

C.D. Michel – SBN 144258  
Sean A. Brady – SBN 262007  
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
Telephone: (562) 216-4444  
Facsimile: (562) 216-4445  
Email: sbrady@michellawyers.com

Attorneys for Defendants  
Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC,  
Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley,  
and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

FRANCISCO GUDINO CARDENAS, an  
individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNNER.NET; et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC

**NOTICE OF SUBMISSION OF PETITION  
FOR COORDINATION**

TO EACH PARTY AND TO THE COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR EACH PARTY:

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT on February 5, 2021 defendants Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC, Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley, and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC submitted to the Chairperson of the Judicial Council a petition to coordinate the instant matter with *Troy McFadyen, et al v. Ghost Gunner, Inc., et al*, Case No. CIV DS 1935422, which is pending in the Superior Court of San Bernardino.

The petition requests assignment of a judge to determine whether coordination of these related actions is appropriate and, if so, to stay them until coordination is completed. Because no party has previously expressed opposition to coordination, Petitioners did not request a hearing on

1 the petition as allowed by Rule 3.527(b) of the California Rules of Court. If any party does in fact  
2 now oppose the petition to coordinate, then it should file its opposition promptly and request a  
3 hearing date. A copy of the Petition and supporting documents is attached as **Exhibit A**.

4  
5 Dated: February 9, 2021

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

6  
7 s/ Sean A. Brady

8 Sean A. Brady

9 Attorney for Defendants

10 Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC,

11 Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley,

12 and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# **EXHIBIT A**

C.D. Michel – SBN 144258  
Sean A. Brady – SBN 262007  
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
Telephone: (562) 216-4444  
Facsimile: (562) 216-4445  
Email: sbrady@michellawyers.com

Attorneys for Petitioners  
Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC,  
Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley, and  
MFY Technical Solutions, LLC

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
CHAIR OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

FRANCISCO GUDINO CARDENAS, an  
individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNNER.NET; et al.,

Defendants.

Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding

JCCP NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-  
2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC

San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIV  
DS 1935422

**PETITION FOR COORDINATION OF  
ACTIONS; SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM  
OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
SUPPORT THEREOF**

[Filed concurrently with the supporting  
declaration of Sean A. Brady]

TROY MCFADYEN, in his Individual  
Capacity, and as Heir at Law and Successor  
in Interest to MICHELLE MCFADYEN,  
Deceased; et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNNER.NET; et al.,

Defendants.

1 TO THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:


2 Pursuant to section 404.4 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, Petitioners Ghost  
3 Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC, Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley, and MFY Technical  
4 Solutions, LLC submit this petition to request assignment of a judge to determine whether it  
5 would be appropriate to coordinate the following two actions : *Francisco Gudino Cardenas v.*  
6 *Ghost Gunner, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC, pending in the Superior  
7 Court of Orange County, and *Troy McFadyen, et al v. Ghost Gunner, Inc., et al*, Case No. CIV  
8 DS 1935422, pending in the Superior Court of San Bernardino. The full title of each action is  
9 shown in the copies of the complaints attached to the declaration of Sean A. Brady as Exhibits  
10 "A" and "C." The January 25, 2021 order of Hon. Gregory H. Lewis granting Petitioners' motion  
11 to submit this petition is attached to the supporting declaration of Sean A. Brady as Exhibit "B."

12 This petition is based on Code of Civil Procedure sections 404 and 404.1, California Rules  
13 of Court, Rule 3.521, the attached memorandum of points and authorities, and the declaration of  
14 Sean A. Brady. This petition is made on the ground that these actions share common questions of  
15 law and fact, and that coordination of these actions will promote the ends of justice. The  
16 declaration of Sean A. Brady sets forth facts showing that the actions are complex and that  
17 coordination would satisfy the criteria set forth in Code of Civil Procedure section 404.1.

18 All Plaintiffs support coordination, as do almost all defendants except for a few who have  
19 remained silent on the issue. However, Plaintiffs request that the coordinated action be assigned  
20 to Orange County Superior Court, while Petitioners and all other defendants who have weighed in  
21 believe that San Bernardino is the better venue. Due to the agreement on coordination generally,  
22 with the sole dispute being over venue, Petitioners do not request a hearing at this time, however,  
23 are prepared to attend such a hearing should this Council find a hearing necessary.

24 Dated: February 5, 2021

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

25   
26 Sean A. Brady  
27 Attorney for Petitioners  
28 Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC,  
Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley,  
and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC

1 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 Petitioners Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC, Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley,  
4 and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC (“Petitioners”) bring this petition for coordination following  
5 their receipt of permission to do so from the Honorable Judge Gregory H. Lewis of the Orange  
6 County Superior Court. The actions to be coordinated are *Francisco Gudino Cardenas v. Ghost*  
7 *Gunner, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC, which is pending in the Superior  
8 Court of Orange County, and *Troy McFadyen, et al v. Ghost Gunner, Inc., et al*, Case No. CIV  
9 DS 1935422, which is pending in the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. The complaints  
10 for each are attached as Exhibits “A” and “C” to the Declaration of Sean A. Brady (“Brady  
11 Decl.”), referred to respectively as the “*Cardenas* Complaint” and the “*McFadyen* Complaint”

12 The actions should plainly be coordinated. Both arise out of the same incident, include the  
13 exact same defendants, and raise the exact same causes of action. In fact, the two complaints are  
14 effectively identical, almost verbatim; the only real difference being the details specific to the  
15 respective plaintiffs in each action. (*Cardenas* Complaint, *passim.*, and *McFadyen* Complaint,  
16 *passim.*) The complaint in the *Cardenas* matter describes the *McFadyen* matter as a “related case”  
17 that was filed the same day. (*Cardenas* Complaint, at 6:3-8.). The two matters are so linked that  
18 the complaint in the *Cardenas* matter originally alleged that venue is proper in *Orange County*  
19 because several defendants have their place of business in *San Bernardino* County (*Cardenas*  
20 Complaint, at 5:20-25.)<sup>1</sup> As the two matters are essentially the same and undeniably complex,<sup>2</sup>  
21 they meet Code of Civil Procedure Section 404’s criteria and thus can and should be coordinated.  
22 If not coordinated, Petitioners will be subjected to duplicative filings and potentially conflicting  
23

24 <sup>1</sup> This was corrected with a notice of errata filed on November 22, 2019, which alleged that  
25 three of the defendants have their principal place of business in Orange County. (Brady Decl., ¶6,  
26 Exhibit E.)

27 <sup>2</sup> Plaintiff in the *Cardenas* matter, for some reason, did not label this case as complex on the  
28 Civil Case cover sheet, but the plaintiffs in the related *McFadyen* matter did label their nearly  
verbatim complaint as a complex matter. Plaintiff in the *Cardenas* matter has now acknowledged  
that the matter is indeed complex. (Brady Decl., ¶12.) In the court’s order permitting the filing of  
this petition, it found the matters to be complex. (Brady Decl., ¶3, Exhibit B.)

1 rulings and judgments should the two matters be allowed to proceed in two separate courts.

2 Significantly, the Plaintiffs in both matters agree that the two matters should be  
3 coordinated, as do all defendants who have weighed in (some have remained silent on the issue,  
4 but none has objected).

## 5 **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

6 On November 14, 2019, plaintiffs in the *McFadyen* matter filed their complaint. Plaintiffs  
7 in that action assert the following causes of action: (1) Negligence; (2) Negligence Per Se; (3)  
8 Negligent Entrustment; (4) Public Nuisance; (5) Violation of Business and Professions Code  
9 Section 17200 (Unfair and Unlawful Sales Practices); and (6) Violation of Business and  
10 Professions Code Section 17200 (Unfair Marketing Tactics). (*McFadyen* Complaint, *passim*).  
11 The *McFadyen* Complaint names as defendants: GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
12 GHOSTGUNNER.NET; DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET; CODY  
13 WILSON d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET; BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP INC.,  
14 d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM; RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a  
15 RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM; GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM; GHOST  
16 FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM; JUGGERNAUT  
17 TACTICAL INC., d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM; MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a  
18 5DTACTICAL.COM; TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80-LOWER.COM; AR-  
19 15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and 80LOWERJIG.COM; JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a  
20 USPATRIOTARMORY.COM; INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC., d/b/a  
21 AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM; and THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a  
22 THUNDERTACTICAL.COM. (*McFadyen* Complaint, 4:16-28.)

23 Plaintiff in the *Cardenas* matter simultaneously filed his complaint on the same date as the  
24 plaintiffs in *McFadyen*, November 14, 2019. Plaintiff Cardenas asserted the identical causes of  
25 action as those asserted in the *McFadyen* complaint against the identical defendants, even in the  
26 same order. (*Cardenas* Complaint, 2:20-3:3, and *McFadyen* Complaint, 4:16-28.) The *Cardenas*  
27 Complaint is mostly identical to the *McFadyen* Complaint, only really differing in its descriptions  
28 of the respective plaintiffs in each matter. A simple review of each shows that most of the

1 numbered paragraphs and entire pages are verbatim copies of each other.

2 Petitioners have all been served with the summons and complaint in both matters, but they  
3 have not had to file a responsive pleading yet in either owing to the respective courts in both those  
4 previously staying proceedings<sup>3</sup>. (Brady Decl., ¶3 and ¶5.) While Petitioners have no reason to  
5 expect either court will refuse to grant further stays as needed until coordination is finalized,  
6 Petitioners intend to submit an application requesting that the assigned judge nevertheless order a  
7 stay of both matters pending its final ruling on this petition pursuant to rule 3.515 of the  
8 California Rules of Court to avoid any potential conflicts.

9 Counsel for Petitioners has confirmed with counsel for six of the remaining nine  
10 defendants to both of these matters that none of them objects to the coordination of these matters.  
11 (Brady Decl., ¶11.). The remaining defendants have been unreachable, despite attempts by  
12 Petitioners' counsel to contact them. (*Ibid.*) But none has expressed opposition to this petition.  
13 (*Ibid.*) Counsel for Plaintiffs in both actions have also expressed that they do not oppose  
14 coordination. (Brady Decl., ¶12, Exhibit F, and ¶13, Exhibit G.) However, Plaintiffs in both  
15 actions have requested that the coordinated matter be assigned to Orange County without  
16 explanation. Petitioners and several other defendants request that the coordinated matter be  
17 assigned to San Bernardino County because the *McFadyen* matter has already been assigned to a  
18 complex department in San Bernardino, several defendants are located in that jurisdiction, and the  
19 original complaint was filed there by more plaintiffs.

### 20 **III. ARGUMENT**

21 When civil actions sharing a common question of fact or law are pending before different  
22 courts, a petition for coordination may be submitted to the Chairperson of the Judicial Council  
23 "... by any party to one of the actions after requesting permission from the presiding judge."  
24 (Code Civ. Proc., §404.) The Hon. Gregory H. Lewis granted Petitioners permission to request  
25 coordination of these two identical matters from this Council. (Brady Decl., ¶3, Exhibit B.)

---

26 <sup>3</sup> While *Cardenas* remains stayed pending resolution of this petition, the stay in *McFadyen*  
27 ended on January 25, 2021. (Brady Decl., ¶5, Exhibit D.) Petitioners intend to request that the  
28 *McFadyen* court reinstate the stay at the upcoming February 10, 2021 case management  
conference.



1 Coordination is proper where (1) the cases to be coordinated are all complex as defined by  
2 California Rules of Court 3.400; and (2) the requirements for coordination in California Code of  
3 Civil Procedure §404.1 are met. (Code Civ. Proc., §404.) As explained below, and as found by the  
4 Hon. Gregory H. Lewis these identical cases meet both the definition of “complex” and the  
5 requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure §404.1.

6 **A. The *McFadyen* and *Cardenas* actions are both complex under California law.**

7 The plaintiffs in *McFadyen* designated that matter as complex on their civil case cover  
8 sheet but the plaintiff in the *Cardenas* matter did not. (Brady Decl., ¶3.) However, plaintiff in the  
9 *Cardenas* matter has since acknowledged the matter is indeed complex. (Brady Decl., ¶12,  
10 Exhibit F.) Regardless, plaintiffs do not choose whether or not a matter is complex, the Court  
11 does. California Rule of Court 3.400(b) sets forth the criteria for that determination:

12 In deciding whether an action is a complex case under (a), the court  
13 must consider, among other things, whether the action is likely to  
14 involve: (1) Numerous pretrial motions raising difficult or novel legal  
15 issues that will be time-consuming to resolve; (2) Management of a  
16 large number of witnesses or a substantial amount of documentary  
17 evidence; (3) Management of a large number of separately  
18 represented parties; (4) Coordination with related actions pending in  
19 one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a  
20 federal court; or (5) Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision.

21 This is a factor test with disjunctive factors, and a case may be considered complex even if  
22 it only satisfies one of the listed criteria. For example, a case may be found to be complex “only  
23 because of the large number of represented parties in related actions pending in different  
24 counties.” (*Thayer v. Wells Fargo Bank* (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 819, 835, fn. 8.) Here, Petitioners  
25 can meet most of the factors. Both matters will involve time-consuming motions which raise  
26 difficult legal issues, given that multiple defendants intend to file demurrers and/or anti-SLAPP  
27 motions. (Brady Decl., ¶9.) If those filings are unsuccessful, there will certainly be a large  
28 number of witnesses and evidence to sort through, given the large number of plaintiffs (16) in the  
*McFadyen* matter and the large number of defendants (13) in both matters. Similarly, both matters  
will involve the management of a large number of separately represented parties. The plaintiffs in  
both matters have separate counsel and among all the defendants, there are at least four different

1 counsel to date. (*Ibid.*) Finally, the actions are of course likely to involve coordination with  
2 related actions in other counties, which is the very reason Petitioners bring this petition. Any one  
3 of these alone is sufficient to find the cases complex, jointly they all but compel such finding.  
4 Indeed, in his order permitting the filing of this petition, Judge Lewis found the matter to be  
5 complex. (Brady Decl., ¶3, Exhibit B.)

6 \* \* \* \*

7 For these reasons, the *Cardenas* and *McFadyen* matters should be deemed complex and  
8 thus eligible for coordination.

9 **B. The requirements for Coordination are met.**

10 CCP §404.1 provides that coordination of civil actions sharing a common question of fact  
11 or law is proper if it will “promote the ends of justice” based on the following factors: “whether  
12 the common question of fact or law is predominating and significant to the litigation; the  
13 convenience of parties, witnesses, and counsel; the relative development of the actions and the  
14 work product of counsel; the efficient utilization of judicial facilities and manpower; the calendar  
15 of the courts; the disadvantages of duplicative and inconsistent rulings, orders, or judgments; and,  
16 the likelihood of settlement of the actions without further litigation should coordination be  
17 denied.” (Code Civ. Proc., §404.1.) Here, consideration of these factors easily supports  
18 coordination of these two matters.

19 **1. Significant common questions of law and fact predominate.**

20 There is no question that common questions of law and fact predominate in both the  
21 *McFadyen* and *Cardenas* actions. The complaints are effectively identical, share the exact same  
22 causes of action, involve the same incident, and were filed on the same day. (Brady Decl., ¶2 and  
23 ¶4.) In some places, counsel in the *Cardenas* action even forgot to change the plural tense of the  
24 original *McFadyen* complaint to the singular to reflect that there is only one Plaintiff in the  
25 *Cardenas* action. (*Cardenas* Complaint, 34:4 [“PLAINTIFF are informed and believe and thereon  
26 allege...”]; *See also*: 10:14-16, 28:21, 31:11-12.)

27 **2. The convenience of parties, witnesses, and counsel.**

28 It is also clear that coordination is an efficient use of judicial resources and will advance

1 the convenience of the parties, witnesses, counsel, and the court system. Given that identical  
2 allegations and claims against the same defendants are to be litigated, and given the number of  
3 plaintiffs and defendants cumulatively involved in the matters, the resources of multiple judicial  
4 chambers will be taxed needlessly by duplications of the same or similar motions, hearings, and  
5 trials. Further, as both actions arise from the same event, they will no doubt involve the same  
6 witnesses, which witnesses should not have to present the same testimony in two different venues.  
7 The convenience of the parties will no doubt be served by the coordination of written discovery  
8 demands and depositions of both lay and expert witnesses, as well as the creation of a common  
9 repository of relevant documents, should this matter reach that stage.

10 **3. The relative development of the actions.**

11 While a petition for coordination may be made at any time after the filing of a complaint  
12 (Cal. Rule Ct. 3.521(a)), coordination is particularly appropriate at earlier stages, before costs  
13 have been sunk into each matter, or various motions filed, or differing rulings made. Here,  
14 complaints have been filed in both actions, but otherwise, there has been no significant progress  
15 in either case. No defendant has yet filed a responsive pleading in either action. Nor has any party  
16 commenced discovery. It is in the interest of all parties to have coordination determined now,  
17 before either case significantly progresses.

18 **4. The efficient utilization of judicial facilities and manpower, and the**  
19 **calendar of the courts.**

20 Judicial facilities and resources will be more efficiently utilized if the cases are  
21 coordinated because there will be a single judge in a single courtroom hearing the large volume of  
22 pretrial motions anticipated in this case, rather than multiple pretrial motions being heard in  
23 different courthouses utilizing countless judge and staff hours. That duplicative burden would be  
24 only exacerbated should trial be necessary here. In sum, allowing both actions to proceed in two  
25 separate courts is an unnecessary burden on judicial resources, especially when the actions are  
26 largely identical except for the identity of the plaintiffs involved.

27 ///

28 ///




1 designate the matter as complex. (Brady Decl., ¶¶ 14-15.) Second, there are seventeen (17)  
2 plaintiffs in *McFadyen* who chose to file their action in San Bernardino, as opposed to a single  
3 plaintiff in *Cardenas* who chose to file his action in Orange County. (Brady Decl., ¶¶ 2-3.) Third,  
4 while both actions were filed on the same day, the complaint in *Cardenas* was obviously a copy of  
5 the *McFadyen* complaint, meaning San Bernardino County was the original venue. (See Brady  
6 Decl., ¶¶ 2-3, Exhibits A and B.) Finally, of the California-based defendants, there are an equal  
7 number located in San Bernardino County (3) as in Orange County (3) and each of the San  
8 Bernardino County-based defendants, as well as two of the Orange County-based defendants (the  
9 third has not responded to take a position), agree that San Bernardino County is the better venue  
10 for the reasons above. (Brady Decl., ¶¶ 10-11.)

#### 11 **IV. CONCLUSION**

12 For the above reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that the *Cardenas* and *McFadyen*  
13 matters be designated as complex, coordinated and assigned to San Bernardino County Superior  
14 Court, and stayed until the coordination process has been completed.

15  
16 Dated: February 5, 2021

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Sean A. Brady  
20 Attorney for Petitioners  
21 Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC,  
22 Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley,  
23 and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 C.D. Michel – SBN 144258  
2 Sean A. Brady – SBN 262007  
3 MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
4 180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  
5 Long Beach, CA 90802  
6 Telephone: (562) 216-4444  
7 Facsimile: (562) 216-4445  
8 Email: sbrady@michellawyers.com

9 Attorneys for Petitioners  
10 Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC,  
11 Ryan Beezley and Bob Beezley,  
12 and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC

13 JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
14 CHAIR OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

15 FRANCISCO GUDINO CARDENAS, an  
16 individual,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
20 GHOSTGUNNER.NET; et al.,

21 Defendants.

Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding

JCCP NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-  
2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC

San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIV  
DS 1935422

**DECLARATION OF SEAN A. BRADY IN  
SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR  
COORDINATION OF ACTIONS**

[Filed concurrently with the petition for  
coordination and memorandum of points of  
points and authorities in support thereof]

22 TROY MCFADYEN, in his Individual  
23 Capacity, and as Heir at Law and Successor  
24 in Interest to MICHELLE MCFADYEN,  
25 Deceased; et al.,

26 Plaintiffs,

27 v.

28 GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNNER.NET; et al,

Defendants.

1 I, Sean A. Brady, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney at law admitted to practice in the State of California. I am  
3 counsel for those bringing this petition, Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC, Ryan Beezley  
4 and Bob Beezley, and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC ("Petitioners"). My statements herein are  
5 based upon my personal knowledge, except those statements that are based upon information and  
6 belief. If I were to be called as a witness, I could and would competently testify under oath as to  
7 the matters that I have set forth in this declaration.

8 2. I represent Petitioners in the matter of *Francisco Gudino Cardenas v. Ghost*  
9 *Gunner, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC, pending in the Superior Court of  
10 Orange County. Petitioners have all been served in that matter. A true and correct copy of the  
11 complaint filed by a single plaintiff in that action is attached as **Exhibit A**.

12 3. I also represent Petitioners in the matter of *Troy McFadyen, et al v. Ghost Gunner,*  
13 *Inc., et al*, Case No. CIV DS 1935422, pending in the Superior Court of San Bernardino.  
14 Petitioners have all been served in that matter. A true and correct copy of the complaint filed by  
15 seventeen plaintiffs in that action is attached as **Exhibit B**.

16 4. By order of Judge Gregory H. Lewis of the Orange County Superior Court,  
17 Petitioners received permission to file their petition for coordination. In that order, Judge Lewis  
18 also stayed the *Cardenas* matter until the Chairperson of the Judicial Council has acted on the  
19 petition. Lastly, Judge Lewis confirmed that the *Cardenas* matter is complex despite it being  
20 erroneously marked as not complex upon its filing by Plaintiff. A true and correct copy of the  
21 minute order permitting the submission of this petition and staying the *Cardenas* matter is  
22 attached as **Exhibit C**.

23 5. By order of the Court, the *McFadyen* matter had been stayed until January 25,  
24 2021. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff McFadyen's notice of that order is attached as **Exhibit**  
25 **D**. Petitioners intend to request an additional stay in the *McFadyen* matter at the next case  
26 management conference, scheduled for February 10, 2021, to halt the case until coordination is  
27 decided.

28 ///

1           6.       A true and correct copy of the notice of errata filed by Plaintiff Francisco Cardenas  
2 on November 22, 2019 is attached as **Exhibit E**.

3           7.       Other than the *McFadyen* matter, I am unaware of any other actions pending in the  
4 state sharing a common question of law or fact with these actions.

