to same.

19.

1

2

For Copyright Infringement [17 U.S.C. ·101 et seq.]

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

3

(Against All Defendants)

5 6

4

16. Schaffel repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 15, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.

8

9

7

17. Schaffel is the sole owner of all right, title and interest in the copyrights to the Interview (the "Copyrights").

Defendants' commercial use, exploitation, attempts to license or sell

10 11 18. Schaffel is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, have commercially used, exploited, attempted to license or sell and disseminated the copyrighted Interview.

1213

and dissemination of the copyrighted materials is unauthorized. Defendants' unauthorized commercial use, exploitation, licensing, attempts to license or sell and dissemination of the Interview constitutes an infringement of Schaffel's rights,

1516

14

including of the Copyrights, and of the copyright laws.

infringing activities are willful and wanton.

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

2728

20. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' infringing activities, Schaffel has sustained and will continue to sustain substantial injury, including damage to its business, reputation and goodwill in an amount not yet known but to be determined according to proof at trial. As a further direct and proximate result of the infringement by Defendants, they have unlawfully and wrongfully derived income and profits from their infringing acts.

Schaffel is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that

22. As a result of their actions, Defendants are liable to Schaffel for willful copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. §501. Schaffel suffered, and will continue to suffer, substantial damage to its professional reputation and goodwill, as well as

Defendants had prior knowledge of Schaffel's rights and, therefore, Defendants'

21.

10

11 12

14

13

16 17

15

18 19

20 21

23 24

22

25

26 27

losses in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be determined according to proof. In addition to Schaffel's actual damages, Schaffel is entitled to receive the profits made by Defendants from their wrongful acts, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §504. In the alternative, Schaffel is entitled to statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §504(c). These statutory damages should be enhanced by 17 U.S.C. §504(c)(2) because of Defendants' willful copyright infringement.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

For Conversion

(Against All Defendants)

- 23. Schaffel repeats, realleges, adopts and incorporates each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 22, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- At all times relevant hereto, Schaffel was, and is, the sole and rightful 24. owner of the Interview.
- Although the Interview is unique and the value of control of same is 25. irreplaceable, the Confidential Outtakes has an estimated value of potentially millions of dollars, the exact amount of which shall be proved at trial.
- 26. At some point and in some manner unknown to Schaffel, Defendants wrongfully and without Schaffel's authority or approval took or obtained possession of the Interview, and have converted the Interview for their own use and commercial gain.
- As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conversion of 27. the Interview, Schaffel has been damaged in an amount that is not yet fully ascertainable.
- 28. Schaffel is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the aforementioned acts of Defendants, and each of them, were done intentionally or with a conscious and reckless disregard of Schaffel, and with the intent to vex, injure or annoy Schaffel, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice, thus

4

5 6

8

9

7

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

entitling Schaffel to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish or set an example of Defendants, and each of them, to deter such conduct in the future, the exact amount of such damages subject to proof at the time of trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Schaffel prays for judgment against Defendants TMZ and Time Warner as follows:

AS TO THE FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

- That the Court enter judgment against Defendants, and each of them, 1. that Defendants have:
- infringed Schaffel's rights in the copyright in the "Interview" (a) under 17 U.S.C. §501, and that the infringement by Defendants, and each of them, was willful; and
- (b) otherwise injured the business reputation and business of Schaffel through the acts and conduct set forth in this Complaint;
- 2. For the damages suffered by Schaffel as a result of the infringement complained of herein, as well as disgorgement of any profits of Defendants attributable to their infringement, including the value of all gains, profits, advantages, benefits, and consideration derived by Defendants from and as a result of their infringement of Schaffel's copyright in the Interview;
- 3. In the alternative, if Schaffel so elects, in lieu of recovery of its actual damages and Defendants' profits, for a 17 U.S.C. §504(c) award of statutory damages against Defendants, or any of them, for all copyright infringements (willful or otherwise) involved in this action as to the Interview;

AS TO THE SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

4. For an award of general and special damages against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, for the value of the property converted, in an amount in excess of jurisdictional limits of this Court in accordance with proof at trial, together with interest thereon at the legal rate;