5           8.       I am informed and believe and thereon state that no trial is imminent in either of the  
6 cases sought to be coordinated.

7           9.       The standards for coordination as set forth in Code of Civil Procedure §404 and  
8 §404.1 are met by the following circumstances:

9               a) The cases are both complex, as defined by California Rule of Court 3.400,  
10 because both matters will involve time-consuming motions which raise difficult legal issues.  
11 There will likely be a large number of witnesses and evidence to sort through, given the number  
12 of plaintiffs in the *McFadyen* matter and the number of defendants in both matters, and several  
13 defendants intend to file demurrers and/or anti-SLAPP motions. Similarly, both matters will  
14 involve the management of a large number of separately represented parties, I am aware of at  
15 least four separate counsel. Although there is only one plaintiff in the *Cardenas* matter, there are  
16 still thirteen named defendants, each with their own Counsel except for the four defendants  
17 bringing this petition and a few more defendants who have not been served. Finally, the actions  
18 are of course likely to involve coordination, as is plain by this very petition.

19               b) Coordination is also proper under §404.1 because significant common  
20 questions of law and fact predominate, given the nearly identical complaints, the identical causes  
21 of action, identical named defendants, and identical incident the complaints arise out of.

22               c) The convenience of the parties will be served by the coordination of written  
23 discovery demands, the coordination of depositions of both lay and expert witnesses, as well as  
24 the creation of a common depository of relevant documents.

25               d) Judicial facilities and resources will be more efficiently utilized if the cases are  
26 coordinated because there will be a single judge in a single courtroom hearing the large volume of  
27 pretrial motions anticipated in this case, rather than multiple pretrial motions being heard in  
28 different courthouses utilizing many hundreds of judge time and staff time, with the attendant risk



1 of inconsistent rulings. Multiple rulings will also generate multiple petitions for appellate review,  
2 which can be avoided by coordination.

3 e) Coordination of the actions will encourage settlement because my clients will  
4 likely not be inclined to settle their cases if common issues are being litigated in other courts in  
5 front of different judges with the possibility of different outcomes.

6 10. Of the six named defendants located in California, three are located in Orange  
7 County (Blackhawk Manufacturing Group, Inc., Ghost America, LLC, and Juggernaut Tactical,  
8 Inc) and three are located in San Bernardino County (Ryan Beezley, Bob, Beezley, and James  
9 Tromblee). (See **Exhibits A & B.**)

10 11. I spoke with other defendants in this matter or their counsel to determine if any of  
11 them would oppose this petition. Defendants Ghost Gunner, Inc., Defense Distributed, Cody  
12 Wilson, James Tromblee, Blackhawk Manufacturing Group, Inc., Juggernaut Tactical, Inc., and  
13 Tactical Gear Heads, LLC have confirmed that they do not oppose this application and agree that  
14 San Bernardino County is the better venue once the two matters are coordinated into one. The  
15 remaining Defendants have not responded as of the filing of this petition.

16 12. Counsel for Plaintiff in the *Cardenas* action indicated that he does not oppose this  
17 petition. Mr. Cardenas filed a notice of non-opposition to the motion to permit filing of a petition  
18 for coordination in that case in which he agreed coordination is proper. In that notice, he also  
19 acknowledged the *Cardenas* matter is indeed complex. A true and correct copy of that notice of  
20 non-opposition is attached as **Exhibit F.**

21 13. Counsel for Plaintiffs in the *McFadyen* action have indicated they do not oppose  
22 this petition. They filed a notice of non-opposition to the motion to permit filing of a petition for  
23 coordination in that case in which they agreed coordination is proper. They pointed out that they  
24 believe that the coordinated matter should proceed in Orange County but did not provide any  
25 reasons in support of their view. A true and correct copy of that notice of non-opposition is  
26 attached as **Exhibit G.**

27 14. The *McFadyen* matter has been assigned to a judge in San Bernardino County  
28 Superior Court's Complex Civil Department.

15. *Cardenas* is not currently in Orange County Superior Court's complex department because the plaintiff did not designate the matter as complex in his civil case cover sheet.

16. The litigation in both the *McFadyen* and *Cardenas* matters is in the very early stages, with no responsive pleadings yet filed in either by any defendant.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 5th day of February 2021, at Long Beach, California.

Sean A. Brady, Declarant

# EXHIBIT A

GERALD B. SINGLETON (SBN 208783)  
SINGLETON LAW FIRM  
450 A Street, 5th Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: (619) 586-5820  
Fax: (619) 255-1515  
gerald@SLFfirm.com

BEN ROSENFELD (SBN 203845)  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
115 ½ Bartlett Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
Tel: (415) 285-8091  
Fax: (415) 285-8092  
ben.rosenfeld@comast.net

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Francisco Gudino Cardenas

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

FRANCISCO GUDINO CARDENAS, an  
individual

Plaintiff,

vs.

GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNNER.NET;

DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNNER.NET

CODY WILSON d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET

BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP  
INC., d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM;

RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a  
RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM;

GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNS.COM;

GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID

No. 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC  
Judge Derek W. Hunt

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

(DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL)

(Personal Injury/Wrongful Death)

CAUSES OF ACTION:

1. NEGLIGENCE
2. NEGLIGENCE PER SE
3. NEGLIGENT ENTRUSTMENT
4. PUBLIC NUISANCE
5. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND  
PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200  
(UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL SALES  
PRACTICES)
6. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND  
PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM;  
JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a  
JTACTICAL.COM;  
MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a  
5DTACTICAL.COM;  
TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80-  
LOWER.COM; AR-  
15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and  
80LOWERJIG.COM;  
JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a  
USPATRIOTARMORY.COM;  
INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC., d/b/a  
AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM;  
THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a  
THUNDERTACTICAL.COM;  
DOES 1-100, Inclusive,  
Defendants.

(UNFAIR MARKETING TACTICS)

**COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1. COMES NOW PLAINTIFF FRANCISCO GUDINO CARDENAS, in his Individual Capacity ( "PLAINTIFF"), by and through his attorneys of record, and alleges the following against DEFENDANTS GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET; BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP INC., d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM; RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM; GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM; GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM; JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM; MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a 5DTACTICAL.COM; TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80- LOWER.COM; AR-15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and 80LOWERJIG.COM; JAMES

1 TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a USPATRIOTARMORY.COM; INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC.,  
2 d/b/a AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM; THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a  
3 THUNDERTACTICAL.COM; and DOES 1-50 (collectively "DEFENDANTS"). Further,  
4 PLAINTIFF demand a jury trial.

### 5 INTRODUCTION

6 2. DEFENDANTS are companies that have chosen to intentionally undermine  
7 federal and state firearms laws by designing, manufacturing, marketing, distributing and/or  
8 selling kits and firearms parts that are easily assembled by the purchaser into fully functional  
9 weapons, including AR-15 style assault weapons to consumers across the nation, including  
10 within the State of California. DEFENDANTS have chosen to engage in this business  
11 primarily by utilizing online sales that enable purchasers to acquire such weapons without a  
12 background check or any interaction with a Federal Firearms Licensee ("FFL," an authorized  
13 gun dealer) and in violation of state law restrictions governing assault weapons, including  
14 restrictions in the State of California.  
15

16 3. The weapons assembled from DEFENDANTS' kits and firearms parts are  
17 termed "ghost guns." This name reflects the fact that such weapons lack a serial number  
18 unless specifically required by state law and are difficult, if not impossible, for law  
19 enforcement to trace back to their manufacturer/seller when recovered from a crime scene.  
20

21 4. DEFENDANTS knew when they entered this business that they would  
22 foreseeably be supplying criminals, killers, and others whose possession of firearms pose an  
23 unacceptably high threat of injury or death to others.

24 5. DEFENDANTS further knew that selling these kits and firearm parts violated  
25 state and federal statutes applicable to the registration, ownership, sale, and marking of  
26 firearms.  
27  
28

1           6.       DEFENDANTS refused to use reasonable safety measures that could have  
2 limited the risk of their products falling into the hands of such dangerous individuals.

3           7.       Instead, DEFENDANTS targeted their business at precisely such individuals  
4 by intentionally emphasizing features of their products that make them particularly attractive  
5 to such dangerous parties as major selling points. For example, DEFENDANTS intentionally  
6 emphasized that 1) their products can be used to assemble untraceable weapons and 2) enable  
7 the purchaser to evade background checks and interaction with an FFL.  
8

9           8.       DEFENDANTS chose profits over people and public safety, and launched and  
10 maintained their business in the unreasonably dangerous manner described herein.

11          9.       Since DEFENDANTS have launched their “ghost guns” business they have  
12 learned with certainty that their business is a massive and growing source of crime guns that  
13 are claiming innocent lives in California and elsewhere.

14          10.      DEFENDANTS could have changed their business practices to institute  
15 reasonable safety measures to minimize the damage done by the problem they created.  
16 Instead DEFENDANTS have continued to choose profits over people and public safety and  
17 have doubled down on their dangerous and irresponsible practices. By doing so,  
18 DEFENDANTS have and are acting with a reckless disregard, conscious disregard or  
19 deliberate indifference to a known and obvious risk that threatens the life and safety of  
20 others.  
21

22          11.      Upon information and belief, all DEFENDANTS designed, advertised,  
23 marketed, sold, distributed and/or offered, one or more “ghost gun” kits/parts that could be  
24 easily assembled into un-serialized AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles that are prohibited under  
25 California’s assault weapons ban to California residents leading up to and/or during  
26 November 2017.

27          12.      PLAINTIFF brings this suit because he was shot and injured as a direct,  
28

1 foreseeable, and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' negligent, reckless, and intentionally  
2 unlawful actions.

3 13. Specifically, PLAINTIFF was shot and injured by a dangerous, mentally  
4 disturbed California resident named KEVIN NEAL, who was barred from firearms  
5 possession by one or more state court orders. NEAL would not have been able to legally  
6 acquire a firearm in the State of California. NEAL purchased parts/kits from one or more of  
7 the DEFENDANTS leading up to and/or during November 2017 and used these parts/kits to  
8 assemble at least two AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles barred under California's prohibition  
9 on assault weapons. NEAL used these "ghost guns" in a rampage shooting that killed or  
10 injured PLAINTIFF or their loved ones on November 13-14, 2017.

11  
12 14. DEFENDANTS, upon information and belief, continue to offer these  
13 products to California residents using marketing strategies and business practices that are  
14 identical or essentially the same as those used during and before November 2017.

### 15 JURISDICTION

16 15. This is a civil action for negligence and violations of the California Unfair  
17 Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § § 17200 et seq). This Court has subject matter  
18 jurisdiction over this action as the amount of the claims exceeds \$25,000.00  
19

20 16. Venue is proper in this court because several of the DEFENDANTS, RYAN  
21 BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY d/b/a RBTACTIALTOOLING.COM, and DEFENDANT  
22 JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a USPATRIOTARMORY.COM are California residents  
23 and/or California Corporations who at all relevant times reside in and/or have their  
24 principal place of business in the City of Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino, State of  
25 California.

26 17. PLAINTIFF seeks an award of compensatory damages, punitive damages  
27 pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 3294, statutory damages pursuant to Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code  
28



1 § 17200, injunctive and declaratory relief, costs and expenses, and reasonable attorney's  
2 fees.

3 **NOTICE OF RELATED CASE**

4 18. This case is related to *McFadyen, et al. v. Ghost Gunner Inc., et al.*, Case No.  
5 \_\_\_\_\_, filed in this San Bernadino County Court on November 13, 2019, in that  
6 it is bath on the same nucleus of operative facts, the same incident, and is brought against  
7 the same defendants.  
8

9 **THE PARTIES**

10 19. Plaintiff FRANCISCO GUDINO CARDENAS is a natural person of  
11 majority age who resided at the time of this incident in Tehama County, CA and presently  
12 resides in San Diego County, CA.

13 20. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT GHOST GUNNER INC.  
14 ("GHOST GUNNER"), d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET, was a Texas corporation with its  
15 principal place of business in Austin, County of Travis, State of Texas. At all times pertinent  
16 hereto, GHOST GUNNER was engaged in the business of designing, marketing,  
17 distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including  
18 AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation, including to consumers  
19 within the State of California. GHOST GUNNER's registered agent is a Texas company  
20 named DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED. DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED and GHOST GUNNER  
21 ("DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST GUNNER") should be viewed as interchangeable  
22 and inextricably linked for purposes of this Complaint for Damages; upon information and  
23 belief, the same individual, Cody Wilson, was involved with running both entities.  
24 DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED's website still links to GHOST GUNNER. See  
25 <https://defdist.org>.  
26

27 21. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT BLACKHAWK  
28

1 MANUFACTURING GROUP INC. ("BLACKHAWK"), d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM,  
2 was a California domestic corporation, with its principal place of business in the Garden  
3 Grove, County of Orange, State of California. At all times pertinent hereto, BLACKHAWK  
4 was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or  
5 selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to  
6 consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.  
7

8 22. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANTS RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB  
9 BEEZLEY have maintained addresses in Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino, State of  
10 California and were doing business as RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM. At all times  
11 pertinent hereto, RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM has maintained a business address in  
12 Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino, State of California. At all times pertinent hereto,  
13 RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM was engaged in the business of designing, marketing,  
14 distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including  
15 AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation, including to consumers  
16 within the State of California.  
17

18 23. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT GHOST AMERICA LLC  
19 ("GHOST AMERICA"), d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM, was a California limited liability  
20 company with its principal place of business in Yorba Linda, County of Orange, State of  
21 California. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST AMERICA was engaged in the business  
22 of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble  
23 "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation,  
24 including to consumers within the State of California.  
25

26 24. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST FIREARMS LLC ("GHOST  
27 FIREARMS"), d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM, was a limited liability  
28 company registered in Florida with its principal place of business in Daytona Beach, County

1 of Volusia, State of Florida. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST FIREARMS was  
2 engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling  
3 parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to  
4 consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

5 25. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL  
6 INC. ("JUGGERNAUT"), d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM, was a California corporation with its  
7 principal place of business in Orange, County of Orange, State of California. At all times  
8 pertinent hereto, JUGGERNAUT was engaged in the business of designing, marketing,  
9 distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including  
10 AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation, including to consumers  
11 within the State of California.  
12

13 26. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT MFY TECHNICAL  
14 SOLUTIONS LLC ("MFY TECHNICAL"), d/b/a 5DTACTICAL.COM, was a  
15 Massachusetts limited liability company with its principal place of business in  
16 Westborough, County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts. At all times pertinent hereto,  
17 MFY TECHNICAL was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing,  
18 manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style  
19 "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of  
20 California.  
21

22 27. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT TACTICAL GEAR HEADS  
23 LLC ("TACTICAL GEAR HEADS"), d/b/a 80-LOWER.COM; AR-  
24 15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and 80LOWERJIG.COM, was an Indiana limited liability  
25 company with its principle of business in Indianapolis, County of Marion, State of Indiana  
26 and/or in Fishers, County of Hamilton, State of Indiana. At all times pertinent hereto,  
27 TACTICAL GEAR HEADS, via its various retail websites, was engaged in the business of  
28

1 designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble  
2 “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles to consumers across the nation,  
3 including to consumers within the State of California.

4 28. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., has  
5 maintained a mailing address in Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino, State of  
6 California. Upon information and belief, TROMBLEE began doing business as  
7 USPATRIOTARMORY.COM on April 25, 2014. USPATRIOTARMORY.COM has  
8 maintained a business and mailing address in Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino,  
9 State of California. At all times pertinent hereto, USPATRIOTARMORY.COM was engaged in  
10 the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used  
11 to assemble “ghost guns,” including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles to consumers across the  
12 nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

14 29. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT INDUSTRY ARMAMENT  
15 INC. (“INDUSTRY ARMAMENT”), d/b/a  
16 AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM, was a Delaware corporation with a  
17 principal place of business in Mesa, County of Maricopa, State of Arizona. At all times  
18 pertinent hereto, INDUSTRY ARMAMENT was engaged in the business of designing,  
19 marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble “ghost guns,”  
20 including AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles to consumers across the nation, including to  
21 consumers within the State of California.

23 30. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT THUNDER GUNS LLC  
24 (“THUNDER GUNS”), d/b/a THUNDERTACTICAL.COM, was a limited liability  
25 company registered in Florida with its principal place of business in Daytona Beach, County  
26 of Volusia, State of Florida. At all times pertinent hereto, THUNDER TACTICAL was  
27 engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling  
28

1 parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to  
2 consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

3 31. DEFENDANTS DOE ONE through DOE ONE HUNDRED ("DOE  
4 DEFENDANTS") are sued herein under fictitious names. PLAINTIFF assert that DOE  
5 DEFENDANTS are engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing,  
6 manufacturing and/or selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style  
7 "ghost gun" rifles, to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of  
8 California. PLAINTIFF do not at this time know the true names or capacities of said DOE  
9 DEFENDANTS, but pray that the same may be alleged herein should that information be  
10 ascertained.  
11

12 32. The true names or capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or  
13 otherwise, of DEFENDANT DOES ONE through ONE HUNDRED, inclusive, are  
14 unknown to PLAINTIFF, who, therefore sue said DEFENDANTS by such fictitious names.  
15 PLAINTIFF are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the DEFENDANTS  
16 designated herein as a DOE is negligently, intentionally, or in some other manner,  
17 responsible for the events and happenings herein referred to and negligently, intentionally,  
18 or in some other manner, caused injury and damages proximately thereby to the PLAINTIFFS  
19 as herein alleged.  
20

21 33. DEFENDANTS were all actively engaged in the business of designing,  
22 marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling these products to California residents  
23 leading up to and during November of 2017, while emphasizing features of their products that  
24 made them particularly attractive to dangerous actors like NEAL.

25 34. All herein complained actions of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, were  
26 done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the rights and safety of others,  
27 and in a willful and reckless manner making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or  
28

1 death highly probable. DEFENDANTS' conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and  
2 malicious within the meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the  
3 imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by  
4 law. DEFENDANTS and each of them acted in a conscious disregard for the rights and  
5 safety of others, in a manner that shocks the conscience, and in a despicable manner  
6 sufficient to warrant the imposition of punitive damages against each and every  
7 DEFENDANT sued herein.  
8

9 **CASE SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS**

10 35. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
11 though set out in full herein.

12 **A. The "Ghost Gun" Industry Negligently and Knowingly Arms Criminals and**  
13 **Other Dangerous People Like Neal and Intentionally Circumvents California**  
14 **and Federal Firearms Laws**

15 36. Every year in America, firearms are used to commit over 500,000 crimes, and  
16 over 100,000 people are shot – close to 40,000 fatally.

17 37. Federal and state laws recognize the grave risk posed by firearms in the wrong  
18 hands, and as a result, regulate and restrict their sale and possession in numerous ways.

19 38. Only FFLs may engage in the business of selling firearms. Felons, domestic  
20 abusers, the dangerously mentally ill, and certain other categories of people are deemed to  
21 pose too great a danger to themselves or others are prohibited from possessing guns as a  
22 matter of federal and/or state law. FFLs are required to conduct background checks on gun  
23 buyers to prevent sales to such prohibited purchasers. Firearms sold by FFLs must include  
24 stamped serial numbers, to enable accurate record keeping and aid law enforcement in  
25 tracing the gun to its initial retail seller if it is later misused in a crime. Such tracing can help  
26 identify the chain of possession and ultimate user of such a crime gun.  
27  
28

1           39. FFLs are also required to exercise common sense in protecting the public by  
2 refusing firearms sales, even where a buyer passes a background check, if the buyer is  
3 displaying disturbing or erratic behavior suggesting a significant psychological disturbance.  
4 A FFL always retains discretion to refuse a firearms sale for any reason.

5           40. A FFL must carefully learn and comply with all federal laws, as well as the  
6 laws of the state in which it resides and, for certain sales to residents of other states, the laws  
7 of those states. Some states, like California, prohibit sales of military-style assault weapons  
8 like AR-15 style rifles.  
9

10          41. DEFENDANTS sought – and continue to seek -- to undermine and  
11 circumvent these federal and state public safety laws.

12          42. DEFENDANTS are not FFLs. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANTS  
13 knew, and they continue to know, that law-abiding persons who desire firearms can and do  
14 obtain manufactured firearms through FFLs.

15          43. DEFENDANTS are companies and entities who chose, at all times pertinent  
16 hereto, to manufacture and/or sold unserialized, unfinished firearms parts (such as frames  
17 and receivers) or firearms assembly kits that can be used to produce “ghost guns,” including  
18 AR-15 style “ghost gun rifles.”  
19

20          44. Much of DEFENDANTS’ business involves online sales, and  
21 DEFENDANTS, at all times pertinent hereto, marketed, advertised, targeted and/or sold their  
22 products to individuals across the country, including in California.

23          45. DEFENDANTS, at all times pertinent hereto, manufactured and/or sold  
24 “ghost gun” parts that require very limited additional milling before they can be easily  
25 combined with other largely unregulated gun parts – which are often included in  
26 DEFENDANTS’ assembly kits— to form a fully functioning “ghost gun.”  
27  
28

1           46. One common “ghost gun” part sold by DEFENDANTS is an 80% receiver,  
2 which is designed to fall just outside of the federal definition of a “firearm” so as to evade  
3 federally required background checks and other regulations applicable to “firearms.”

4           47. The process of converting such parts into a “ghost gun,” whether it be a semi-  
5 automatic handgun or an AR-15 style assault rifle, involves just a few steps.  
6 DEFENDANTS’ parts/kits can be used to create a fully functional “ghost gun” in as little as  
7 a few minutes without the consumer possessing any specialized skill or abilities.  
8

9           48. DEFENDANTS thus enabled anyone, including individuals prohibited from  
10 possessing any firearms or individuals prohibited from possessing assault weapons by virtue  
11 of state law, to build “ghost guns,” including but not limited to assault weapons.

12           49. Once assembled, “ghost guns” are just as deadly and dangerous as traditional  
13 firearms.

14           50. DEFENDANTS purposefully chose – and continue to choose-- not to stamp  
15 serial numbers on these parts or other parts included in their firearms assembly kits. This  
16 means that the “ghost guns” produced from DEFENDANTS’ products cannot be traced back  
17 to the initial manufacturer or seller, making it harder to identify the chain of possession and  
18 ultimate user of a gun recovered from a crime scene. This makes the parts/kits used to  
19 assemble these weapons highly attractive to criminals and illegal gun traffickers.  
20

21           51. Because DEFENDANTS’ products were – and continue to be – readily  
22 available online for purchase with no background check, they are also very attractive to  
23 criminals, prohibited domestic abusers, and other dangerous individuals who would  
24 otherwise be prevented from purchasing a gun due to the inability to pass a background  
25 check.

26           52. Similarly, because DEFENDANTS’ products were – and continue to be –  
27 capable of purchase without the buyer having any interaction with an FFL, these products are  
28



1 also attractive and accessible to individuals with psychological or behavioral issues who fear  
2 they may not be able to pass muster at a responsible FFL.

3 53. DEFENDANTS were, and still are, well aware that, as a special agent in  
4 charge of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' ("ATF") Los Angeles  
5 field division recently told reporters, "Criminals are making their own weapons because they  
6 cannot buy them legally ... or they are paying other people to make those guns for them to  
7 get around the gun laws."  
8

9 54. DEFENDANTS intentionally targeted and continue to target precisely the  
10 criminals and other dangerous parties described above.

11 55. In their marketing and advertising, DEFENDANTS purposefully emphasize  
12 the untraceable nature of "ghost guns" due the absence of a serial number as a major selling  
13 point.

14 56. In their marketing and advertising, DEFENDANTS purposefully emphasize  
15 the fact that their products can be purchased without a background check or interaction with  
16 an FFL as major selling points.  
17

18 57. DEFENDANTS' marketing to the criminal market includes but is not limited  
19 to the following examples:

- 20 a. RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM emphasizes that its products allow the  
21 production of unserialized weapons. *See*  
22 <https://www.rbttacticaltooling.com/about/>. One of its AR-15 receivers  
23 includes a stamp of an individual giving the middle finger to law enforcement  
24 personnel who would be looking for a serial number to trace a "ghost gun"  
25 recovered from a crime scene *See*  
26 <https://www.rbttacticaltooling.com/product/magpul-lower-receiver-ar-15/>:  
27  
28



- b. A Q & A section on one of TACTICAL GEAR HEAD's retail websites includes this disclosure: "An AR-15 built using an 80% lower [receiver] will have no serialization or paperwork attached to it by default. Therefore, it is typically impossible to determine the firearm's origin or history." *See* <https://www.80-lower.com/faqs/>. The site further emphasizes that a purchaser need not interact with an FFL to acquire its parts/kits and make a "ghost gun" AR-15 style rifle. *See* <https://www.80-lower.com/products/ar-15-build-kit-5-56mm-nato-16-melonite-barrel-classic-a2-handguard-w-80-lower-1-7-twist/>:



- c. INDUSTRY ARMAMENT's website states, on a page listing an AR-15 receiver for sale, that "[t]he purchase of this component does not constitute the purchase of a firearm and as such does not require a FFL for transfer." *See* <https://americanweaponscomponents.com/product/80-ar-15-forged-anodized-lower-receiver>.
- d. THUNDER GUNS' website states, on a page offering a pack of 5 AR-15 lower receivers, that "[t]hese products are not FFL items." *See* <https://thundertactical.com/product/80-ar-lower-receiver-5-pack/>.

58. The above examples are illustrative rather than exhaustive. Upon information and belief, they are also identical to or essentially the same as DEFENDANTS' marketing

1 tactics for “ghost gun” parts/kits that can be assembled into AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles  
2 during the relevant time period.

3 59. Sales of “ghost gun” parts/kits have increased significantly in recent years.  
4 Not surprisingly, the use of “ghost guns” in crimes has also increased exponentially.

5 60. According to ATF, 30 percent of all guns recovered at California crime scenes  
6 are now untraceable “ghost guns.”

7 61. “Ghost guns” – and, in particular, AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles—have been  
8 used in many incidents of violence in California. For example:  
9

10 a. In June 2013, John Zawahri went on a shooting spree with a “ghost gun” and  
11 killed five people in Santa Monica, California. Zawahri, who had a  
12 documented history of mental illness, was a prohibited purchaser and the  
13 “ghost gun” he used was an AR-15 style rifle.

14 b. In July 2015, Scott Bertics shot and killed a woman with whom he was  
15 involved in a romantic relationship and he then used a second gun to kill  
16 himself in Walnut Creek, California. Both of the guns used were “ghost  
17 guns.”

18 c. In July 2015, in Stockton, California, gunmen used an AK-47-style “ghost  
19 gun” in an attempted bank robbery, and held three people hostage.

20 d. In June 2019, 26-year-old Sacramento Police Officer Tara O’Sullivan was  
21 shot and killed with an AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifle while responding to a  
22 domestic disturbance call.

23 e. In August 2019, a convicted felon used an AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifle to  
24 kill California Highway Patrol officer Andre Moya and wound two of his  
25 colleagues, during a freeway shootout in Riverside, California.

26 62. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS were aware of one or all of  
27 these and other incidents involving the unlawful use of “ghost guns.”  
28

63. AR-15 style rifles are, and were, prohibited assault weapons under California  
law. *See* Cal. Pen. Code § 30510(a)(5) (assault weapons include semiautomatic rifles within  
the “Colt AR-15 series”); § 30510(f) (“As used in this section, ‘series’ includes all other  
models that are only variations, with minor differences, of those models listed in subdivision

1 (a), regardless of the manufacturer.”); § 30605(a) (criminalizing possession of an assault  
2 weapon).

3 64. Federal law requires all FFLs—even those outside of a purchaser’s state—to  
4 comply with the laws of a purchaser’s state when selling long guns like AR-15 style rifles.  
5 *See* 18 U.S.C. § 922(b)(3).

6 65. California’s ban on AR-15 style rifles is a reasonable and responsible reaction  
7 to the grave threat that AR-15 style weapons pose to the health and safety of Californians.  
8 These types of weapons are favored by mass shooters. As illustrative examples, in addition  
9 to this case, the shooters in the Aurora, Colorado movie theater shooting in July 2012, the  
10 Newtown, Connecticut elementary school shooting in December 2012, and the  
11 aforementioned Santa Monica, California shooting in June 2013, all used AR-15 style rifles.

12 66. Upon information and belief, all DEFENDANTS were aware that AR-15 style  
13 rifles are frequently used by mass shooters.

14 67. “Ghost gun” parts/kits enable dangerous people in California like NEAL to  
15 obtain such banned weapons.

16 68. In September 2019, New York Attorney General Letitia James announced that  
17 she had ordered 16 websites to immediately stop selling products enabling the assembly of  
18 “ghost guns” in New York. Attorney General James acknowledged the reality that “ghost  
19 guns” had been providing the means to violate the state’s assault weapons ban, stating:  
20 “There is only one purpose for the products that these companies are selling — to  
21 manufacture illegal and deadly assault weapons.” James went on to note that “[t]he  
22 proliferation of these types of weapons has not only caused indescribable suffering across the  
23 country, but gravely endangers every New Yorker.” DEFENDANTS’ business practices  
24 similarly undermine California’s assault weapons ban and endanger every Californian.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           69. DEFENDANTS could have taken steps to avoid supplying individuals in  
2 California with prohibited assault weapons and/or violating various federal firearms laws.  
3 Below is a non-exhaustive list of feasible steps that a reasonable and law-abiding company  
4 would have taken to avoid undermining California law and/or federal law:

- 5           a. DEFENDANTS could have blocked Internet Protocol (“IP”) addresses  
6 associated with California from accessing their websites and/or the portions of  
7 their websites listing products enabling the assembly of AR-15 style “ghost  
8 gun” rifles;  
9           b. DEFENDANTS could have refused to ship such products to California;  
10           c. DEFENDANTS could have required that their products only be transferred  
11 through a sale carried out by an FFL;  
12           d. DEFENDANTS could have required that only individuals who could legally  
13 purchase and possess firearms could purchase their products; and  
14           e. DEFENDANTS could have included serial numbers on their products.

15           70. Upon information and belief, none of the DEFENDANTS took these, or any  
16 other reasonable safety precautions, to prevent dangerous California residents from violating  
17 California and/or federal law and endangering the safety of others with “ghost guns”  
18 produced from DEFENDANTS products.

19           71. Instead, upon information and belief, all of the DEFENDANTS intentionally  
20 targeted California consumers.

21           72. For example, Cody Wilson of DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST GUNNER  
22 stated that he aimed to undermine gun violence prevention legislation, and in particular,  
23 California’s regulatory regime. Wilson, shortly after the Tehama attack in 2017, confirmed  
24 that much of DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST GUNNER’s business comes from  
25 California.

26           73. Similarly, on its website, BLACKHAWK specifically emphasizes that “in our  
27 home state of California, as well as almost every other state in the U.S., it is legal to build  
28 your own firearm for personal use.” See <https://www.80percentarms.com/pages/faq.html>.

          74. Upon information and belief, these and other DEFENDANTS were all  
intentionally designing, advertising, manufacturing, marketing and/or selling ghost guns

1 parts/kits designed and intended to be assembled into AR-15 style rifles to California  
2 consumers like NEAL.

3 75. DEFENDANTS also, as noted above, purposefully emphasized features of  
4 their products they knew to be particularly attractive to criminals and dangerous parties like  
5 NEAL— such as their untraceability and the absence of a background check or interaction  
6 with a FFLs.

7  
8 76. DEFENDANTS knew that “ghost guns” are frequently used by criminals and  
9 dangerous individuals and have continued to gain additional knowledge of this reality.

10 77. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS have, nevertheless, not changed  
11 their reckless and unlawful business practices.

12 **B. “Ghost Guns” Were Used To Harm PLAINTIFF**

13 78. On November 13-14, 2017, NEAL engaged in a rampage shooting spree  
14 spanning across multiple locations in Tehama County, California which left PLAINTIFF  
15 seriously injured for life, when NEAL pulled up alongside PLAINTIFF’S car in NEAL’s  
16 stolen car on Rancho Tehama Road, in the community of Rancho Tehama Reserve (outside  
17 of the City of Corning, CA), and opened fire on PLAINTIFF, actually shooting PLAINTIFF  
18 through a femoral artery. PLAINTIFF almost bled out before he was evacuated by air  
19 ambulance and barely escaped with his life, arriving at a trauma center in Redding, CA with  
20 almost no pulse.

21  
22 79. Prior to the shooting, NEAL was prohibited from possession firearms by one  
23 or more court orders. The order(s) required authorities to arrest NEAL if he violated these  
24 orders. Multiple PLAINTIFF and/or their loved ones were named as protected parties on one  
25 or more of these orders, including PLAINTIFF BOB STEELE and G.E., as well as decedent  
26 DIANA STEELE.  
27  
28

1           80. During his rampage, NEAL was in possession of and used at least two AR-15  
2 style semiautomatic rifles. Both of these firearms were “ghost guns.”

3           81. Upon information and belief, at the time of the shooting, NEAL’s “ghost  
4 guns” lacked any identifying serial numbers.

5           82. It is unknown how and where NEAL acquired the “ghost gun” parts/kits used  
6 to assemble the weapons used in the attack. Given DEFENDANTS’ actions, it may be  
7 impossible to determine the exact manufacturer(s)/seller(s) of the “ghost gun” parts/kits  
8 NEAL used to assemble the AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles used in the attack.  
9

10          83. Upon information and belief, NEAL could not have legally acquired an AR-  
11 15 style rifle like those utilized in the attack from a FFL either inside or outside of California,  
12 because of his status as a California resident and California’s ban on the possession of assault  
13 weapons.

14          84. Upon information and belief, NEAL also could not have secured an AR-15  
15 style rifle – or, indeed, any firearm – from an FFL because he was displaying erratic and  
16 disturbing behavior for a significant period of time leading up to the shooting due to severe  
17 mental illness.

18          85. The above discussion is not intended to be an exhaustive listing of the reasons  
19 why NEAL could not have purchased a serialized, fully assembled AR-15 style rifle from an  
20 FFL. Various other California or federal firearms restrictions may also have blocked such a  
21 sale.  
22

23          86. NEAL was only able to acquire his arsenal of weapons through the negligence  
24 of DEFENDANTS. Had DEFENDANTS complied with the law and relevant standards of  
25 care, NEAL would not have been able to use “ghost guns” to harm PLAINTIFF.

26           **C. The “Ghost Gun” Industry and Defendants’ Role as Substantial Players in A**  
27           **Market Involving Fungible, Dangerous Goods**  
28

1           87. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS were all intentionally  
2 making/marketing/selling “ghost guns” parts/kits designed and intended to be assembled into  
3 AR-15 style rifles into California leading up to and at the time of NEAL’s purchase of the  
4 relevant “ghost gun” parts/kits.

5           88. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS also all purposefully targeted a  
6 dangerous subclass of California consumers who had no or limited access to these weapons  
7 by virtue of disqualifying records, mental illness, and/or relevant legal restrictions.  
8

9           89. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in aggregate, were responsible  
10 for manufacturing and/or selling a substantial percentage of all “ghost gun” parts/kits  
11 enabling assembly of AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles which entered into California leading up  
12 to and during November 2017.

13           90. Upon information and belief, there is a substantial probability that one or  
14 more of the DEFENDANTS sold NEAL one or more “ghost gun” parts/kits used to assemble  
15 the AR-15 style rifles used in the attack, either online or via some other medium, with full  
16 knowledge that (1) NEAL was a resident of California, (2) that California prohibits the  
17 possession of AR-15 style rifles, and (3) AR-15 style rifles have frequently been used in  
18 mass shootings.  
19

20           91. Upon information and belief, there is a substantial probability that one or  
21 more of the DEFENDANTS shipped one or more “ghost gun” parts/kits used to assemble the  
22 weapons used in the attack to NEAL’s California residence.

23           92. “Ghost gun” parts/kits that can be used to assemble unserialized AR-15 style  
24 rifles are fungible products. Such parts/kits share the same core characteristics and present  
25 an equivalent risk of danger to members of the public like PLAINTIFF. These products  
26 provide dangerous parties like NEAL with an identical capability to possess untraceable  
27  
28



1 assault weapons without going through an FFL and in violation of California's assault  
2 weapons ban.

3 93. Had these one or more DEFENDANTS complied with the law and relevant  
4 standards of care, NEAL would never have had access to the relevant products. Any and all  
5 DEFENDANTS named herein could and should have made, sold, distributed and/or  
6 marketed their products with greater precautions to (1) make it more difficult for California  
7 consumers to use their products to produce dangerous weapons that violated California law  
8 and (2) to make it more difficult for dangerous individuals like NEAL to assemble "ghost  
9 guns" from their products.  
10

11 94. Without access to DEFENDANTS' one or more products, NEAL could not  
12 have assembled his "ghost guns" and could not have used them to harm PLAINTIFF.

13 95. NEAL's misuse of these assembled products was particularly foreseeable to  
14 PLAINTIFF because NEAL fell within the dangerous subclass of consumers specifically  
15 targeted by DEFENDANTS.  
16

17 **CAUSE OF ACTION I: NEGLIGENCE (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

18 96. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
19 though set out in full herein.

20 97. A seller of "ghost gun" parts/kits – particularly parts/kits intended to be  
21 assembled into highly dangerous AR-15 style weapons commonly used by mass shooters like  
22 NEAL – owes the highest degree of care to the general public when selling such items.

23 98. This standard of care imposes a duty to take all reasonable and practical safety  
24 precautions to prevent dangerous and irresponsible individuals like NEAL from gaining  
25 access to "ghost gun" parts/kits designed and intended for assembly into AR-15 style rifles.

26 99. Such safety precautions would include, but are not limited to, carefully  
27 learning and continually checking relevant state and federal firearms laws regarding assault  
28

1 weapons, never shipping to states where the possession of an AR-15 style weapon created  
2 from one of a defendant's parts/kits would be deemed illegal, and blocking all IP addresses  
3 from such states. Additionally, a responsible seller of such products would take steps to  
4 verify that only individuals legally permitted to possess firearms and not displaying signs of  
5 significant psychological disturbance were buying its products—such as by requiring all  
6 transactions to go through an FFL in the buyer's home state.

7  
8 100. Upon information and belief, none of these DEFENDANTS had, at the time  
9 NEAL purchased the relevant product(s) from the DEFENDANT(s), taken these or other  
10 reasonable safety precautions which would have blocked NEAL's purchase of the relevant  
11 products.

12 101. DEFENDANTS' violation of the above standards of care proximately caused  
13 PLAINTIFF'S harm by granting NEAL access to highly lethal weapons he could not have  
14 legally acquired.

15 102. Had NEAL been denied access to the parts/kits used to make his two AR-15  
16 style "ghost gun" rifles, he could not have used these weapons to harm PLAINTIFF.

17 103. As a direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
18 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and  
19 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF was injured and suffered grievous and permanent injuries  
20 to his physical, mental, emotional and nervous systems, all to his detriment in an amount  
21 greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.

22  
23 104. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions  
24 and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal, and  
25 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF had to, and will have to in the future, rely on surgeons and  
26 other physicians, and undergo other and further expense for his medical care, in amounts  
27 which cannot yet be fully ascertained.  
28

1           105. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions  
2 and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal, and  
3 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has lost wages and suffered great reduction in his working  
4 capacity and future wages as a result of his disabling gunshot injury proximately caused by  
5 DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and, on such information and belief  
6 states, that this said reduction in earning capacity will continue into the future in an amount  
7 which cannot yet be ascertained.  
8

9           106. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
10 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
11 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has suffer loss of companionship  
12 and consortium with his wife.

13           107. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
14 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
15 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has suffered, and will continue to  
16 suffer in the future, consequential damages and other incidental damages and out-of-pocket  
17 expenses, all to PLAINTIFF'S general damages in a sum to be determined at the time of  
18 trial.  
19

20           108. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
21 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
22 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has had to retain legal counsel to  
23 protect and vindicate his rights. Therefore, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable to  
24 PLAINTIFF for attorney's fees incurred by PLAINTIFF in a sum to be determined at the  
25 time of trial.  
26

27           109. DEFENDANTS, and each of their negligence, as set forth above, was a  
28 substantial factor in causing PLAINTIFF'S harm.

1           110. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that  
2 DEFENDANTS and each of their conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate  
3 disregard for the rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFF, and in a willful and  
4 reckless manner making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly  
5 probable. DEFENDANTS conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the  
6 meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and  
7 exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
8

9           111. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS,  
10 and each of them, are negligent or in some other way responsible for acts of which  
11 PLAINTIFF is unaware.

12           **CAUSE OF ACTION II: NEGLIGENCE PER SE FOR VIOLATION OF**  
13           **CALIFORNIA AND/OR FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS (AGAINST ALL**  
14           **DEFENDANTS)**

15           112. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
16 though set out in full herein.

17           113. NEAL's purchase of "ghost gun" parts/kits and the use of them to assemble  
18 AR-15 style rifles violated California's assault weapons ban. *See* Cal. Pen. Code §  
19 30510(a)(5) (assault weapons include semiautomatic rifles within the "Colt AR-15 series"); §  
20 30510(f) ("As used in this section, 'series' includes all other models that are only variations,  
21 with minor differences, of those models listed in subdivision (a), regardless of the  
22 manufacturer."); § 30605(a) (criminalizing possession of an assault weapon).

23           114. DEFENDANTS are manufacturer/sellers of "ghost gun" parts/kits who  
24 intentionally targeted – and continue to target -- the California market and ship "ghost gun"  
25 parts/kits designed for assembly into AR-15 style rifles to California consumers like NEAL.  
26 DEFENDANTS did so, and continue to do so, with the knowledge and intention that those  
27 consumers will use these products to assemble weapons prohibited under California law.  
28

1           115. All of the DEFENDANTS are, thus, responsible as knowing accomplices, for  
2 their consumers' direct violations of, at minimum, California's ban on the possession of  
3 assault weapons. *See* Cal. Pen. Code § 31 (anyone who "aid[s] and abet[s]" in the  
4 commission of an offense is a principal); § 971 ("all persons concerned in the commission of  
5 a crime, who by the operation of other provisions of this code are principals therein, shall  
6 hereafter be prosecuted, tried and punished as principals"); § 27(a)(1) (California has  
7 jurisdiction over crimes where at least part of the offense takes place within the state).

9           116. All of the DEFENDANTS may also be responsible, either directly or as an  
10 accomplice, for violation one or more additional state or federal firearms laws, including, but  
11 not limited to, various provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968 or the National Firearms  
12 Act.

13           117. In addition to these laws explicitly referencing firearms, DEFENDANTS also  
14 violated California statutes prohibiting unfair, immoral and reckless business practices and  
15 the creation and maintenance of public nuisances, as discussed further below. *See* Cal. Bus.  
16 & Prof Code § 17200"; Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3479, 3480.

17           118. Whichever DEFENDANT or DEFENDANTS are responsible, either directly  
18 or as an accomplice, for selling NEAL one or more "ghost gun" parts/kits in violation of one  
19 or more statutes including, at minimum, California's assault weapons ban, breached the  
20 standard of care imposed by statute.

22           119. This violation proximately caused PLAINTIFF'S harm by providing NEAL  
23 access to highly lethal weapons that he could not have legally acquired in California.

24           120. Had NEAL been denied access to the "ghost gun" parts/kits used to make his  
25 two AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles, he could not have used these weapons to harm  
26 PLAINTIFF.

27           121. As a direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
28

1 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and  
2 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF was injured and suffered grievous and permanent injuries  
3 to his physical, mental, emotional and nervous systems, all to his detriment in an amount  
4 greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.

5 122. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions  
6 and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal, and  
7 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF had to, and will have to in the future, rely on surgeons and  
8 other physicians, and undergo other and further expense for his medical care, in amounts  
9 which cannot yet be fully ascertained.  
10

11 123. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions  
12 and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal, and  
13 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has lost wages and suffered great reduction in his working  
14 capacity and future wages as a result of his disabling gunshot injury proximately caused by  
15 DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and, on such information and belief  
16 states, that this said reduction in earning capacity will continue into the future in an amount  
17 which cannot yet be ascertained.  
18

19 124. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
20 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
21 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has suffer loss of companionship  
22 and consortium with his wife.