Case 2:10-cv-01306-GHK-SS Document 1 Filed 02/22/10 Page 9 of 13 www.iptrademarkattorney.com For damages for the proximate and foreseeable loss resulting from 5. 1 Defendants' conversion in a sum according to proof at the time of trial, together 2 with interest thereon at the legal rate; and 3 For punitive and exemplary damages. 6. 4 AS TO ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF: 5 For attorneys' fees and costs of the suit incurred; 7. 6 For interest at the maximum statutory rate; and 8. 7 For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper. 9. 8 9 KING, HOLMES, PATERNO & BERLINER, LLP DATED: February 22, 2010 10 11 By: 12 HOWARD E. KING ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF 13 F. MARC SCHAFFEL PRODUCTIONS, LLC 14 REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL 15 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules 16 of Civil Procedure. 17 18 KING, HOLMES, PATERNO & BERLINER, LLP DATED: February 22, 2010 20 By:

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

(ING, HOLMES, **PATERNO**

HOWARD E. KING

F. MARC SCHAFFEL PRODUCTIONS, LLC

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

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 George	King and th	ne assigned	discovery
Magistrate Judge is Suzanne H. Segal.				

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

CV10- 1306 GHK (SSx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central

			te Judge has been designated		
A	all discovery related motions	shou	ald be noticed on the calendar	of th	e Magistrate Judge
<u></u>	=======================================	===	==========	==	:
			NOTICE TO COUNSEL		
	py of this notice must be served w a copy of this notice must be sen		e summons and complaint on all del n all plaintiffs).	endar	nts (if a removal action is
Subs	sequent documents must be filed a	at the	following location:		
[X]	Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	LJ	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	L	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 2:10-cv-01306-GHK-SS Document 1 Filed 02/22/10 Page 11 of 13 www.iptrademarkattorney.com

	DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
F. MARC SCHAFFEL PRODUCTIONS, LLC, a California limited liability company,	CASE NUMBER
PLAINTIFF(S) V.	CV10-01306 GHK(SSA
TMZ PRODUCTIONS, INC., a California corporation; TMZ.com, a fictional entity of unknown form; TIME WARNER, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-10, inclusive DEFENDANT(S).	SUMMONS
TO: DEFENDANT(S): NAMED ABOVE	
Within days after service of this summust serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached x counterclaim cross-claim or a motion under Rule or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, King, Holmes, Paterno & Berliner LLP, 1900 Avenue of the Stars, judgment by default will be entered against you for the your answer or motion with the court.	e 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer Howard E. King , whose address is 25th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90067 . If you fail to do so, relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file
Dated: 22 FEB 2010	By: Deputy Clerk (Seal of the Court)
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United State 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)]. CV-01A (12/07) SUMM	