23 125. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
24 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
25 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has suffered, and will continue to  
26 suffer in the future, consequential damages and other incidental damages and out-of-pocket  
27 expenses, all to PLAINTIFF'S general damages in a sum to be determined at the time of  
28

1 trial.

2 126. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
3 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
4 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has had to retain legal counsel to  
5 protect and vindicate his rights. Therefore, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable to  
6 PLAINTIFF for attorney's fees incurred by PLAINTIFF in a sum to be determined at the  
7 time of trial.  
8

9 127. DEFENDANTS, and each of their negligence, as set forth above, was a  
10 substantial factor in causing PLAINTIFF'S harm.

11 128. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that  
12 DEFENDANTS and each of their conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate  
13 disregard for the rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFF, and in a willful and  
14 reckless manner making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly  
15 probable. DEFENDANTS conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the  
16 meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and  
17 exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
18

19 129. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS,  
20 and each of them, are negligent or in some other way responsible for acts of which  
21 PLAINTIFF are unaware.

22 **CAUSE OF ACTION III: NEGLIGENT ENTRUSTMENT**  
23 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

24 130. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
25 though set out in full herein.

26 131. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS purposefully targeted residents  
27 of states with strict gun violence prevention regimes, like California, who were seeking to  
28 bypass the laws of their home state.

1           132. By targeting and supplying dangerous individuals already showing contempt  
2 for the rule of law and disrespect towards the safety rules accepted by their communities,  
3 DEFENDANTS were purposefully selling to a class of purchasers who were inherently  
4 showing a high likelihood of misusing their “ghost gun” parts/kits in a dangerous manner that  
5 would cause harm to third parties like PLAINTIFF.

6           133. Whichever DEFENDANT or DEFENDANTS sold or shipped one or more  
7 “ghost gun” parts/kits capable of and intended to be assembled into AR-15 style rifles  
8 prohibited by California law to NEAL, despite knowing that he was a California resident and  
9 that California prohibits such weapons were, thus, negligently entrusting these one or more  
10 items.

11           134. This violation of relevant standards of care proximately caused PLAINTIFF’S  
12 harm by granting NEAL access to highly lethal weapons that he could not have legally  
13 acquired in California.

14           135. Had NEAL been denied access to the “ghost gun” parts/kits he used to  
15 assemble his two AR-15 style “ghost gun” rifles, he could not have used these weapons to  
16 harm PLAINTIFF.

17           136. As a direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
18 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and  
19 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF was injured and suffered grievous and permanent injuries  
20 to his physical, mental, emotional and nervous systems, all to his detriment in an amount  
21 greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.

22           137. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions  
23 and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal, and  
24 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF had to, and will have to in the future, rely on surgeons and  
25 other physicians, and undergo other and further expense for his medical care, in amounts  
26  
27  
28



1 which cannot yet be fully ascertained.

2 138. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions  
3 and conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal, and  
4 dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has lost wages and suffered great reduction in his working  
5 capacity and future wages as a result of his disabling gunshot injury proximately caused by  
6 DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and, on such information and belief  
7 states, that this said reduction in earning capacity will continue into the future in an amount  
8 which cannot yet be ascertained.  
9

10 139. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
11 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
12 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has suffer loss of companionship  
13 and consortium with his wife.

14 140. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
15 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
16 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has suffered, and will continue to  
17 suffer in the future, consequential damages and other incidental damages and out-of-pocket  
18 expenses, all to PLAINTIFF'S general damages in a sum to be determined at the time of  
19 trial.  
20

21 141. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
22 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
23 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF has had to retain legal counsel to  
24 protect and vindicate his rights. Therefore, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable to  
25 PLAINTIFF for attorney's fees incurred by PLAINTIFF in a sum to be determined at the  
26 time of trial.  
27

28 142. DEFENDANTS negligent entrustment of the dangerous instrumentalities, as

1 set forth above, was a substantial factor in causing PLAINTIFF'S harm.

2 143. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that  
3 DEFENDANTS and each of their conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate  
4 disregard for the rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFF, and in a willful and  
5 reckless manner making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly  
6 probable. DEFENDANTS conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the  
7 meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and  
8 exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
9

10 144. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that defendants, and  
11 each of them, are negligent or in some other way responsible for acts of which PLAINTIFF  
12 are unaware.

13 **CAUSE OF ACTION IV: PUBLIC NUISANCE (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

14 145. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
15 though set out in full herein.

16 146. By negligently, recklessly, and/or intentionally selling vast quantities of  
17 "ghost gun" parts/kits enabling the assembly of AR-15 style rifles to buyers in California in  
18 violation of, at a minimum, California law, DEFENDANTS have negligently and/or  
19 knowingly participated in creating and maintaining an unreasonable interference with the  
20 rights held in common by the general public. This constitutes a public nuisance under  
21 California law, including California Civil Code §§ 3479 and 3480.  
22

23 147. Without limitation, the acts of DEFENDANTS as alleged herein caused,  
24 created, and continue to maintain a substantial and unreasonable interference with the  
25 public's health, safety, convenience, comfort, peace, and use of public property and/or  
26 private property. These activities are injurious to health and offensive to the senses so as to  
27 interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property in an entire community or  
28

1 neighborhood. Numerous members of the public are threatened, killed, injured, or are  
2 victims of criminal acts as a result of “ghost gun” parts/kits sold by DEFENDANTS.  
3 DEFENDANTS’ acts and omissions as alleged herein cause a substantial and unreasonable  
4 increase in the number of members of the general public who are threatened, killed, and  
5 injured by “ghost guns.”

6  
7 148. The acts and omissions of DEFENDANTS, as alleged herein, substantially  
8 and unreasonably interfere with the public’s use of public facilities, including the use of  
9 public highways and walkways. Public highways and walkways are made substantially and  
10 unreasonably unsafe because of the presence of ghost guns intentionally, negligently and  
11 unlawfully supplied by DEFENDANTS.

12 149. DEFENDANTS’ acts and omissions as alleged herein substantially and  
13 unreasonably (a) increase the number of “ghost guns” in and on public facilities, including on  
14 public highways and walkways; (b) increase the degree to which unlawful possessors in and  
15 on public facilities, including on highways and walkways, are illegally armed with weapons;  
16 and (c) allow for banned assault weapons to be present in California, including on public  
17 highways and walkways.

18  
19 150. DEFENDANTS’ acts and omissions as alleged herein cause substantial and  
20 unreasonable interferences with the public’s health, safety, convenience, comfort, and peace  
21 in numerous other ways, including: (a) increasing the number of unlawful possessors of  
22 weapons who use these weapons to commit violent crimes against innocent members of the  
23 general public; (b) increasing the number and severity of property crimes committed by those  
24 in possession of “ghost guns” against innocent members of the general public; (c) increasing  
25 the number and severity of incidents in which those in possession of “ghost guns” disturb the  
26 peace by being disorderly; and (d) increasing the amount of society’s resources that are  
27 diverted toward dealing with the problems associated with the possession of “ghost guns.”  
28

1           151. DEFENDANTS know or have reason to know that the acts and omissions  
2 alleged herein caused substantial and unreasonable interferences with the public's health,  
3 safety, convenience, comfort, peace, and use of public facilities. DEFENDANTS' acts and  
4 omissions as alleged herein were undertaken with negligent and/or intentional disregard of  
5 the rights of the general public. DEFENDANTS knew that they could have taken  
6 precautions as outlined above that would have eliminated or minimized the injuries to the  
7 general public. Instead they chose not to take those precautions and, in fact, actively  
8 exacerbated these risks with the irresponsible marketing campaign described herein in order  
9 to maximize their profits.  
10

11           152. DEFENDANTS' interference with the public's health, safety, convenience,  
12 comfort, peace, and use of public facilities is unreasonable, unlawful, substantial, significant,  
13 continuing, and long-lasting. This interference, is annoying, offensive, and disturbing to an  
14 ordinary person. The interference is not insubstantial or fleeting, and involves deaths and  
15 serious injuries suffered by many people and a severe disruption of public health, peace,  
16 order, and safety.  
17

18           153. The manner in which DEFENDANTS make, sell, and market their products  
19 has no social utility. Even if it did, the seriousness of their interference with the rights of the  
20 public and harm they cause far outweighs any social utility associated with DEFENDANTS'  
21 conduct.  
22

23           154. DEFENDANTS' unlawful, negligent and/or intentional creation and  
24 maintenance of the public nuisance directly and proximately caused significant harm,  
25 including serious physical injury and associated harm to PLAINTIFF that is different from  
26 the harm suffered by other members of the public, including loss of enjoyment of life, as well  
27 as those damages set forth in paragraphs 121-131 above, all to their damage in an amount to  
28 be determined at a trial of this matter.

1 155. PLAINTIFF have not, at any time, consented to DEFENDANTS' conduct.

2 156. At all times herein mentioned, DEFENDANTS had notice and knowledge  
3 that their actions created a public nuisance.

4 157. PLAINTIFF are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendants and  
5 each of their, conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the  
6 rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFF, and in a willful and reckless manner  
7 making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. Defendants  
8 conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California  
9 Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and  
10 exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
11

12 **CAUSE OF ACTION V: VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS**  
13 **CODE SECTION 17200 (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**  
14 **(Unfair and Unlawful Competition in Sales Practices)**

15 158. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
16 though set out in full herein.

17 159. DEFENDANTS in the course of their retail business of selling "ghost guns,"  
18 engaged in business acts or practices that were unlawful, unfair, deceptive, or misleading,  
19 and which therefore violated Bus. & Prof Code § 17200.

20 160. By selling to NEAL, a dangerous individual, who was prohibited from  
21 purchasing and possessing firearms, "ghost gun" parts/kits for a prohibited assault-style  
22 weapons, in violation of state and/or federal law, DEFENDANTS engaged in business  
23 practices that were unlawful, immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.

24 161. Also, by supplying to a subclass of purchasers who are inherently showing a  
25 high likelihood of misusing their "ghost gun" parts/kits in a dangerous manner that would  
26 cause harm to third parties like PLAINTIFF, DEFENDANTS engaged in business practices  
27 that were unlawful, immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.  
28

1           162. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing acts and practices,  
2 DEFENDANTS have received income, profits, and other benefits, which they would not  
3 have received if DEFENDANTS had not engaged in the violations of Bus. & Prof Code  
4 § 17200 as described in this Complaint for Damages.

5           163. Further, upon information and belief, had DEFENDANTS not violated  
6 California's prohibition on such unethical and unlawful marketing and business practices,  
7 NEAL could not have acquired the parts/kits used to assemble his AR-15 style "ghost gun"  
8 rifles or used these items to harm PLAINTIFF.  
9

10           164. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that  
11 DEFENDANTS and each of their conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate  
12 disregard for the rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFF, and in a willful and  
13 reckless manner making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly  
14 probable. DEFENDANTS conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the  
15 meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and  
16 exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
17

18           165. To prevent their unjust enrichment, DEFENDANTS and each of them,  
19 should be required, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq, to  
20 disgorge their ill-gotten gains for the purpose of making full restitution to PLAINTIFF as a  
21 consequence of DEFENDANTS unlawful and unfair activities, injunctive relief, as well as  
22 all attorney's fees and costs.

23           **CAUSE OF ACTION VI: VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS**  
24           **CODE SECTION 17200 (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**  
25           **(Unfair Marketing Tactics)**

26           166. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
27 though set out in full herein.  
28

1           167. DEFENDANTS in the course of their retail business of selling ghost guns,  
2 engaged in business acts or practices that were unfair, deceptive, or misleading, and which  
3 therefore violated Bus. & Prof Code § 17200.

4           168. Specifically, by employing marketing tactics which emphasized that their  
5 products, including banned assault weapons, were untraceable and could be acquired without  
6 a background check or an interaction with an FFL, DEFENDANTS intentionally targeted  
7 prohibited persons and other dangerous individuals like NEAL. Such tactics and practices  
8 were unfair, immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.  
9

10           169. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing acts and practices,  
11 DEFENDANTS have received income, profits, and other benefits, which they would not  
12 have received if DEFENDANTS had not engaged in the violations of Bus. & Prof Code  
13 § 17200 as described in this Complaint for Damages.

14           170. Further, upon information and belief, had DEFENDANTS not violated  
15 California's prohibition on such unethical and unlawful marketing and business practices,  
16 NEAL could not have acquired the parts/kits used to assemble his AR-15 style "ghost gun"  
17 rifles or used these weapons to harm PLAINTIFF.

18           171. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that defendants and  
19 each of their conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the  
20 rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFF, and in a willful and reckless manner  
21 making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. Defendants  
22 conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California  
23 Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and  
24 exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
25

26           172. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon allege that  
27 DEFENDANTS and each of their conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate  
28

1 disregard for the rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFF, and in a willful and  
2 reckless manner making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly  
3 probable. DEFENDANTS conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the  
4 meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and  
5 exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law.

6  
7 173. To prevent their unjust enrichment, DEFENDANTS and each of them,  
8 should be required, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq, to  
9 disgorge their ill-gotten gains for the purpose of making full restitution to PLAINTIFF as a  
10 consequence of DEFENDANTS unlawful and unfair activities, injunctive relief, as well as  
11 all attorney's fees and costs.

12 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

13 174. Plaintiff requests and demands trial by jury as to each and every fact, claim,  
14 and cause of action alleged and pleaded herein.

15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**


16 175. WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment and relief against  
17 DEFENDANTS, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 18  
19 a Compensatory damages for physical and emotional pain and suffering,  
20 including those non-economic damages which are enumerated under Cal. Civil  
21 Code § 1431.2(b)(2);  
22 b Compensatory damages for past medical expenses;  
23 c Compensatory damages for future medical expenses and medical monitoring;  
24 d Compensatory damages for past and future wage loss and loss of earning  
25 capacity;  
26 e Compensatory damages for damage to or destruction of personal property;  
27 f Punitive (exemplary) damages;  
28 g Incidental damages;  
h Presumed damages;



- 1 i Nominal damages;
- 2 j Attorney's fees, including pursuant to Code of Civ. Pro. § 1021.5 (California
- 3 Private Attorney General Doctrine) and § 2033.420(a) (in the event plaintiff has
- 4 to prove up any facts which defendants refused to admit in their responses to
- 5 plaintiffs' Requests for Admissions);
- 6 k Costs of litigation;
- 7 l Pre- and post-judgment interest awardable at the highest legal rate(s) allowable,
- 8 including without limitation under Cal. Civil Code §§ 3287 and/or 3291; and
- 9 m Such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dated: November 14, 2019

By: Ben Rosenfeld  
Gerald B. Singleton  
Attorneys for Plaintiff Cardenas

# EXHIBIT B

1 DUGAN BARR .....State Bar No. 40663  
 2 DOUGLAS MUDFORD .....State Bar No. 156392  
 3 ESTEE LEWIS .....State Bar No. 268358  
 4 CATIE BARR .....State Bar No. 295538  
 5 BRANDON STORMENT .....State Bar No. 267260  
 6 BARR & MUDFORD, LLP  
 1824 Court Street/Post Office Box 994390  
 Redding, California 96099-4390  
 Telephone: (530) 243-8008  
 Facsimile: (530) 243-1648

7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**FILED**  
 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
 SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT

NOV 14 2019

BY Alma Vallejo Garcia  
 ALMA VALLEJO GARCIA, DEPUTY

9 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
 10 IN THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

12 TROY MCFADYEN, in his Individual  
 Capacity, and as Heir at Law and Successor  
 13 in Interest to MICHELLE MCFADYEN,  
 Deceased;

15 PHILLIP BOW and  
 SIA BOW, as Heirs at Law and Successors  
 16 in Interest to MICHELLE MCFADYEN,  
 Deceased;

18 BOB STEELE, a Dependent Adult, by and  
 through his Guardian ad Litem, DAVID STEELE,  
 19 Heir at Law and Successor in  
 Interest to DIANA STEELE, Deceased;

21 MICHAEL ELLIOTT, Heir at Law and  
 Successor in Interest to DANIEL LEE  
 22 ELLIOT II, Deceased, and  
 DIANA STEELE, Deceased;

24 G.E., a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad  
 Litem, ALMA FEITELBERG, Heir at Law  
 25 and Successor in Interest to DANIEL LEE  
 ELLIOT II, Deceased, and  
 26 DIANA STEELE, Deceased;

27 M.E., a Minor, by and through her Guardian ad  
 Litem, LATISHA CORNWALL, Heir at Law  
 28 and Successor in Interest to DANIEL LEE

No.

CIV DS 1935422

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

(DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL)

(Personal Injury/Wrongful Death)

CAUSES OF ACTION:

1. NEGLIGENCE

2. NEGLIGENCE PER SE

3. NEGLIGENT ENTRUSTMENT

4. PUBLIC NUISANCE

5. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND  
 PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION  
 17200 (UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL  
 SALES PRACTICES)

6. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND  
 PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION  
 17200 (UNFAIR MARKETING  
 TACTICS)

1 ELLIOT II, Deceased, and  
2 DIANA STEELE, Deceased;

3 MARCIA MCHUGH, Heir at Law and Successor  
4 in Interest to JOSEPH MCHUGH, Deceased;

5 GRACE MCHUGH, Heir at Law and Successor  
6 in Interest to JOSEPH MCHUGH, Deceased;

7 A.H., a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad  
8 Litem, MARIA MONROY;

9 TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP;

10 JOHN PHOMMATHEP SR.;

11 J.P. II, a Minor, by and through his Guardian  
12 ad Litem, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP;

13 J.P., a Minor, by and through his Guardian  
14 ad Litem, TIFFANYPHOMMATHEP;

15 N.P, a Minor, by and through his Guardian  
16 ad Litem, TIFFANYPHOMMATHEP;

17 JAMES WOODS, JR.; and

18 JAMES WOODS, SR.

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21 GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
22 GHOSTGUNNER.NET;

23 DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED d/b/a  
24 GHOSTGUNNER.NET

25 CODY WILSON d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET

26 BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP  
27 INC., d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM;

28 RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a  
RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM;

GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a

1 GHOSTGUNS.COM;  
2 GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID  
3 DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM;  
4 JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a  
5 JTACTICAL.COM;  
6 MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a  
7 5DTACTICAL.COM;  
8 TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80-  
9 LOWER.COM; AR-  
10 15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and  
11 80LOWERJIG.COM;  
12 JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a  
13 USPATRIOTARMORY.COM;  
14 INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC., d/b/a  
15 AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM;  
16 THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a  
17 THUNDERTACTICAL.COM;  
18 DOES 1-100, Inclusive,  
19 Defendants.

### COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

20 1. COMES NOW PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYEN, in his Individual Capacity,  
21 and as Heir at Law and Successor in Interest to MICHELLE MCFADYEN, Deceased ("TROY  
22 MCFADYEN"); PHILLIP BOW and SIA BOW, as Heirs at Law and Successors in Interest to  
23 MICHELLE MCFADYEN, Deceased ("PHILLIP BOW and SIA BOW"); BOB STEELE, a  
24 Dependent Adult, by and through his Guardian ad Litem, DAVID STEELE, Heir at Law and  
25 Successor in Interest to DIANA STEELE, Deceased ("BOB STEELE"); MICHAEL ELLIOTT,  
26 Heir at Law and Successor in Interest to DANIEL LEE ELLIOT II, Deceased, and DIANA  
27 STEELE, Deceased ("MICHAEL ELLIOT"); G.E., a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad  
28

1 Litem, ALMA FEITELBERG, Heir at Law and Successor in Interest to DANIEL LEE ELLIOT  
2 II, Deceased, and DIANA STEELE, Deceased ("G.E., a minor"); and M.E., a Minor, by and  
3 through her Guardian ad Litem, LATISHA CORNWALL, Heir at Law and Successor in  
4 Interest to DANIEL LEE ELLIOT II, Deceased, and DIANA STEELE, Deceased ("M.E., a  
5 minor"); MARCIA MCHUGH, Heir at Law and Successor in Interest to JOSEPH MCHUGH,  
6 Deceased ("MARCIA MCHUGH"); GRACE MCHUGH, Heir at Law and Successor in Interest  
7 to JOSEPH MCHUGH, Deceased ("GRACE MCHUGH"); A.H., a Minor, by and through his  
8 Guardian ad Litem, MARIA MONROY ("A.H., a minor"); TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP; JOHN  
9 PHOMMATHEP SR.; J.P. II, a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad Litem, TIFFANY  
10 PHOMMATHEP ("J.P. II, a minor"); J.P., a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad Litem,  
11 TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP ("J.P., a minor"); N.P, a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad  
12 Litem, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP ("N.P., minor"), JAMES WOODS, JR.; and JAMES  
13 WOODS, SR., ("collectively "PLAINTIFFS"), by and through their attorneys of record, and  
14 allege the following against DEFENDANTS GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
15 GHOSTGUNNER.NET; BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP INC., d/b/a  
16 80PERCENTARMS.COM; RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a  
17 RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM; GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM;  
18 GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM;  
19 JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM; MFY TECHNICAL  
20 SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a 5DTACTICAL.COM; TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80-  
21 LOWER.COM; AR-15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and 80LOWERJIG.COM; JAMES  
22 TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a USPATRIOTARMORY.COM; INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC.,  
23 d/b/a AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM; THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a  
24 THUNDERTACTICAL.COM; and DOES 1-50 (collectively "DEFENDANTS"). Further,  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 PLAINTIFFS demand a jury trial.

2 **INTRODUCTION**

3 2. DEFENDANTS are companies that have chosen to intentionally undermine federal  
4 and state firearms laws by designing, manufacturing, marketing, distributing and/or selling kits  
5 and firearms parts that are easily assembled by the purchaser into fully functional weapons,  
6 including AR-15 style assault weapons to consumers across the nation, including within the State  
7 of California. DEFENDANTS have chosen to engage in this business primarily by utilizing  
8 online sales that enable purchasers to acquire such weapons without a background check or any  
9 interaction with a Federal Firearms Licensee ("FFL," an authorized gun dealer) and in violation of  
10 state law restrictions governing assault weapons, including restrictions in the State of California.

11 3. The weapons assembled from DEFENDANTS' kits and firearms parts are termed  
12 "ghost guns." This name reflects the fact that such weapons lack a serial number unless  
13 specifically required by state law and are difficult, if not impossible, for law enforcement to trace  
14 back to their manufacturer/seller when recovered from a crime scene.

15 4. DEFENDANTS knew when they entered this business that they would foreseeably  
16 be supplying criminals, killers, and others whose possession of firearms pose an unacceptably  
17 high threat of injury or death to others.

18 5. DEFENDANTS further knew that selling these kits and firearm parts violated state  
19 and federal statutes applicable to the registration, ownership, sale, and marking of firearms.

20 6. DEFENDANTS refused to use reasonable safety measures that could have limited  
21 the risk of their products falling into the hands of such dangerous individuals.

22 7. Instead, DEFENDANTS targeted their business at precisely such individuals by  
23 intentionally emphasizing features of their products that make them particularly attractive to such  
24 dangerous parties as major selling points. For example, DEFENDANTS intentionally  
25 emphasized that 1) their products can be used to assemble untraceable weapons and 2) enable the  
26 purchaser to evade background checks and interaction with an FFL.

27 8. DEFENDANTS chose profits over people and public safety, and launched and  
28 maintained their business in the unreasonably dangerous manner described herein.

1           9.       Since DEFENDANTS have launched their "ghost guns" business they have  
2 learned with certainty that their business is a massive and growing source of crime guns that are  
3 claiming innocent lives in California and elsewhere.

4           10.       DEFENDANTS could have changed their business practices to institute  
5 reasonable safety measures to minimize the damage done by the problem they created. Instead  
6 DEFENDANTS have continued to choose profits over people and public safety and have  
7 doubled down on their dangerous and irresponsible practices. By doing so, DEFENDANTS  
8 have and are acting with a reckless disregard, conscious disregard or deliberate indifference to a  
9 known and obvious risk that threatens the life and safety of others.  
10

11           11.       Upon information and belief, all DEFENDANTS designed, advertised, marketed,  
12 sold, distributed and/or offered, one or more "ghost gun" kits/parts that could be easily  
13 assembled into un-serialized AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles that are prohibited under  
14 California's assault weapons ban to California residents leading up to and/or during November  
15 2017.  
16

17           12.       PLAINTIFFS bring this suit because they or their loved ones were killed or  
18 injured as a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' negligent, reckless,  
19 and intentionally unlawful actions.

20           13.       Specifically, PLAINTIFFS or their loved ones were killed or injured by a  
21 dangerous, mentally disturbed California resident named KEVIN NEAL, who was barred from  
22 firearms possession by one or more state court orders. NEAL would not have been able to  
23 legally acquire a firearm in the State of California. NEAL purchased parts/kits from one or more  
24 of the DEFENDANTS leading up to and/or during November 2017 and used these parts/kits to  
25 assemble at least two AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles barred under California's prohibition on  
26 assault weapons. NEAL used these "ghost guns" in a rampage shooting that killed or injured  
27 PLAINTIFFS or their loved ones on November 13-14, 2017.  
28



14. DEFENDANTS, upon information and belief, continue to offer these products to California residents using marketing strategies and business practices that are identical or essentially the same as those used during and before November 2017.

### JURISDICTION

1. This is a civil action for negligence and violations of the California Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § § 17200 et seq). This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action as the amount of the claims exceeds \$25,000.00

2. Venue is proper in this court because several of the DEFENDANTS, RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY d/b/a RBTACTIALTOOLING.COM, and DEFENDANT JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a USPATRIOTARMORY.COM are California residents and/or California Corporations who at all relevant times reside in and/or have their principal place of business in the City of Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino, State of California.

3. PLAINTIFFS seek an award of compensatory damages, punitive damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 3294, statutory damages pursuant to Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code § 17200, injunctive and declaratory relief, costs and expenses, and reasonable attorney's fees.

### THE PARTIES

15. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF TROY MCFADYEN was a resident of Cottonwood, County of Shasta, State of California. TROY MCFADYEN is the surviving spouse of MICHELLE MCFADYEN, deceased. TROY MCFADYEN brings this action in his individual capacity as a victim and as the heir of MICHELLE MCFADYEN, deceased.

16. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF PHILLIP BOW was a resident of the Santa Rosa, County of Sonoma, State of California. PHILLIP BOW is the surviving adult son of MICHELLE MCFADYEN, deceased.

17. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF SIA BOW was a resident of Redding,

1 County of Shasta, State of California. SIA BOW is the surviving adult daughter of MICHELLE  
2 MCFADYEN, deceased.

3 18. At all times pertinent hereto, TROY MCFADYEN, PHILLIP BOW and SIA  
4 BOW, were the surviving heirs of decedent MICHELLE MCFADYEN, based on California  
5 intestacy laws.

6  
7 19. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF BOB STEELE was a resident of  
8 Corning, County of Tehama, State of California. BOB STEELE currently resides in Red Bluff,  
9 County of Tehama, State of California. At all times pertinent hereto, BOB STEELE was  
10 incapacitated and a dependent adult due to numerous physical and mental ailments. BOB  
11 STEELE is being represented by his Guardian ad Litem, DAVID STEELE. BOB STEELE  
12 was, at all relevant times, a protected person pursuant to one or more court orders in effect  
13 against NEAL.

14  
15 20. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF MICHAEL ELLIOT was a resident of  
16 the Mayville, County of Traill, State of North Dakota.

17 21. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF G.E., an 8-year-old, was a resident of  
18 Corning, County of Tehama, State of California. G.E. is currently a resident of Ware, County  
19 of Hampshire, State of Massachusetts, and is being represented by his Guardian ad Litem,  
20 ALMA FEITELBERG. G.E. was, all relevant times, a protected person pursuant to one or more  
21 court orders in effect against NEAL.

22  
23 22. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF M.E., a 10-year-old, was a resident of  
24 Rio Linda, County of Sacramento, State of California. M.E. is being represented by her  
25 Guardian ad Litem, LATISHA CORNWALL. M.E. remains a resident of the County of  
26 Sacramento.

27 23. BOB STEELE was the surviving husband of decedent, DIANA STEELE, and is  
28

1 an heir to decedent DIANA STEELE. DIANA STEELE was also, at all relevant times, a  
2 protected person pursuant to one or more court orders in effect against NEAL.

3 24. At all times pertinent hereto, MICHAEL ELLIOT, G.E. and M.E., were the  
4 surviving children and heirs of decedent DANIEL ELLIOTT II, and the additional heirs of their  
5 grandmother, DIANA STEELE, based on California intestacy laws.  
6

7 25. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF MARCIA MCHUGH was a resident  
8 of the City of Corning, County of Tehama, State of California, and is the surviving mother, who  
9 was dependent on JOSEPH MCHUGH.

10 26. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF GRACE MCHUGH was a resident of  
11 the Ceres, County of Stanislaus, State of California, and is the surviving adult daughter of  
12 JOSEPH MCHUGH.  
13

14 27. At all times pertinent hereto, MARCIA MCHUGH and GRACE MCHUGH,  
15 were the surviving heirs of decedent JOSEPH MCHUGH, based on California intestacy laws.

16 28. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF A.H., a minor, was a resident of the  
17 Corning, County of Tehama, State of California. A.H. is being represented by his Guardian ad  
18 Litem, MARIA MONROY.

19 29. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP is and  
20 was a resident of Corning in the County of Tehama, State of California.  
21

22 30. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF JOHN PHOMMATHEP is and was a  
23 resident of Corning in the County of Tehama, State of California.

24 31. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF J.P. II., a minor is and was a resident  
25 of Corning in the County of Tehama, State of California. J.P. II., a minor, is being represented  
26 by his Guardian ad Litem, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP.  
27

28 32. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF J.P., a minor is and was a resident of

1 Corning in the County of Tehama, State of California. J.P. is being represented by his Guardian  
2 ad Litem, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP.

3 33. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF N.P., a minor is and was a resident of  
4 Corning in the County of Tehama, State of California. N.P. is being represented by his  
5 Guardian ad Litem, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP.

6 34. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF JAMES WOODS JR., is and was a  
7 resident of Corning in the County of Tehama, State of California.

8 35. At all times pertinent hereto, PLAINTIFF JAMES WOODS SR., is and was a  
9 resident of Corning in the County of Tehama, State of California.

10 36. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT GHOST GUNNER INC. ("GHOST  
11 GUNNER"), d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET, was a Texas corporation with its principal place of  
12 business in Austin, County of Travis, State of Texas. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST  
13 GUNNER was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and  
14 selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to  
15 consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California. GHOST  
16 GUNNER's registered agent is a Texas company named DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED.  
17 DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED and GHOST GUNNER ("DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST  
18 GUNNER") should be viewed as interchangeable and inextricably linked for purposes of this  
19 Complaint for Damages; upon information and belief, the same individual, Cody Wilson, was  
20 involved with running both entities. DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED's website still links to GHOST  
21 GUNNER. See <https://defdist.org>.

22 37. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT BLACKHAWK  
23 MANUFACTURING GROUP INC. ("BLACKHAWK"), d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM, was  
24 a California domestic corporation, with its principal place of business in the Garden Grove,  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 County of Orange, State of California. At all times pertinent hereto, BLACKHAWK was  
2 engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and/or selling  
3 parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers  
4 across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

5  
6 38. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANTS RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB  
7 BEEZLEY have maintained addresses in Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino, State of  
8 California and were doing business as RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM. At all times pertinent  
9 hereto, RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM has maintained a business address in Apple Valley,  
10 County of San Bernardino, State of California. At all times pertinent hereto,  
11 RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM was engaged in the business of designing, marketing,  
12 distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-  
13 15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the  
14 State of California.  
15

16 39. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT GHOST AMERICA LLC  
17 ("GHOST AMERICA"), d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM, was a California limited liability company  
18 with its principal place of business in Yorba Linda, County of Orange, State of California. At  
19 all times pertinent hereto, GHOST AMERICA was engaged in the business of designing,  
20 marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns,"  
21 including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation, including to consumers  
22 within the State of California.  
23

24 40. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST FIREARMS LLC ("GHOST  
25 FIREARMS"), d/b/a GRID DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM, was a limited liability  
26 company registered in Florida with its principal place of business in Daytona Beach, County of  
27 Volusia, State of Florida. At all times pertinent hereto, GHOST FIREARMS was engaged in  
28

1 the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to  
2 assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the  
3 nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

4 41. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC.  
5 ("JUGGERNAUT"), d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM, was a California corporation with its principal  
6 place of business in Orange, County of Orange, State of California. At all times pertinent  
7 hereto, JUGGERNAUT was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing,  
8 manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style  
9 "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of  
10 California.  
11

12 42. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS  
13 LLC ("MFY TECHNICAL"), d/b/a 5DTACTICAL.COM, was a Massachusetts limited liability  
14 company with its principal place of business in Westborough, County of Worcester, State of  
15 Massachusetts. At all times pertinent hereto, MFY TECHNICAL was engaged in the business  
16 of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble  
17 "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation,  
18 including to consumers within the State of California.  
19

20 43. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC  
21 ("TACTICAL GEAR HEADS"), d/b/a 80-LOWER.COM; AR-15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM;  
22 and 80LOWERJIG.COM, was an Indiana limited liability company with its principle of  
23 business in Indianapolis, County of Marion, State of Indiana and/or in Fishers, County of  
24 Hamilton, State of Indiana. At all times pertinent hereto, TACTICAL GEAR HEADS, via its  
25 various retail websites, was engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing,  
26 manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style  
27  
28

1 "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of  
2 California.

3 44. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., has  
4 maintained a mailing address in Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino, State of California.  
5 Upon information and belief, TROMBLEE began doing business as  
6 USPATRIOTARMORY.COM on April 25, 2014. USPATRIOTARMORY.COM has  
7 maintained a business and mailing address in Apple Valley, County of San Bernardino, State of  
8 California. At all times pertinent hereto, USPATRIOTARMORY.COM was engaged in the  
9 business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to  
10 assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the  
11 nation, including to consumers within the State of California.  
12

13 45. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC.  
14 ("INDUSTRY ARMAMENT"), d/b/a AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM, was a  
15 Delaware corporation with a principal place of business in Mesa, County of Maricopa, State of  
16 Arizona. At all times pertinent hereto, INDUSTRY ARMAMENT was engaged in the business  
17 of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to assemble  
18 "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the nation,  
19 including to consumers within the State of California.  
20

21 46. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANT THUNDER GUNS LLC  
22 ("THUNDER GUNS"), d/b/a THUNDERTACTICAL.COM, was a limited liability company  
23 registered in Florida with its principal place of business in Daytona Beach, County of Volusia,  
24 State of Florida. At all times pertinent hereto, THUNDER TACTICAL was engaged in the  
25 business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing and selling parts/kits used to  
26 assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles to consumers across the  
27  
28

1 nation, including to consumers within the State of California.

2 47. DEFENDANTS DOE ONE through DOE ONE HUNDRED ("DOE  
3 DEFENDANTS") are sued herein under fictitious names. PLAINTIFFS assert that DOE  
4 DEFENDANTS are engaged in the business of designing, marketing, distributing, manufacturing  
5 and/or selling parts/kits used to assemble "ghost guns," including AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles,  
6 to consumers across the nation, including to consumers within the State of California.  
7 PLAINTIFFS do not at this time know the true names or capacities of said DOE DEFENDANTS,  
8 but pray that the same may be alleged herein should that information be ascertained.  
9

10 48. The true names or capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or  
11 otherwise, of DEFENDANT DOES ONE through ONE HUNDRED, inclusive, are unknown to  
12 PLAINTIFFS, who, therefore sue said DEFENDANTS by such fictitious names. PLAINTIFFS  
13 are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the DEFENDANTS designated herein  
14 as a DOE is negligently, intentionally, or in some other manner, responsible for the events and  
15 happenings herein referred to and negligently, intentionally, or in some other manner, caused  
16 injury and damages proximately thereby to the PLAINTIFFS as herein alleged.  
17

18 49. DEFENDANTS were all actively engaged in the business of designing, marketing,  
19 distributing, manufacturing and/or selling these products to California residents leading up to and  
20 during November of 2017, while emphasizing features of their products that made them  
21 particularly attractive to dangerous actors like NEAL.

22 50. All herein complained actions of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, were done  
23 in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the rights and safety of others, and in a  
24 willful and reckless manner making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly  
25 probable. DEFENDANTS' conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the  
26 meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and  
27 exemplary damages against them in the fullest extent allowed by law. DEFENDANTS and each  
28



1 of them acted in a conscious disregard for the rights and safety of others, in a manner that  
2 shocks the conscience, and in a despicable manner sufficient to warrant the imposition  
3 of punitive damages against each and every DEFENDANT sued herein.

4 **CASE SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS**

5 51. PLAINTIFFS hereby incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
6 though set out in full herein.

7  
8 A. **The "Ghost Gun" Industry Negligently and Knowingly Arms Criminals and Other**  
9 **Dangerous People Like Neal and Intentionally Circumvents California and Federal**  
10 **Firearms Laws**

11 52. Every year in America, firearms are used to commit over 500,000 crimes, and  
12 over 100,000 people are shot – close to 40,000 fatally.

13 53. Federal and state laws recognize the grave risk posed by firearms in the wrong  
14 hands, and as a result, regulate and restrict their sale and possession in numerous ways.

15 54. Only FFLs may engage in the business of selling firearms. Felons, domestic  
16 abusers, the dangerously mentally ill, and certain other categories of people are deemed to pose  
17 too great a danger to themselves or others are prohibited from possessing guns as a matter of  
18 federal and/or state law. FFLs are required to conduct background checks on gun buyers to  
19 prevent sales to such prohibited purchasers. Firearms sold by FFLs must include stamped serial  
20 numbers, to enable accurate record keeping and aid law enforcement in tracing the gun to its  
21 initial retail seller if it is later misused in a crime. Such tracing can help identify the chain of  
22 possession and ultimate user of such a crime gun.

23 55. FFLs are also required to exercise common sense in protecting the public by  
24 refusing firearms sales, even where a buyer passes a background check, if the buyer is displaying  
25 disturbing or erratic behavior suggesting a significant psychological disturbance. A FFL always  
26 retains discretion to refuse a firearms sale for any reason.

27 56. A FFL must carefully learn and comply with all federal laws, as well as the laws  
28 of the state in which it resides and, for certain sales to residents of other states, the laws of those

1 states. Some states, like California, prohibit sales of military-style assault weapons like AR-15  
2 style rifles.

3 57. DEFENDANTS sought – and continue to seek -- to undermine and circumvent  
4 these federal and state public safety laws.

5 58. DEFENDANTS are not FFLs. At all times pertinent hereto, DEFENDANTS  
6 knew, and they continue to know, that law-abiding persons who desire firearms can and do  
7 obtain manufactured firearms through FFLs.

8 59. DEFENDANTS are companies and entities who chose, at all times pertinent  
9 hereto, to manufacture and/or sold unserialized, unfinished firearms parts (such as frames and  
10 receivers) or firearms assembly kits that can be used to produce “ghost guns,” including AR-15  
11 style “ghost gun rifles.”

12 60. Much of DEFENDANTS’ business involves online sales, and DEFENDANTS, at  
13 all times pertinent hereto, marketed, advertised, targeted and/or sold their products to individuals  
14 across the country, including in California.

15 61. DEFENDANTS, at all times pertinent hereto, manufactured and/or sold “ghost  
16 gun” parts that require very limited additional milling before they can be easily combined with  
17 other largely unregulated gun parts – which are often included in DEFENDANTS’ assembly  
18 kits— to form a fully functioning “ghost gun.”

19 62. One common “ghost gun” part sold by DEFENDANTS is an 80% receiver, which  
20 is designed to fall just outside of the federal definition of a “firearm” so as to evade federally  
21 required background checks and other regulations applicable to “firearms.”

22 63. The process of converting such parts into a “ghost gun,” whether it be a semi-  
23 automatic handgun or an AR-15 style assault rifle, involves just a few steps. DEFENDANTS’  
24 parts/kits can be used to create a fully functional “ghost gun” in as little as a few minutes without  
25 the consumer possessing any specialized skill or abilities.  
26  
27  
28

1           64. DEFENDANTS thus enabled anyone, including individuals prohibited from  
2 possessing any firearms or individuals prohibited from possessing assault weapons by virtue of  
3 state law, to build "ghost guns," including but not limited to assault weapons.

4           65. Once assembled, "ghost guns" are just as deadly and dangerous as traditional  
5 firearms.

6           66. DEFENDANTS purposefully chose – and continue to choose-- not to stamp serial  
7 numbers on these parts or other parts included in their firearms assembly kits. This means that  
8 the "ghost guns" produced from DEFENDANTS' products cannot be traced back to the initial  
9 manufacturer or seller, making it harder to identify the chain of possession and ultimate user of a  
10 gun recovered from a crime scene. This makes the parts/kits used to assemble these weapons  
11 highly attractive to criminals and illegal gun traffickers.

12           67. Because DEFENDANTS' products were – and continue to be – readily available  
13 online for purchase with no background check, they are also very attractive to criminals,  
14 prohibited domestic abusers, and other dangerous individuals who would otherwise be prevented  
15 from purchasing a gun due to the inability to pass a background check.

16           68. Similarly, because DEFENDANTS' products were – and continue to be – capable  
17 of purchase without the buyer having any interaction with an FFL, these products are also  
18 attractive and accessible to individuals with psychological or behavioral issues who fear they  
19 may not be able to pass muster at a responsible FFL.

20           69. DEFENDANTS were, and still are, well aware that, as a special agent in charge  
21 of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' ("ATF") Los Angeles field  
22 division recently told reporters, "Criminals are making their own weapons because they cannot  
23 buy them legally ... or they are paying other people to make those guns for them to get around  
24 the gun laws."


25           70. DEFENDANTS intentionally targeted and continue to target precisely the  
26 criminals and other dangerous parties described above.  
27  
28

71. In their marketing and advertising, DEFENDANTS purposefully emphasize the untraceable nature of "ghost guns" due the absence of a serial number as a major selling point.

72. In their marketing and advertising, DEFENDANTS purposefully emphasize the fact that their products can be purchased without a background check or interaction with an FFL as major selling points.

73. DEFENDANTS' marketing to the criminal market includes but is not limited to the following examples:

- a. RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM emphasizes that its products allow the production of unserialized weapons. See <https://www.rbtacticaltooling.com/about/>. One of its AR-15 receivers includes a stamp of an individual giving the middle finger to law enforcement personnel who would be looking for a serial number to trace a "ghost gun" recovered from a crime scene. See <https://www.rbtacticaltooling.com/product/magpul-lower-receiver-ar-15/>:



- b. A Q & A section on one of TACTICAL GEAR HEAD's retail websites includes this disclosure: "An AR-15 built using an 80% lower [receiver] will have no serialization or paperwork attached to it by default. Therefore, it is typically impossible to determine the firearm's origin or history." See <https://www.80-lower.com/faqs/>. The site further emphasizes that a purchaser need not interact with an FFL to acquire its parts/kits and make a "ghost gun" AR-15 style rifle. See <https://www.80-lower.com/products/ar-15-build-kit-5-56mm-nato-16-melonite-barrel-classic-a2-handguard-w-80-lower-1-7-twist/>:



- c. INDUSTRY ARMAMENT's website states, on a page listing an AR-15 receiver for sale, that "[t]he purchase of this component does not constitute the purchase of a firearm and as such does not require a FFL for transfer." See <https://americanweaponscomponents.com/product/80-ar-15-forged-anodized-lower-receiver>.
- d. THUNDER GUNS' website states, on a page offering a pack of 5 AR-15 lower receivers, that "[t]hese products are not FFL items." See <https://thundertactical.com/product/80-ar-lower-receiver-5-pack/>.