www.iptradentankentanten

	CIVIL CO	VER SHEET	
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing y	ourself [])	DEFENDANTS	
F. MARC SCHAFFEL PRODUCTIONS, LLC, a		TMZ PRODUCTIONS, INC., a California corporation; TMZ.com, a fictional er	atitv
California limited liability company		of unknown form; TIME WARNER, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES	-
California 22ISCA 12Early company		through 10, inclusive	-
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Numb yourself, provide same.)	er. If you are representing	Attorneys (If Known)	
Howard E. King, Esq. King, Holmes, Paterno & Berli	nor ILD	·	
1900 Avenue of the Stars	Her Dub		
25th Floor			
Los Angeles, California 90067			
(310) 282-8989			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box		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 X 3 Federal Quest Government I		of This State PTF DEF 1 Incorporated or Principal Place X 4 X of Business in this State	
2 U.S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indoor of Parties in I	icate Citizenship	of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 X of Business in Another State	5
_	Citizen	or Subject of a 3 5 Foreign Nation 6 9 gn Country	6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)			
X 1 Original 2 Removed from 3 Remander Proceeding State Court Appellate		or 5 Transferred from another district 6 Multi- 7 Appeal to Dis (specify): District Judge from Litigation Magistrate Ju	
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAN	D: X Yes N	(Check 'Yes' only if demanded in complaint.)	
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes X No	[MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$ subject to proof	_
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute un	der which you are filing a	nd write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversi	ty.)
Copyright Infringement 17 U.S. Defendants infringed Plaintiff	C. Section 10's copyright	l, et seq. through exploitation of Plaintiff's video	,
production. VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)			
TOTALES NATIONES CONTRACT	SALES TOROS	\$200 (2000) 1000 (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000) (2000)	
400 State Reapportionment 110 Insurance	TRANSPARENT	PAR TO Feir Leben	
410 Antitrust 120 Marine	310 Airplane	510 Motions to Standards Act	
430 Banks and Banking 130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Pro		
450 Commerce/ICC 140 Negotiable Instrume Rates/etc. 150 Recovery of	320 Assault, Lib	el & 380 Other Personal 530 General 730 Labor/Memt	
460 Deportation Overpayment &	Slander	Property Damage 535 Death Penalty Reporting &	
470 Racketeer Influenced Enforcement of	330 Fed. Employ	385 Property Damage 540 Mandamus/ 740 Pailway Labor	
and Corrupt Organizations Judgment Judgment Judgment	Liability 340 Marine	1 Todate Elability	AUL
Urganizations 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Default	345 Marine Proc		
490 Cable/Sat TV Student Loan (Excl.	Liability	422 Appear 28 USC	
810 Selective Service Veterans)	350 Motor Vehic	158	
850 Securities/Commodities/ 153 Recovery of Exchange Overpayment of	Product Liai	pility USC 157 610 Agriculture	S.
875 Customer Challenge 12 Veteran's Benefits	360 Other Person	[
USC 3410	Injury 362 Personal Inj	ury- 441 Voting Drug 830 Patent 242 Employment 625 Drug Related 840 Trademark	
890 Other Statutory Actions 190 Other Contract	Med Malpra	ctice 443 Housing/Acco- Seizure of	*A**
891 Agricultural Act 195 Contract Product Liability	365 Personal Inju		\
Act 196 Franchise	Product Liab		
893 Environmental Matters	Injury Produ	ct Disabilities - 640 R.R. & Truck (405(g))	
894 Energy Allocation Act 210 Land Condemnation	Liability	Employment 650 Airline Regs 864 SSID Title XV	Ί
895 Freedom of Info. Act 220 Foreclosure 200 Appeal of Fee Determi-230 Rent Lease & Ejectm	nent 462 Naturalization		8
nation Under Equal 240 Torts to Land	Application	Other 690 Other 870 Taxes (U.S.	
Access to Justice 245 Tort Product Liabilit	y 463 Habeas Corr	us- 440 Other Civil Plaintiff or	
950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 290 All Other Real Prope	Alien Detair		_ -
	Actions	ration 871 IRS - Third Pa 26 USC 7609	пу
		70/	_
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:	V7U-U1	プ0゚゚	—

Case 2:10-cv-01306-GHK-SS Document 1 Filed 02/22/10 Page 13 of 13 UNITED STATI HISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT F CALIFORNIA WWW.iptrademarkattorney.com CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASE If yes, list case number(s):	S: Has this action	peen previously filed in this court	and dismissed, remanded or closed? X No Yes	
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: If yes, list case number(s):	: Have any cases be	en previously filed in this court the	hat are related to the present case? X No Yes	
Civil cases are deemed related (Check all boxes that apply)	A. Arise B. Call fi	from the same or closely related to or determination of the same or su ther reasons would entail substanti	ransactions, happenings, or events; or abstantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or al duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or opyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.	
(a) List the County in this Dist	ng the following intrict; California Cou	ormation, use an additional sheet inty outside of this District; State	if necessary.) if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides.	
County in this District:* Los Angeles	mient, its agencies		If this box is checked, go to item (b). Ilifornia County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. nt. If this box is checked, go to item (c).	
County in this District:* TMZ Productions, TMZ.com - Los An			lifornia County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country me Warner, Inc Delaware	
(c) List the County in this Dist	rict; California Cou	nty outside of this District; State e location of the tract of land in	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.	
County in this District:* Los Angeles		Ca	lifornia County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Be Note: In land condemnation case		le, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or of the tract of land involved	San Luis Obispo Counties	
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORN	EY (OR PRO PER)	Howard E. King	Date February 22, 2010	
or other papers as required by	law. This form, ap	proved by the Judicial Conference	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)	
Key to Statistical codes relating	to Social Security C	ases:		
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Caus	se of Action	
861	HIA	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 income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.		
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))		

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Page 2 of 2

CV-71 (05/08)