74. The above examples are illustrative rather than exhaustive. Upon information and belief, they are also identical to or essentially the same as DEFENDANTS' marketing tactics for "ghost gun" parts/kits that can be assembled into AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles during the relevant time period.

75. Sales of "ghost gun" parts/kits have increased significantly in recent years. Not surprisingly, the use of "ghost guns" in crimes has also increased exponentially.

76. According to ATF, 30 percent of all guns recovered at California crime scenes are now untraceable "ghost guns."

77. "Ghost guns" – and, in particular, AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles—have been used in many incidents of violence in California. For example:

- a. In June 2013, John Zawahri went on a shooting spree with a "ghost gun" and killed five people in Santa Monica, California. Zawahri, who had a documented history of mental illness, was a prohibited purchaser and the "ghost gun" he used was an AR-15 style rifle.

- 1 b. In July 2015, Scott Bertics shot and killed a woman with whom he was involved  
2 in a romantic relationship and he then used a second gun to kill himself in Walnut  
3 Creek, California. Both of the guns used were "ghost guns."  
4  
5 c. In July 2015, in Stockton, California, gunmen used an AK-47-style "ghost gun" in  
6 an attempted bank robbery, and held three people hostage.  
7  
8 d. In June 2019, 26-year-old Sacramento Police Officer Tara O'Sullivan was shot  
9 and killed with an AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifle while responding to a domestic  
10 disturbance call.  
11  
12 e. In August 2019, a convicted felon used an AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifle to kill  
13 California Highway Patrol officer Andre Moye and wound two of his colleagues,  
14 during a freeway shootout in Riverside, California.  
15

16 78. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS were aware of one or all of these  
17 and other incidents involving the unlawful use of "ghost guns."

18 79. AR-15 style rifles are, and were, prohibited assault weapons under California law.  
19 See Cal. Pen. Code § 30510(a)(5) (assault weapons include semiautomatic rifles within the "Colt  
20 AR-15 series"); § 30510(f) ("As used in this section, 'series' includes all other models that are  
21 only variations, with minor differences, of those models listed in subdivision (a), regardless of  
22 the manufacturer."); § 30605(a) (criminalizing possession of an assault weapon).  
23

24 80. Federal law requires all FFLs—even those outside of a purchaser's state—to  
25 comply with the laws of a purchaser's state when selling long guns like AR-15 style rifles. See  
26 18 U.S.C. § 922(b)(3).  
27

28 81. California's ban on AR-15 style rifles is a reasonable and responsible reaction to  
the grave threat that AR-15 style weapons pose to the health and safety of Californians. These  
types of weapons are favored by mass shooters. As illustrative examples, in addition to this case,  
the shooters in the Aurora, Colorado movie theater shooting in July 2012, the Newtown,  
Connecticut elementary school shooting in December 2012, and the aforementioned Santa  
Monica, California shooting in June 2013, all used AR-15 style rifles.

82. Upon information and belief, all DEFENDANTS were aware that AR-15 style  
rifles are frequently used by mass shooters.

1 83. "Ghost gun" parts/kits enable dangerous people in California like NEAL to  
2 obtain such banned weapons.

3 84. In September 2019, New York Attorney General Letitia James announced that she  
4 had ordered 16 websites to immediately stop selling products enabling the assembly of "ghost  
5 guns" in New York. Attorney General James acknowledged the reality that "ghost guns" had  
6 been providing the means to violate the state's assault weapons ban, stating: "There is only one  
7 purpose for the products that these companies are selling — to manufacture illegal and deadly  
8 assault weapons." James went on to note that "[t]he proliferation of these types of weapons has  
9 not only caused indescribable suffering across the country, but gravely endangers every New  
10 Yorker." DEFENDANTS' business practices similarly undermine California's assault weapons  
11 ban and endanger every Californian.

12 85. DEFENDANTS could have taken steps to avoid supplying individuals in  
13 California with prohibited assault weapons and/or violating various federal firearms laws.  
14 Below is a non-exhaustive list of feasible steps that a reasonable and law-abiding company  
15 would have taken to avoid undermining California law and/or federal law:

- 16 a. DEFENDANTS could have blocked Internet Protocol ("IP") addresses associated  
17 with California from accessing their websites and/or the portions of their websites  
18 listing products enabling the assembly of AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles;  
19 b. DEFENDANTS could have refused to ship such products to California;  
20 c. DEFENDANTS could have required that their products only be transferred  
21 through a sale carried out by an FFL;  
22 d. DEFENDANTS could have required that only individuals who could legally  
23 purchase and possess firearms could purchase their products; and  
24 e. DEFENDANTS could have included serial numbers on their products.

25 86. Upon information and belief, none of the DEFENDANTS took these, or any other  
26 reasonable safety precautions, to prevent dangerous California residents from violating  
27 California and/or federal law and endangering the safety of others with "ghost guns" produced  
28 from DEFENDANTS products.

1 87. Instead, upon information and belief, all of the DEFENDANTS intentionally  
2 targeted California consumers.

3 88. For example, Cody Wilson of DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST GUNNER  
4 stated that he aimed to undermine gun violence prevention legislation, and in particular,  
5 California's regulatory regime. Wilson, shortly after the Tehama attack in 2017, confirmed that  
6 much of DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED/GHOST GUNNER's business comes from California.

7 89. Similarly, on its website, BLACKHAWK specifically emphasizes that "in our  
8 home state of California, as well as almost every other state in the U.S., it is legal to build your  
9 own firearm for personal use." See <https://www.80percentarms.com/pages/faq.html>.

10 90. Upon information and belief, these and other DEFENDANTS were all  
11 intentionally designing, advertising, manufacturing, marketing and/or selling ghost guns  
12 parts/kits designed and intended to be assembled into AR-15 style rifles to California consumers  
13 like NEAL.

14 91. DEFENDANTS also, as noted above, purposefully emphasized features of their  
15 products they knew to be particularly attractive to criminals and dangerous parties like NEAL—  
16 such as their untraceability and the absence of a background check or interaction with a FFLs.

17 92. DEFENDANTS knew that "ghost guns" are frequently used by criminals and  
18 dangerous individuals and have continued to gain additional knowledge of this reality.

19 93. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS have, nevertheless, not changed  
20 their reckless and unlawful business practices.

21 **B. "Ghost Guns" Were Used To Harm PLAINTIFFS**

22 94. On November 13-14, 2017, NEAL engaged in a rampage shooting spree spanning  
23 across multiple locations in Tehama County, California which left PLAINTIFFS and/or their  
24 loved ones wounded or killed.

25 95. Prior to the shooting, NEAL was prohibited from possession firearms by one or  
26 more court orders. The order(s) required authorities to arrest NEAL if he violated these orders.  
27 Multiple PLAINTIFFS and/or their loved ones were named as protected parties on one or more  
28



1 of these orders, including PLAINTIFFS BOB STEELE and G.E., as well as decedent DIANA  
2 STEELE.

3 96. During his rampage, NEAL was in possession of and used at least two AR-15  
4 style semiautomatic rifles. Both of these firearms were "ghost guns."

5 97. Upon information and belief, at the time of the shooting, NEAL's "ghost guns"  
6 lacked any identifying serial numbers.

7 98. It is unknown how and where NEAL acquired the "ghost gun" parts/kits used to  
8 assemble the weapons used in the attack. Given DEFENDANTS' actions, it may be impossible  
9 to determine the exact manufacturer(s)/seller(s) of the "ghost gun" parts/kits NEAL used to  
10 assemble the AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles used in the attack.

11 99. Upon information and belief, NEAL could not have legally acquired an AR-15  
12 style rifle like those utilized in the attack from a FFL either inside or outside of California,  
13 because of his status as a California resident and California's ban on the possession of assault  
14 weapons.

15 100. Upon information and belief, NEAL also could not have secured an AR-15 style  
16 rifle – or, indeed, any firearm – from an FFL because he was displaying erratic and disturbing  
17 behavior for a significant period of time leading up to the shooting due to severe mental illness.

18 101. The above discussion is not intended to be an exhaustive listing of the reasons  
19 why NEAL could not have purchased a serialized, fully assembled AR-15 style rifle from an  
20 FFL. Various other California or federal firearms restrictions may also have blocked such a sale.

21 102. NEAL was only able to acquire his arsenal of weapons through the negligence of  
22 DEFENDANTS. Had DEFENDANTS complied with the law and relevant standards of care,  
23 NEAL would not have been able to use "ghost guns" to harm PLAINTIFFS.

24 **C. The "Ghost Gun" Industry and Defendants' Role as Substantial Players in A**  
25 **Market Involving Fungible, Dangerous Goods**

26 103. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS were all intentionally  
27 making/marketing/selling "ghost guns" parts/kits designed and intended to be assembled into  
28

1 AR-15 style rifles into California leading up to and at the time of NEAL's purchase of the  
2 relevant "ghost gun" parts/kits.

3 104. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS also all purposefully targeted a  
4 dangerous subclass of California consumers who had no or limited access to these weapons by  
5 virtue of disqualifying records, mental illness, and/or relevant legal restrictions.

6 105. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in aggregate, were responsible for  
7 manufacturing and/or selling a substantial percentage of all "ghost gun" parts/kits enabling  
8 assembly of AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles which entered into California leading up to and  
9 during November 2017.

10 106. Upon information and belief, there is a substantial probability that one or more of  
11 the DEFENDANTS sold NEAL one or more "ghost gun" parts/kits used to assemble the AR-15  
12 style rifles used in the attack, either online or via some other medium, with full knowledge that  
13 (1) NEAL was a resident of California, (2) that California prohibits the possession of AR-15  
14 style rifles, and (3) AR-15 style rifles have frequently been used in mass shootings.

15 107. Upon information and belief, there is a substantial probability that one or more of  
16 the DEFENDANTS shipped one or more "ghost gun" parts/kits used to assemble the weapons  
17 used in the attack to NEAL's California residence.

18 108. "Ghost gun" parts/kits that can be used to assemble unserialized AR-15 style  
19 rifles are fungible products. Such parts/kits share the same core characteristics and present an  
20 equivalent risk of danger to members of the public like PLAINTIFFS. These products provide  
21 dangerous parties like NEAL with an identical capability to possess untraceable assault weapons  
22 without going through an FFL and in violation of California's assault weapons ban.

23 109. Had these one or more DEFENDANTS complied with the law and relevant  
24 standards of care, NEAL would never have had access to the relevant products. Any and all  
25 DEFENDANTS named herein could and should have made, sold, distributed and/or marketed  
26 their products with greater precautions to (1) make it more difficult for California consumers to  
27 use their products to produce dangerous weapons that violated California law and (2) to make it  
28

1 more difficult for dangerous individuals like NEAL to assemble "ghost guns" from their  
2 products.

3 110. Without access to DEFENDANTS' one or more products, NEAL could not have  
4 assembled his "ghost guns" and could not have used them to harm PLAINTIFFS.

5 111. NEAL's misuse of these assembled products was particularly foreseeable to  
6 PLAINTIFFS because NEAL fell within the dangerous subclass of consumers specifically  
7 targeted by DEFENDANTS.

8 **COUNT I: NEGLIGENCE (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

9 112. PLAINTIFFS hereby incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
10 though set out in full herein.

11 113. A seller of "ghost gun" parts/kits – particularly parts/kits intended to be  
12 assembled into highly dangerous AR-15 style weapons commonly used by mass shooters like  
13 NEAL – owes the highest degree of care to the general public when selling such items.

14 114. This standard of care imposes a duty to take all reasonable and practical safety  
15 precautions to prevent dangerous and irresponsible individuals like NEAL from gaining access to  
16 "ghost gun" parts/kits designed and intended for assembly into AR-15 style rifles.

17 115. Such safety precautions would include, but are not limited to, carefully learning  
18 and continually checking relevant state and federal firearms laws regarding assault weapons,  
19 never shipping to states where the possession of an AR-15 style weapon created from one of a  
20 defendant's parts/kits would be deemed illegal, and blocking all IP addresses from such states.  
21 Additionally, a responsible seller of such products would take steps to verify that only  
22 individuals legally permitted to possess firearms and not displaying signs of significant  
23 psychological disturbance were buying its products—such as by requiring all transactions to go  
24 through an FFL in the buyer's home state.

25 116. Upon information and belief, none of these DEFENDANTS had, at the time  
26 NEAL purchased the relevant product(s) from the DEFENDANT(s), taken these or other  
27  
28

1 reasonable safety precautions which would have blocked NEAL's purchase of the relevant  
2 products.

3 117. DEFENDANTS' violation of the above standards of care proximately caused  
4 PLAINTIFFS' harm by granting NEAL access to highly lethal weapons he could not have  
5 legally acquired.

6 118. Had NEAL been denied access to the parts/kits used to make his two AR-15 style  
7 "ghost gun" rifles, he could not have used these weapons to harm PLAINTIFFS.

8 119. As a direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
9 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
10 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P., II, a minor, J.P.  
11 a minor, N.P. a minor, A.H., a minor, JAMES WOOD JR and JAMES WOOD SR. were injured  
12 and suffered grievous and permanent injuries to their physical, mental, emotional and nervous  
13 systems, all to their detriment in an amount greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this  
14 Court.  
15

16 120. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
17 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal, and dangerous  
18 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P., II, a minor, J.P.,  
19 a minor, N.P., a minor, A.H., a minor, JAMES WOOD JR and JAMES WOOD SR. were forced  
20 to hire physicians and surgeons and undergo other and further expense as and for their medical  
21 care, all in an amount which cannot yet be ascertained. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend  
22 this Complaint for Damages to allege such amount when it becomes more certain.  
23

24 121. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
25 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal, and dangerous  
26 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, JAMES WOOD JR,  
27 JAMES WOOD SR. and A.H., a minor, have lost wages or been greatly reduced in their working  
28

1 capacity and/or future working capacity. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and, on such  
2 information, and belief state that this said reduction in earning capacity will continue into the  
3 future in an amount which cannot yet be ascertained.

4 122. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
5 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
6 weapons, DANNY ELLIOTT II, DIANA STEELE, MICHELLE MCFADYEN, and JOSEPH  
7 MCHUGH, were fatally shot, all to PLAINTIFFS' damage in an amount greatly in excess of the  
8 minimum jurisdiction of this Court.  
9

10 123. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
11 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
12 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYEN, PHILLIP BOW, SIA BOW, BOB STEELE,  
13 MICHAEL ELLIOTT, G.E., a minor, M.E., a minor, MARCIA MCHUGH, and GRACE  
14 MCHUGH have been deprived of the care, comfort, society and support of their loved ones,  
15 DANNY ELLIOTT II, DIANA STEELE, MICHELLE MCFADYEN, and JOSEPH MCHUGH,  
16 all to PLAINTIFFS' damage in an amount greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this  
17 Court.  
18

19 124. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
20 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
21 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYEN, PHILLIP BOW, SIA BOW, BOB STEELE,  
22 MICHAEL ELLIOTT, G.E., a minor, M.E., a minor, MARCIA MCHUGH, and GRACE  
23 MCHUGH have incurred funeral and burial expenses in an amount subject to proof at the time of  
24 trial of this matter.  
25

26 125. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
27 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
28

1 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFF TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP suffered  
2 serious and grievous injuries, which has caused her husband, JOHN PHOMMATHEP to suffer  
3 the loss of love, companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection, affection, society, child-  
4 rearing, marital relations, and moral support that TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP would have  
5 provided had this incident now occurred.  
6

7 126. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
8 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
9 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS have suffered, and will continue to  
10 suffer in the future, consequential damages and other incidental damages and out-of-pocket  
11 expenses, all to PLAINTIFFS' general damages in a sum to be determined at the time of trial.  
12

13 127. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
14 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
15 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS were compelled to retain legal  
16 counsel to protect their rights. Therefore, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable to  
17 PLAINTIFFS for those attorney's fees incurred by PLAINTIFFS in a sum to be determined at  
18 the time of trial.  
19

20 128. DEFENDANTS, and each of their negligence, as set forth above, was a  
21 substantial factor in causing PLAINTIFFS' harm.

22 129. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS  
23 and each of their, conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the  
24 rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner  
25 making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS  
26 conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California Civil  
27 Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them  
28

1 in the fullest extent allowed by law.

2 130. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS,  
3 and each of them, are negligent or in some other way responsible for acts of which PLAINTIFFS  
4 are unaware. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint for Damages at  
5 such time as PLAINTIFFS discover the other acts of said DEFENDANTS constituting said  
6 liability.  
7

8 **COUNT II: NEGLIGENCE PER SE FOR VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA AND/OR**  
9 **FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

10 131. PLAINTIFFS hereby incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
11 though set out in full herein.

12 132. NEAL's purchase of "ghost gun" parts/kits and the use of them to assemble AR-  
13 15 style rifles violated California's assault weapons ban. *See* Cal. Pen. Code § 30510(a)(5)  
14 (assault weapons include semiautomatic rifles within the "Colt AR-15 series"); § 30510(f) ("As  
15 used in this section, 'series' includes all other models that are only variations, with minor  
16 differences, of those models listed in subdivision (a), regardless of the manufacturer."); §  
17 30605(a) (criminalizing possession of an assault weapon).

18 133. DEFENDANTS are manufacturer/sellers of "ghost gun" parts/kits who  
19 intentionally targeted -- and continue to target -- the California market and ship "ghost gun"  
20 parts/kits designed for assembly into AR-15 style rifles to California consumers like NEAL.  
21 DEFENDANTS did so, and continue to do so, with the knowledge and intention that those  
22 consumers will use these products to assemble weapons prohibited under California law.

23 134. All of the DEFENDANTS are, thus, responsible as knowing accomplices, for  
24 their consumers' direct violations of, at minimum, California's ban on the possession of assault  
25 weapons. *See* Cal. Pen. Code § 31 (anyone who "aid[s] and abet[s]" in the commission of an  
26 offense is a principal); § 971 ("all persons concerned in the commission of a crime, who by the  
27 operation of other provisions of this code are principals therein, shall hereafter be prosecuted,  
28

1 tried and punished as principals"); § 27(a)(1) (California has jurisdiction over crimes where at  
2 least part of the offense takes place within the state).

3 135. All of the DEFENDANTS may also be responsible, either directly or as an  
4 accomplice, for violation one or more additional state or federal firearms laws, including, but not  
5 limited to, various provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968 or the National Firearms Act.

6 136. In addition to these laws explicitly referencing firearms, DEFENDANTS also  
7 violated California statutes prohibiting unfair, immoral and reckless business practices and the  
8 creation and maintenance of public nuisances, as discussed further below. *See* Cal. Bus. & Prof  
9 Code § 17200"; Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3479, 3480.

10 137. Whichever DEFENDANT or DEFENDANTS are responsible, either directly or  
11 as an accomplice, for selling NEAL one or more "ghost gun" parts/kits in violation of one or  
12 more statutes including, at minimum, California's assault weapons ban, breached the standard of  
13 care imposed by statute.

14 138. This violation proximately caused PLAINTIFFS' harm by providing NEAL  
15 access to highly lethal weapons that he could not have legally acquired in California.

16 139. Had NEAL been denied access to the "ghost gun" parts/kits used to make his two  
17 AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles, he could not have used these weapons to harm PLAINTIFFS.

18 140. As a direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
19 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
20 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P., II, a minor, J.P.  
21 a minor, N.P. a minor, A.H., a minor, JAMES WOOD JR and JAMES WOOD SR. were injured  
22 and suffered grievous and permanent injuries to their physical, mental, emotional and nervous  
23 systems, all to their detriment in an amount greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this  
24 Court, including, but not limited to,

25 141. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
26 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
27  
28



1 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P., II, a minor, J.P.,  
2 a minor, N.P., a minor, A.H., a minor, JAMES WOOD JR and JAMES WOOD SR. were forced  
3 to hire physicians and surgeons and undergo other and further expense as and for their medical  
4 care, all in an amount which cannot yet be ascertained. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend  
5 this Complaint for Damages to allege such amount when it becomes more certain.  
6

7 142. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
8 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
9 weapons, plaintiff, TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, JAMES WOOD JR and  
10 JAMES WOOD SR. and A.H., a minor, have lost wages or been greatly reduced in their working  
11 capacity and/or future working capacity. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and, on such  
12 information, and belief state that this said reduction in earning capacity will continue into the  
13 future in an amount which cannot yet be ascertained.  
14

15 143. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
16 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
17 weapons, DANNY ELLIOTT II, DIANA STEELE, MICHELLE MCFADYEN, and JOSEPH  
18 MCHUGH, were fatally shot, all to PLAINTIFFS' damage in an amount greatly in excess of the  
19 minimum jurisdiction of this Court.  
20

21 144. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
22 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
23 weapons, PLAINTIFFS, TROY MCFADYEN, PHILLIP BOW, SIA BOW, BOB STEELE,  
24 MICHAEL ELLIOTT, G.E., a minor, M.E., a minor, MARCIA MCHUGH, and GRACE  
25 MCHUGH have been deprived of the care, comfort, society and support of their loved ones,  
26 DANNY ELLIOTT II, DIANA STEELE, MICHELLE MCFADYEN, and JOSEPH MCHUGH,  
27 all to PLAINTIFFS' damage in an amount greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this  
28

1 Court.

2 145. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
3 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
4 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYEN, PHILLIP BOW, SIA BOW, BOB STEELE,  
5 MICHAEL ELLIOTT, G.E., a minor, M.E., a minor, MARCIA MCHUGH, and GRACE  
6 MCHUGH have incurred funeral and burial expenses in an amount subject to proof at the time of  
7 trial of this matter.  
8

9 146. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
10 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
11 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, plaintiff TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP suffered  
12 serious and grievous injuries, which has caused her husband, JOHN PHOMMATHEP to suffer  
13 the loss of love, companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection, affection, society, child-  
14 rearing, marital relations, and moral support that TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP would have  
15 provided had this incident now occurred.  
16

17 147. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
18 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
19 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS have suffered, and will continue to  
20 suffer in the future, consequential damages and other incidental damages and out-of-pocket  
21 expenses, all to PLAINTIFFS' general damages in a sum to be determined at the time of trial.  
22

23 148. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
24 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
25 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS were compelled to retain legal  
26 counsel to protect their rights. Therefore, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable to  
27 plaintiffs for those attorney's fees incurred by PLAINTIFFS in a sum to be determined at the  
28

1 time of trial.

2 149. DEFENDANTS, and each of their negligence, as set forth above, was a  
3 substantial factor in causing PLAINTIFFS' harm.

4 150. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS  
5 and each of their, conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the  
6 rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner  
7 making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS  
8 conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California Civil  
9 Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them  
10 in the fullest extent allowed by law.

11 151. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS,  
12 and each of them, are negligent or in some other way responsible for acts of which PLAINTIFFS  
13 are unaware. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint for Damages at  
14 such time as PLAINTIFFS discover the other acts of said DEFENDANTS constituting said  
15 liability.

16  
17 **COUNT III: NEGLIGENT ENTRUSTMENT (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

18 152. PLAINTIFFS hereby incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
19 though set out in full herein.

20 153. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS purposefully targeted residents of  
21 states with strict gun violence prevention regimes, like California, who were seeking to bypass  
22 the laws of their home state.

23 154. By targeting and supplying dangerous individuals already showing contempt for  
24 the rule of law and disrespect towards the safety rules accepted by their communities,  
25 DEFENDANTS were purposefully selling to a class of purchasers who were inherently showing  
26

1 a high likelihood of misusing their "ghost gun" parts/kits in a dangerous manner that would  
2 cause harm to third parties like PLAINTIFFS.

3 155. Whichever DEFENDANT or DEFENDANTS sold or shipped one or more "ghost  
4 gun" parts/kits capable of and intended to be assembled into AR-15 style rifles prohibited by  
5 California law to NEAL, despite knowing that he was a California resident and that California  
6 prohibits such weapons were, thus, negligently entrusting these one or more items.

7 156. This violation of relevant standards of care proximately caused PLAINTIFFS'  
8 harm by granting NEAL access to highly lethal weapons that he could not have legally acquired  
9 in California.

10 157. Had NEAL been denied access to the "ghost gun" parts/kits he used to assemble  
11 his two AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles, he could not have used these weapons to harm  
12 PLAINTIFFS.

13 158. As a direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
14 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
15 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P., II, a minor, J.P.  
16 a minor, N.P. a minor, A.H., a minor, JAMES WOOD JR and JAMES WOOD SR. were injured  
17 and suffered grievous and permanent injuries to their physical, mental, emotional and nervous  
18 systems, all to their detriment in an amount greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this  
19 Court, including, but not limited to,  
20

21 159. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
22 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
23 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P., II, a minor, J.P.,  
24 a minor, N.P., a minor, A.H., a minor, JAMES WOOD JR and JAMES WOOD SR. were forced  
25 to hire physicians and surgeons and undergo other and further expense as and for their medical  
26 care, all in an amount which cannot yet be ascertained. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend  
27 this Complaint for Damages to allege such amount when it becomes more certain.  
28

1 160. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
2 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
3 weapons, plaintiff, TROY MCFADYN, TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, JAMES WOOD JR and  
4 JAMES WOOD SR. and A.H., a minor, have lost wages or been greatly reduced in their working  
5 capacity and/or future working capacity. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and, on such  
6 information, and belief state that this said reduction in earning capacity will continue into the  
7 future in an amount which cannot yet be ascertained.  
8

9 161. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
10 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
11 weapons, DANNY ELLIOTT II, DIANA STEELE, MICHELLE MCFADYEN, and JOSEPH  
12 MCHUGH, were fatally shot, all to PLAINTIFFS' damage in an amount greatly in excess of the  
13 minimum jurisdiction of this Court.  
14

15 162. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
16 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
17 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYEN, PHILLIP BOW, SIA BOW, BOB STEELE,  
18 MICHAEL ELLIOTT, G.E., a minor, M.E., a minor, MARCIA MCHUGH, and GRACE  
19 MCHUGH have been deprived of the care, comfort, society and support of their loved ones,  
20 DANNY ELLIOTT II, DIANA STEELE, MICHELLE MCFADYEN, and JOSEPH MCHUGH,  
21 all to PLAINTIFFS' damage in an amount greatly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this  
22 Court.  
23

24 163. As a further direct, proximate, immediate and foreseeable result of the actions and  
25 conduct of DEFENDANTS, which granted NEAL access to highly lethal, illegal and dangerous  
26 weapons, PLAINTIFFS TROY MCFADYEN, PHILLIP BOW, SIA BOW, BOB STEELE,  
27 MICHAEL ELLIOTT, G.E., a minor, M.E., a minor, MARCIA MCHUGH, and GRACE  
28

1 MCHUGH have incurred funeral and burial expenses in an amount subject to proof at the time of  
2 trial of this matter.

3 164. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
4 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS and each of them, which granted NEAL access to highly  
5 lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, plaintiff TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP suffered serious and  
6 grievous injuries, which has caused her husband, JOHN PHOMMATHEP to suffer the loss of  
7 love, companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection, affection, society, child-rearing,  
8 marital relations, and moral support that TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP would have provided had  
9 this incident now occurred.  
10

11 165. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
12 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
13 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS have suffered, and will continue to  
14 suffer in the future, consequential damages and other incidental damages and out-of-pocket  
15 expenses, all to plaintiffs' general damages in a sum to be determined at the time of trial.  
16

17 166. As a further, direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforementioned  
18 actions, and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, which granted NEAL access to  
19 highly lethal, illegal and dangerous weapons, PLAINTIFFS were compelled to retain legal  
20 counsel to protect their rights. Therefore, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable to  
21 plaintiffs for those attorney's fees incurred by PLAINTIFFS in a sum to be determined at the  
22 time of trial.  
23

24 167. DEFENDANTS negligent entrustment of the dangerous instrumentalities, as set  
25 forth above, was a substantial factor in causing PLAINTIFFS' harm.

26 168. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS  
27 and each of their, conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the  
28

1 rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner  
2 making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS  
3 conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California Civil  
4 Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them  
5 in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
6

7 169. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendants, and  
8 each of them, are negligent or in some other way responsible for acts of which PLAINTIFFS are  
9 unaware. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint for Damages at such  
10 time as PLAINTIFFS discover the other acts of said DEFENDANTS constituting said liability.  
11

12 **COUNT IV: PUBLIC NUISANCE (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

13 170. PLAINTIFFS hereby incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
14 though set out in full herein.

15 171. By negligently, recklessly, and/or intentionally selling vast quantities of "ghost  
16 gun" parts/kits enabling the assembly of AR-15 style rifles to buyers in California in violation of,  
17 at a minimum, California law, DEFENDANTS have negligently and/or knowingly participated  
18 in creating and maintaining an unreasonable interference with the rights held in common by the  
19 general public. This constitutes a public nuisance under California law, including California  
20 Civil Code §§ 3479 and 3480.

21 172. Without limitation, the acts of DEFENDANTS as alleged herein caused, created,  
22 and continue to maintain a substantial and unreasonable interference with the public's health,  
23 safety, convenience, comfort, peace, and use of public property and/or private property. These  
24 activities are injurious to health and offensive to the senses so as to interfere with the  
25 comfortable enjoyment of life or property in an entire community or neighborhood. Numerous  
26 members of the public are threatened, killed, injured, or are victims of criminal acts as a result of  
27 "ghost gun" parts/kits sold by DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS' acts and omissions as alleged  
28

1 herein cause a substantial and unreasonable increase in the number of members of the general  
2 public who are threatened, killed, and injured by "ghost guns."

3 173. The acts and omissions of DEFENDANTS, as alleged herein, substantially and  
4 unreasonably interfere with the public's use of public facilities, including the use of public  
5 highways and walkways. Public highways and walkways are made substantially and  
6 unreasonably unsafe because of the presence of ghost guns intentionally, negligently and  
7 unlawfully supplied by DEFENDANTS.

8 174. DEFENDANTS' acts and omissions as alleged herein substantially and  
9 unreasonably (a) increase the number of "ghost guns" in and on public facilities, including on  
10 public highways and walkways; (b) increase the degree to which unlawful possessors in and on  
11 public facilities, including on highways and walkways, are illegally armed with weapons; and (c)  
12 allow for banned assault weapons to be present in California, including on public highways and  
13 walkways.

14 175. DEFENDANTS' acts and omissions as alleged herein cause substantial and  
15 unreasonable interferences with the public's health, safety, convenience, comfort, and peace in  
16 numerous other ways, including: (a) increasing the number of unlawful possessors of weapons  
17 who use these weapons to commit violent crimes against innocent members of the general  
18 public; (b) increasing the number and severity of property crimes committed by those in  
19 possession of "ghost guns" against innocent members of the general public; (c) increasing the  
20 number and severity of incidents in which those in possession of "ghost guns" disturb the peace  
21 by being disorderly; and (d) increasing the amount of society's resources that are diverted toward  
22 dealing with the problems associated with the possession of "ghost guns."

23 176. DEFENDANTS know or have reason to know that the acts and omissions alleged  
24 herein caused substantial and unreasonable interferences with the public's health, safety,  
25 convenience, comfort, peace, and use of public facilities. DEFENDANTS' acts and omissions  
26 as alleged herein were undertaken with negligent and/or intentional disregard of the rights of the  
27 general public. DEFENDANTS knew that they could have taken precautions as outlined above  
28 that would have eliminated or minimized the injuries to the general public. Instead they chose



1 not to take those precautions and, in fact, actively exacerbated these risks with the irresponsible  
2 marketing campaign described herein in order to maximize their profits.

3 177. DEFENDANTS' interference with the public's health, safety, convenience,  
4 comfort, peace, and use of public facilities is unreasonable, unlawful, substantial, significant,  
5 continuing, and long-lasting. This interference, is annoying, offensive, and disturbing to an  
6 ordinary person. The interference is not insubstantial or fleeting, and involves deaths and serious  
7 injuries suffered by many people and a severe disruption of public health, peace, order, and  
8 safety.

9 178. The manner in which DEFENDANTS make, sell, and market their products has  
10 no social utility. Even if it did, the seriousness of their interference with the rights of the public  
11 and harm they cause far outweighs any social utility associated with DEFENDANTS' conduct.

12 179. DEFENDANTS' unlawful, negligent and/or intentional creation and maintenance  
13 of the public nuisance directly and proximately caused significant harm, including serious  
14 physical injury and associated harm to PLAINTIFFS that is different from the harm suffered by  
15 other members of the public, including loss of enjoyment of life, as well as those damages set  
16 forth in paragraphs 121-131 above, all to their damage in an amount to be determined at a trial of  
17 this matter.

18 180. PLAINTIFFS have not, at any time, consented to DEFENDANTS' conduct.

19 181. At all times herein mentioned, DEFENDANTS had notice and knowledge that  
20 their actions created a public nuisance.

21 182. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendants and  
22 each of their, conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the rights  
23 and safety of others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner making the  
24 infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. Defendants conduct was  
25 despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294,  
26 so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them in the fullest  
27  
28

1 extent allowed by law.

2 **COUNT V: VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION**

3 **17200 (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

4 **(Unfair and Unlawful Competition in Sales Practices)**

5 183. PLAINTIFFS hereby incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
6 though set out in full herein.

7 184. DEFENDANTS in the course of their retail business of selling "ghost guns,"  
8 engaged in business acts or practices that were unlawful, unfair, deceptive, or misleading, and  
9 which therefore violated Bus. & Prof Code § 17200.

10 185. By selling to NEAL, a dangerous individual, who was prohibited from purchasing  
11 and possessing firearms, "ghost gun" parts/kits for a prohibited assault-style weapons, in  
12 violation of state and/or federal law, DEFENDANTS engaged in business practices that were  
13 unlawful, immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.

14 186. Also, by supplying to a subclass of purchasers who are inherently showing a high  
15 likelihood of misusing their "ghost gun" parts/kits in a dangerous manner that would cause harm  
16 to third parties like PLAINTIFFS, DEFENDANTS engaged in business practices that were  
17 unlawful, immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.

18 187. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing acts and practices,  
19 DEFENDANTS have received income, profits, and other benefits, which they would not have  
20 received if DEFENDANTS had not engaged in the violations of Bus. & Prof Code § 17200 as  
21 described in this Complaint for Damages.

22 188. Further, upon information and belief, had DEFENDANTS not violated  
23 California's prohibition on such unethical and unlawful marketing and business practices, NEAL  
24 could not have acquired the parts/kits used to assemble his AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles or  
25 used these items to harm PLAINTIFFS.

26 189. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS

1 and each of their, conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the  
2 rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner  
3 making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS  
4 conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California Civil  
5 Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them  
6 in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
7

8 190. To prevent their unjust enrichment, DEFENDANTS and each of them, should be  
9 required, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq, to disgorge their ill-  
10 gotten gains for the purpose of making full restitution to PLAINTIFFS as a consequence of  
11 DEFENDANTS unlawful and unfair activities, injunctive relief, as well as all attorney's fees  
12 and costs.  
13

14 **COUNT VI: VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION**  
15 **17200 (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**  
16 **(Unfair Marketing Tactics)**

17 1. PLAINTIFFS hereby incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as  
18 though set out in full herein.

19 2. DEFENDANTS in the course of their retail business of selling ghost guns,  
20 engaged in business acts or practices that were unfair, deceptive, or misleading, and which  
21 therefore violated Bus. & Prof Code § 17200.  
22

23 3. Specifically, by employing marketing tactics which emphasized that their  
24 products, including banned assault weapons, were untraceable and could be acquired without a  
25 background check or an interaction with an FFL, DEFENDANTS intentionally targeted  
26 prohibited persons and other dangerous individuals like NEAL. Such tactics and practices were  
27 unfair, immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.  
28

1           4. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing acts and practices,  
2 DEFENDANTS have received income, profits, and other benefits, which they would not have  
3 received if DEFENDANTS had not engaged in the violations of Bus. & Prof Code § 17200 as  
4 described in this Complaint for Damages.

5           5. Further, upon information and belief, had DEFENDANTS not violated  
6 California's prohibition on such unethical and unlawful marketing and business practices, NEAL  
7 could not have acquired the parts/kits used to assemble his AR-15 style "ghost gun" rifles or  
8 used these weapons to harm PLAINTIFFS.  
9

10           6. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendants and  
11 each of their, conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the rights  
12 and safety of others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner making the  
13 infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. Defendants conduct was  
14 despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California Civil Code §§ 3294,  
15 so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them in the fullest  
16 extent allowed by law.  
17

18           7. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and thereon allege that DEFENDANTS  
19 and each of their, conduct was done in a conscious disregard and deliberate disregard for the  
20 rights and safety of others, including PLAINTIFFS, and in a willful and reckless manner  
21 making the infliction of grievous bodily injury and/or death highly probable. DEFENDANTS  
22 conduct was despicable, willful, wanton and malicious within the meaning of California Civil  
23 Code §§ 3294, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages against them  
24 in the fullest extent allowed by law.  
25

26           8. To prevent their unjust enrichment, DEFENDANTS and each of them, should be  
27 required, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq, to disgorge their ill-  
28

1 gotten gains for the purpose of making full restitution to PLAINTIFFS as a consequence of  
2 DEFENDANTS unlawful and unfair activities, injunctive relief, as well as all attorney's fees  
3 and costs.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS PRAY FOR A JURY TRIAL and judgment against  
6 DEFENDANTS as follows:  
7

8 1. For general damages for TROY MCFADYEN, against each DEFENDANT,  
9 jointly and severally, in the amount to be proven at trial;

10 2. For special damages for TROY MCFADYEN, against each DEFENDANT,  
11 jointly and severally, in the amount to be proved at trial;

12 3. For medical expenses of TROY MCFADYEN, against each DEFENDANT,  
13 jointly and severally, according to proof;

14 4. For loss of wages and earning capacity for TROY MCFADYEN, against each  
15 DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in a sum according to proof;

16 5. For General damages for TROY MCFADYEN, SIA BOW and PHILLIP BOW,  
17 for the loss of society and companionship of decedent MICHELLE MCFADYEN, against each  
18 DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in the amount to be proven at trial;

19 6. For funeral and burial expenses of MICHELL MCFADYEN, for TROY  
20 MCFADYEN, SIA BOW and PHILLIP BOW, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and  
21 severally, according to proof;

22 7. For special damages for TROY MCFADYEN, SIA BOW and PHILLIP BOW  
23 for future contributions and value of personal services, advice or training as to decedent  
24 MICHELLE MCFADYEN, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, according to  
25 proof;  
26  
27  
28

1 8. For general damages to BOB STEELE, MICHAEL ELLIOT, G.E., and M.E. for  
2 the loss of society and companionship of decedents DANIEL ELLIOTT and DIANA STEELE,  
3 against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in the amount to be proven at trial;

4 9. For funeral and burial expenses of DANIEL ELLIOTT and DIANA STEELE,  
5 against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, according to proof;

6 10. For special damages for BOB STEELE, MICHAEL ELLIOT, G.E., and M.E.,  
7 for future contributions and value of personal services, advice or training of decedents DANIEL  
8 ELLIOTT and DIANA STEELE, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, according  
9 to proof;

10 11. For general damages to MARCIA MCHUGH and GRACE MCHUGH for the  
11 loss of society and companionship of decedent JOSEPH MCHUGH, against each  
12 DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in the amount to be proven at trial;

13 12. For funeral and burial expenses of JOSEPH MCHUGH, against each  
14 DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, according to proof;

15 13. For special damages for MARCIA MCHUGH and GRACE MCHUGH for future  
16 contributions and value of personal services, advice or training of decedent JOSEPH  
17 MCHUGH, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, according to proof;

18 14. For general damages for A.H. a minor, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and  
19 severally, in the amount to be proven at trial;

20 15. For special damages for A.H. a minor, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and  
21 severally, in the amount to be proved at trial;

22 16. For medical expenses of A.H. a minor, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and  
23 severally, according to proof;

24 17. For loss of earning capacity for A.H. a minor, against each DEFENDANT,

1 jointly and severally, in a sum according to proof;

2 18. For general damages for TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P. II. a minor, J.P. a  
3 minor, and N.P. a minor, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in the amount to be  
4 proven at trial;

5 19. For special damages for TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P. II. a minor, J.P. a  
6 minor, and N.P. a minor, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in the amount to be  
7 proved at trial;

8 20. For medical expenses of TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP, J.P. II. a minor, J.P. a  
9 minor, and N.P. a minor, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, according to proof;

10 21. For lost wages and/or loss of earning capacity for TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP,  
11 J.P. II. a minor, J.P. a minor, and N.P. a minor, against each DEFENDANT, jointly and  
12 severally, in a sum according to proof;

13 22. For loss of consortium damages for JOHN PHOMMATHEP;

14 23. For general damages for JAMES WOODS JR., and JAMES WOOD SR., against  
15 each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in the amount to be proven at trial;

16 24. For special damages for JAMES WOODS JR., and JAMES WOOD SR., against  
17 each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in the amount to be proved at trial;

18 25. For medical expenses of JAMES WOODS JR., and JAMES WOOD SR., against  
19 each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, according to proof;

20 26. For lost wages and/or loss of earning capacity for JAMES WOODS JR., and  
21 JAMES WOOD SR., against each DEFENDANT, jointly and severally, in a sum according to  
22 proof;

23 27. For punitive and exemplary damages to PLAINTIFFS against DEFENDANTS,  
24 and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish them and deter others from engaging in  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 similar misconduct;

2 28. For prejudgment interest, as allowed by law;

3 29. For injunctive relief against DEFENDANTS;


4 30. For an Order, pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17203, that  
5 DEFENDANTS be permanently enjoined from committing any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent  
6 acts of unfair competition in Violation of Business and Professions Code Section 17200;

7  
8 31. For attorney's fees and costs of this suit;

9 32. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper.

10  
11 DATED: November 13, 2019

BARR & MUDFORD, LLP



12  
13 JOHN DOUGLAS BARR (SBN 40663)

14 CATHLEEN T BARR (SBN 295538)

15 ESTEE LEWIS (SBN 268358)

16 BRANDON STORMENT (SBN 267260)

TROY DOUGLAS MUDFORD (156392)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs



# EXHIBIT C

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,  
COUNTY OF ORANGE  
CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 01/25/2021 TIME: 10:30:00 AM DEPT: C26

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Gregory H. Lewis

CLERK: B. Chumpitazi

REPORTER/ERM:

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: Michelle Nevarez

CASE NO: 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC CASE INIT.DATE: 11/14/2019

CASE TITLE: **Cardenas vs. Ghost Gunner Inc.**

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: PI/PD/WD - Other

---

EVENT ID/DOCUMENT ID: 73400538

**EVENT TYPE:** Motion - Other

MOVING PARTY: BOB BEEZLEY, MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, THUNDER GUNS LLC,  
GHOST FIREARMS LLC, RYAN BEEZLEY

CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Motion - Other, 10/28/2020

---

**APPEARANCES**

John P. Cogger from Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP present telephonically

Tentative Ruling posted on the Internet .

Defendant submit on the Court's tentative ruling.

The Court confirms the tentative ruling as follows:

**Motion to Permit Filing of Petition for Coordination**

Moving Party: Defendants Ghost Firearms, LLC, Thunder Guns, LLC, Ryan Beezley, Bob Beezley and MFY Technical Solutions, LLC

Responding Party: All other parties

**Ruling: Defendant's Motion to Permit Filing of Petition for Coordination of this action with *McFadyen v. Ghost Gunner*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, CIC DS 1935422 is GRANTED. This action is stayed until the Chairperson of the Judicial Council has acted on the Petition.**

Pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc.*, § 404.1, the court finds that standards for coordination have been met. The two cases share common questions of fact and law that predominate and are significant to the litigation. Coordination will promote the convenience of the parties, witnesses and counsel. Coordination will avoid duplicative and inconsistent rulings.

The court further finds that these two actions are complex under the definition of CRC Rule 3.400.

There will be numerous pretrial motions raising difficult or novel legal issues that will be time-consuming to resolve. There will be a large number of witnesses and documentary evidence.

# EXHIBIT D

1 DOUGLAS MUDFORD .....State Bar No. 156392  
2 ESTEE LEWIS .....State Bar No. 268358  
3 CATIE BARR .....State Bar No. 295538  
4 BRANDON STORMENT .....State Bar No. 267260  
5 BARR & MUDFORD, LLP  
6 1824 Court Street/Post Office Box 994390  
7 Redding, California 96099-4390  
8 Telephone: (530) 243-8008  
9 Facsimile: (530) 243-1648

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

TROY MCFADYEN, in his Individual  
Capacity, and as Heir at Law and Successor  
in Interest to MICHELLE MCFADYEN,  
Deceased;

PHILLIP BOW and  
SIA BOW, as Heirs at Law and Successors  
in Interest to MICHELLE MCFADYEN,  
Deceased;

BOB STEELE, a Dependent Adult, by and  
through his Guardian ad Litem, DAVID  
STEELE, Heir at Law and Successor in  
Interest to DIANA STEELE, Deceased;

MICHAEL ELLIOTT, Heir at Law and  
Successor in Interest to DANIEL LEE  
ELLIOT II, Deceased, and  
DIANA STEELE, Deceased;

G.E., a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad  
Litem, ALMA FEITELBERG, Heir at Law  
and Successor in Interest to DANIEL LEE  
ELLIOT II, Deceased, and  
DIANA STEELE, Deceased;

M.E., a Minor, by and through her Guardian ad  
Litem, LATISHA CORNWALL, Heir at Law

No. CIV-DS1935422

NOTICE OF FURTHER CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Date : February 10, 2021

Time : 9:00 a.m.

Dept. : S26 w/Hon. David Cohn

1 and Successor in Interest to DANIEL LEE  
2 ELLIOT II, Deceased, and  
3 DIANA STEELE, Deceased;  
4  
5 MARCIA MCHUGH, Heir at Law and Successor  
6 in Interest to JOSEPH MCHUGH, Deceased;  
7  
8 GRACE MCHUGH, Heir at Law and Successor  
9 in Interest to JOSEPH MCHUGH, Deceased;  
10  
11 A.H., a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad  
12 Litem, MARIA MONROY;  
13  
14 TIFFANY PHOMMATHEP;  
15  
16 JOHN PHOMMATHEP SR.;

17 JAMES WOODS, SR.

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.  
20

21 GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
22 GHOSTGUNNER.NET;

23 DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED d/b/a  
24 GHOSTGUNNER.NET

25 CODY WILSON d/b/a GHOSTGUNNER.NET

26 BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP  
27 INC., d/b/a 80PERCENTARMS.COM;

28 RYAN BEEZLEY and BOB BEEZLEY, d/b/a  
RBTACTICALTOOLING.COM;

1 GHOST AMERICA LLC, d/b/a  
2 GHOSTGUNS.COM;  
3 GHOST FIREARMS LLC, d/b/a GRID  
4 DEFENSE and GHOSTRIFLES.COM;  
5 JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC., d/b/a  
6 JTACTICAL.COM;  
7 MFY TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS LLC, d/b/a  
8 5DTACTICAL.COM;  
9 TACTICAL GEAR HEADS LLC, d/b/a 80-  
10 LOWER.COM; AR-  
11 15LOWERRECEIVERS.COM; and  
12 80LOWERJIG.COM;  
13 JAMES TROMBLEE, JR., d/b/a  
14 USPATRIOTARMORY.COM;  
15 INDUSTRY ARMAMENT INC., d/b/a  
16 AMERICANWEAPONSCOMPONENTS.COM;  
17 THUNDER GUNS LLC, d/b/a  
18 THUNDERTACTICAL.COM;  
19 DOES 1-100, Inclusive,  
20  
21 Defendants.

22 **TO ALL PARTIES AND/OR THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

23 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that a **Further Case Management Conference** has been  
24 scheduled for **February 10, 2021**, at **9:00 a.m.** in **Department S26** of the above-entitled Court  
25 located at 247 W. Third Street, San Bernardino, California.

26 **PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that this matter is STAYED pending Plaintiff  
27 *Francisco Gudino Cardenas* Motion to Consolidated Actions (*Cardenas v. Ghost Gunner, Inc.*,  
28 *Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC*), scheduled to be  
heard on January 25, 2021.

...

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DATED: December 11, 2020

BARR & MUDFORD, LLP.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BRANDON STORMENT  
Attorney for Plaintiffs

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of Shasta, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business mailing address is Post Office Box 994390, Redding, California 96099-4390. I am familiar with this firm's practice whereby the mail, after being placed in a designated area, is given the appropriate postage and is deposited in a U.S. mailbox after the close of the day's business.


XX On the date indicated below, I served the document(s) designated below on all parties in said action by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the designated area for outgoing mail addressed as set forth below:

\_\_\_\_\_ On the date indicated below, I served the document(s) designated below on all parties in said action by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope and mailed it via overnight mail with Federal Express addressed as set forth below:

XX On the date indicated below, I personally served the document(s) designated below by transmitting a true copy thereof via electronic mail in .pdf format as an e-mail attachment to each addressee set forth below:

**NOTICE OF FURTHER CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed December 14, 2020, at Redding, California.

  
BREE A. BOUGHN

**SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST**



1 Craig J. Mariam  
2 John P. Cogger  
3 Sebastian M. Van Roundsburg  
4 Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP  
5 633 West Fifth Street, 52<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
6 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
7 Email: [cmariam@grsm.com](mailto:cmariam@grsm.com)  
8 [Jcogger@grsm.com](mailto:Jcogger@grsm.com) and  
9 [sroundsburg@grsm.com](mailto:sroundsburg@grsm.com)  
10 Telephone: 213-576-5000  
11 Facsimile : 877-306-0043  
12 *Attorneys for Defendant, JUGGERNAUT*  
13 *TACTICAL, INC.*

14 Craig A. Livingston and  
15 Crystal L. Van Der Putten  
16 Livingston Law Firm  
17 1600 South Main Street, Suite 280  
18 Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
19 Telephone: 925-952-9880  
20 Facsimile : 925-952-9881  
21 [clivingston@livingstonlawyers.com](mailto:clivingston@livingstonlawyers.com)  
22 [cvanderputten@livingstonlawyers.com](mailto:cvanderputten@livingstonlawyers.com)  
23 *Attorneys for Defendant,*  
24 *TACTICAL GEAR HEADS, LLC*

25 Sean A. Brady  
26 C. D. Michel  
27 Michel & Associates, P.C.  
28 180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
Email: [sbrady@michellawyers.com](mailto:sbrady@michellawyers.com)  
[lpalmerin@michellawyers.com](mailto:lpalmerin@michellawyers.com)  
Telephone: 562-216-4444  
Facsimile : 562-216-4445  
*Attorneys for Defendants, BLACKHAWK*  
*MANUFACTURING GROUP, INC.,*  
*RYAN AND BOB BEEZLEY*  
*BOB BEEZLEY (R & B TOOL SUPPLY)*  
*DBA RBTACTICIALTOOLING.COM*  
*GHOST FIREARMS, LLC; MFY TECHNICAL*  
*SOLUTIONS, LLC AND THUNDER GUNS, LLC*

Justin R. Felton  
Marie Frandsen  
Pettit Kohn Ingrassia Lutz & Dolin, PC  
5901 West Century Blvd., Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Email: [jfelton@pettikohn.com](mailto:jfelton@pettikohn.com)  
[mfrandsen@pettikohn.com](mailto:mfrandsen@pettikohn.com)  
Telephone: 310-649-5772  
Facsimile: 310-649-5777  
*Attorneys for Defendants, DEFENSE*  
*DISTRIBUTED (ERRONEOUSLY SUED AS*  
*GHOST GUNNER, INC. DBA*  
*GHOSTGUNNER.NET; CODY R. WILSON,*  
*CODY WILSON DBA*  
*GHOSTGUNNER.NET)*

Christopher Renzulli (Pro Hac Vice)  
Howard B. Schilsky (Pro Hac Vice)  
Renzulli Law Firm, LLP  
One North Broadway, Suite 1005  
White Plains, NY 10601  
Email: [crenzulli@renzullilaw.com](mailto:crenzulli@renzullilaw.com)  
[hschlisky@renzullilaw.com](mailto:hschlisky@renzullilaw.com)  
Telephone: 914-285-0700  
Facsimile : 914-285-1213  
*Co-Counsel for Defendant, JUGGERNAUT*  
*TACTICAL, INC.*

*Courtesy copies to:*  
Gerald B. Singleton  
Singleton Law Firm  
450 A Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Email: [Gerald@SLFfirm.com](mailto:Gerald@SLFfirm.com)

Ben Rosenfeld  
115 ½ Bartlett Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
Email: [ben.rosenfeld@comcast.net](mailto:ben.rosenfeld@comcast.net)

# EXHIBIT E

LAW OFFICE OF BEN ROSENFELD  
San Francisco, CA

GERALD B. SINGLETON (SBN 208783)  
SINGLETON LAW FIRM  
450 A Street, 5th Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: (619) 586-5820  
Fax: (619) 255-1515  
[gerald@SLFfirm.com](mailto:gerald@SLFfirm.com)

BEN ROSENFELD (SBN 203845)  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
115 ½ Bartlett Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
Tel: (415) 285-8091  
Fax: (415) 285-8092  
[ben.rosenfeld@comast.net](mailto:ben.rosenfeld@comast.net)

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Francisco Gudino Cardenas

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE  
(UNLIMITED CIVIL)

FRANCISCO GUDINO CARDENAS, an  
individual

Plaintiff,

vs.

GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNNER.NET, et al.

Defendants.

No. 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF ERRATA  
AND CORRECTION IN STATEMENT  
OF JURISDICTION IN COMPLAINT


**TO: ALL PARTIES, THEIR ATTORNEYS, AND TO THE COURT:**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE:** Plaintiff's complaint, filed on November 4, 2019, contains  
errata in the Statement of Jurisdiction. Specifically, the venue statement in paragraph 16 should  
read (in place of what was typed):

1 16. Venue is proper in this court because several of the defendants, namely  
2 BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING GROUP INC. ("BLACKHAWK"), d/b/a  
3 80PERCENTARMS.COM, GHOST AMERICA LLC ("GHOST AMERICA"),  
4 d/b/a GHOSTGUNS.COM, and JUGGERNAUT TACTICAL INC.  
5 ("JUGGERNAUT"), d/b/a JTACTICAL.COM, are California based companies  
6 whose principal places of business are located in the County of Orange, State of  
7 California.

8 Respectfully Submitted,

9 Ben Rosenfeld, Attorney  
10 Gerald B. Singleton, Attorney



11 Dated: November 22, 2019

12 By: Ben Rosenfeld  
13 Attorneys for Plaintiff Cardenas  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# EXHIBIT F

1 BEN ROSENFELD (SBN 203845)  
2 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
3 115 ½ Bartlett Street  
4 San Francisco, CA 94110  
5 Tel: (415) 285-8091  
6 Fax: (415) 285-8092  
7 ben.rosenfeld@comast.net

8 GERALD B. SINGLETON (SBN 208783)  
9 SINGLETON LAW FIRM  
10 450 A Street, 5th Floor  
11 San Diego, CA 92101  
12 Tel: (619) 586-5820  
13 Fax: (619) 255-1515  
14 gerald@SLFfirm.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
16 Francisco Gudino Cardenas

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
12 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
13

14 FRANCISCO GUDINO CARDENAS,  
15  
16 Plaintiff,  
17  
18 v.

19 GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
20 GHOSTGUNNER.NET; et al.,  
21  
22 Defendants.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. CIVDS1935422

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF NON-  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO PERMIT FILING OF  
PETITION FOR COORDINATION OR, IN  
THE ALTERNATIVE, TO TRANSFER  
AND CONSOLIDATE ACTIONS

1           **TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

2           **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE:** Plaintiff does not oppose defendants' pending Motion to  
3 Permit Filing of Petition for Coordination or, in the Alternative, to Transfer and Consolidate  
4 Actions, filed in this Court on or about October 28, 2020, and agrees that coordination and or  
5 consolidation of the *Cardenas* and *McFadyen*<sup>1</sup> matters in this Court is proper because it will  
6 promote the ends of justice under Code of Civil Procedure § 404.1 and promote efficiency.


7           Despite the initial designation on the Civil Case cover sheet in this matter, plaintiffs also  
8 agree that the matter is complex under California Rule of Court 3.400 due to the large number of  
9 defendants, large number of plaintiffs (upon coordination/consolidation), and the potential  
10 number of witnesses to present and volume of evidence to process.

11           Therefore, plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court also enter the proposed order and  
12 consolidate this matter with *Troy McFadyen, et al v. Ghost Gunner, Inc., et al*, Case No.  
13 CIVDS 1935422 and designate the consolidated matter on the complex docket in the Superior  
14 Court of Orange County.

15  
16 Dated: November 19, 2020

BEN ROSENFELD, ATTORNEY  
SINGLETON LAW FIRM

17  
18  
19 By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
BEN ROSENFELD  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
Francisco Gudino Cardenas

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28           <sup>1</sup> *Troy McFadyen, et al. v. Ghost Gunner, Inc., et al.*, Case No. CIVDS 1935422 (San  
Bernadino County Superior Court).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

*Cardenas v. Ghost Gunner Inc. et al.*  
Case No. 30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC (Orange County Superior Court)

I, the undersigned, hereby declare and state that I am over the age of 18, employed in the City of San Francisco, California, and not a party to the within action. My business address is 115 ½ Bartlett Street, San Francisco, CA 94110.

On the date set forth below, I caused or will cause the following document(s)

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF NON-OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION  
TO PERMIT FILING OF PETITION FOR COORDINATION OR, IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, TO TRANSFER AND CONSOLIDATE ACTIONS

to be served via the following methods, on the following recipients:


☒ Email (due to Covid19 pandemic)  
☐ U.S.P.S. First Class or Priority Mail  
☐ U.S.P.S. Express Mail  
☐ Personal Delivery  
☐ Facsimile

Sean A. Brady, Esq.  
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
[sbrady@michellawyers.com](mailto:sbrady@michellawyers.com)

Justin Felton, Esq.  
Petit Kohn  
5901 W Century Blvd, Ste 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90045-5435  
[jfelton@petitkohn.com](mailto:jfelton@petitkohn.com)

Howard Schilsky, Esq.  
Renzulli Law Firm, LLP  
One North Broadway, Suite 1005  
White Plains, NY 10601  
[hschilsky@renzullilaw.com](mailto:hschilsky@renzullilaw.com)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on November 19, 2020, at San Francisco, California.



Ben Rosenfeld, Attorney



# EXHIBIT G

1 DOUGLAS MUDFORD (STATE BAR NO. 156392)  
2 ESTEE LEWIS (STATE BAR NO. 268358)  
3 CATIE BARR (STATE BAR NO. 295538)  
4 BRANDON STORMENT (STATE BAR NO. 267260)  
5 BARR & MUDFORD, LLP  
6 1824 Court Street/Post Office Box 994390  
7 Redding, California 96099-4390  
8 Telephone: (530) 243-8008  
9 Facsimile: (530) 243-1648

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

Troy McFadyen; et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GHOST GUNNER INC., d/b/a  
GHOSTGUNNER.NET; et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVDS1935422

**[CORRECTED] NON-OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANTS MOTION TO PERMIT  
FILING OF PETITION FOR  
COORDINATION OR, IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, TO TRANSFER AND  
CONSOLIDATE ACTIONS**

1 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD: Plaintiffs  
2 do not oppose and, in fact, agree with counsel that coordination of the *Cardenas* and *McFadyen*  
3 matters is proper because it will promote the ends of justice under Code of Civil Procedure § 404.1  
4 and promote efficiency among the matters. Despite the initial designation on the Civil Case cover  
5 sheet for this matter, we also agree the matter is complex under California Rule of Court 3.400 due  
6 to the large number of defendants, large number of plaintiffs, and the potential amount of witnesses  
7 and evidence to sort through.

8 Therefore, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this court enter the proposed order without  
9 delay to consolidate this matter with *Francisco Gudino Cardenas, et al v. Ghost Gunner, Inc., et*  
10 *al*, Case No.30-2019-01111797-CU-PO-CJC and designate the consolidated matter for the complex  
11 docket in the Superior Court of Orange County. Plaintiffs currently have an upcoming CMC in the  
12 *McFayden* matter on December 4, 2020. In order to not waste court resources and time, we would  
13 appreciate approving the consolidation and transfer as soon as possible.

14  
15 Dated: November 23, 2020

BRANDON STORMENT  
Barr & Mudford LLP

16  
17  
18 By: 

BRANDON STORMENT  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

## PROOF OF SERVICE

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of Shasta, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business mailing address is Post Office Box 994390, Redding, California 96099-4390. I am familiar with this firm's practice whereby the mail, after being placed in a designated area, is given the appropriate postage and is deposited in a U.S. mailbox after the close of the day's business.

XX On the date indicated below, I served the document(s) designated below on all parties in said action by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the designated area for outgoing mail addressed as set forth below:

On the date indicated below, I served the document(s) designated below on all parties in said action by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope and mailed it via overnight mail with Federal Express addressed as set forth below:

XX On the date indicated below, I personally served the document(s) designated below by transmitting a true copy thereof via electronic mail in .pdf format as an e-mail attachment to each addressee set forth below:

### **[CORRECTED] NON-OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO PERMIT FILING OF PETITION FOR COORDINATION OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO TRANSFER AND CONSOLIDATE ACTIONS**

Craig J. Mariam  
John P. Cogger  
Sebastian M. Van Roundsburg  
Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP  
633 West Fifth Street, 52<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Email: [cmariam@grsm.com](mailto:cmariam@grsm.com)  
[Jcogger@grsm.com](mailto:Jcogger@grsm.com) and  
[sroundsburg@grsm.com](mailto:sroundsburg@grsm.com)  
Telephone: 213-576-5000  
Facsimile : 877-306-0043  
*Attorneys for Defendant, JUGGERNAUT  
TACTICAL, INC.*

Justin R. Felton  
Marie Frandsen  
Pettit Kohn Ingrassia Lutz & Dolin, PC  
5901 West Century Blvd., Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Email: [jfelton@pettikohn.com](mailto:jfelton@pettikohn.com)  
[mfrandsen@pettitkohn.com](mailto:mfrandsen@pettitkohn.com)  
Telephone: 310-649-5772  
Facsimile: 310-649-5777  
*Attorneys for Defendants, Defense  
Distributed (erroneously sued as Ghost  
Gunner, Inc. dba Ghostgunner.net; Cody R.  
Wilson, Cody Wilson dba Ghostgunner.net)*

Craig A. Livingston and  
Crystal L. Van Der Putten  
Livingston Law Firm  
1600 South Main Street, Suite 280  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: 925-952-9880  
Facsimile : 925-952-9881  
[clivingston@livingstonlawyers.com](mailto:clivingston@livingstonlawyers.com)  
[cvanderputten@livingstonlawyers.com](mailto:cvanderputten@livingstonlawyers.com)

Christopher Renzulli (Pro Hac Vice)  
Howard B. Schilsky (Pro Hac Vice)  
Renzulli Law Firm, LLP  
One North Broadway, Suite 1005  
White Plains, NY 10601  
Email: [crenzulli@renzullilaw.com](mailto:crenzulli@renzullilaw.com)  
[hschlisky@renzulilaw.com](mailto:hschlisky@renzulilaw.com)  
Telephone: 914-285-0700  
Facsimile : 914-285-1213

1 Attorneys for Defendant,  
2 Tactical Gear Heads, LLC

Co-Counsel for Defendant, JUGGERNAUT  
TACTICAL, INC.  
(VIA REGULAR MAIL ONLY)

3  
4 Sean A. Brady and C. D. Michel  
5 Michel & Associates, P.C.  
6 180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200  
7 Long Beach, CA 90802  
8 Email: [sbrady@michellawyers.com](mailto:sbrady@michellawyers.com)  
9 [lpalmerin@michellawyers.com](mailto:lpalmerin@michellawyers.com)  
10 Telephone: 562-216-4444  
11 Facsimile : 562-216-4445  
12 *Attorneys for Defendants, Blackhawk Manufacturing Group, Inc.,*  
13 *Ryan and Bob Beezley*  
14 *Bob Beezley (R & B Tool Supply)*  
15 *dba RBTACTICIALTOOLING.COM*  
16 *Ghost Firearms, LLC; MFY Technical Solutions, LLC*  
17 *and Thunder Guns, LLC*

18 *Courtesy copies to:*  
19 Gerald B. Singleton  
20 Singleton Law Firm  
21 450 A Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
22 San Diego, CA 92101  
23 Email: [Gerald@SLFfirm.com](mailto:Gerald@SLFfirm.com)

24 Ben Rosenfeld  
25 115 ½ Bartlett Street  
26 San Francisco, CA 94110  
27 Email: [ben.rosenfeld@comcast.net](mailto:ben.rosenfeld@comcast.net)

28  
I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the  
foregoing is true and correct. Executed November 23, 2020, at Redding, California.



BREE A. BOUGHN

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
3 COUNTY OF ORANGE

4 I, Laura Palmerin, am employed in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County,  
5 California. I am over the age eighteen (18) years and am not a party to the within action. My  
6 business address is 180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200, Long Beach, California 90802.

7 On February 9, 2021, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

8 **NOTICE OF SUBMISSION OF PETITION FOR COORDINATION**


9 on the interested parties in this action by placing  
10 [ ] the original  
11 [X] a true and correct copy  
12 thereof by the following means, addressed as follows:

13 Please see Attached Service List.

14 X (BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) As follows: I served a true and correct copy by electronic  
15 transmission through One Legal. Said transmission was reported and completed without  
16 error.

17 X (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that  
18 the foregoing is true and correct.

19 Executed on February 9, 2021, at Long Beach, California.

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Laura Palmerin  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**SERVICE LIST**

Ben Rosenfeld  
[ben.rosenfeld@comcast.net](mailto:ben.rosenfeld@comcast.net)  
Attorney at Law  
115 ½ Bartlett Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
Fax: (415) 285-8091

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

Gerald B. Singleton  
[gerald@SLFfirm.com](mailto:gerald@SLFfirm.com)  
SINGLETON LAW FIRM  
450 A Street, 5th Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Fax: (619) 255-1515

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*