Defendant/Counterclaimant/Third Party Plaintiff David L. Clabuesch ("Clabuesch") having filed an Answer to the Complaint herein, now assert, files and alleges the following Counterclaim.

- 1. Clabuesch incorporates by this reference his entire Answer to the Complaint herein.
- 2. Barrett-Jackson Auction Company, L.L.C. is an Arizona limited liability company with its principal place of business at 3020 North Scottsdale Road in Scottsdale, Arizona, which is located in this judicial district. Barrett-Jackson US, L.L.C. is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business at 3020 North Scottsdale Road in Scottsdale, Arizona, which is located in this judicial district. These two entities shall hereinafter be jointly referred to as "Barrett-Jackson".
 - 3. David Clabuesch is an individual who resides in the State of Michigan.

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 4. ThumbCo is a Michigan Nominee Partnership with its principal place of business located in the State of Michigan.
- 5. ThumbCo has assigned all its rights, claims and causes of action herein to Clabuesch. Clabuesch is entitled to assert and prosecute all claims herein that might otherwise belong to ThumbCo.
- 6. Counter-Defendants John Does 1 through 30 are persons, corporations, partnerships or business entities (collectively, "persons") whose true names are not known to the Counterclaimants at the present time, and whose negligent acts or omissions were a cause of the injuries and damages set forth hereafter. Counterclaimants will substitute the true names of such fictitiously named persons when and if they are ascertained.
- 7. At all times material hereto, Counter-Defendants (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Barrett-Jackson") held themselves out as being especially skilled, qualified, careful and diligent in the practice of automobile consignment and auctions.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over this counterclaim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the action is between citizens of different States and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs. This Court also has pendant jurisdiction over this counterclaim.
- 9. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Clabuesch's claims occurred in this judicial district.

- 10. On December 5, 2006, ThumbCo entered into a Consignment Agreement (attached as Exhibit 1 to the Complaint herein) with Barrett-Jackson.
- 11. Barrett-Jackson knew that the Consignment Agreement was for the benefit of Clabuesch. Clabuesch is a third party beneficiary of the Consignment Agreement.
- 12. ThumbCo has assigned its rights, claims and causes of action under the Consignment Agreement to Clabuesch.
- 13. The Consignment Agreement related to a six-day automobile auction in Scottsdale, Arizona to be held in January 2007.
- 14. The Consignment Agreement was a valid contract until it was breached by Barrett-Jackson.
- 15. Under the Consignment Agreement, Barrett-Jackson held in trust a 1970

 Plymouth Hemi-Cuda race car (hereinafter the "RAMCHARGER"). The RAMCHARGER was one of the premiere vehicles featured at this auction. The RAMCHARGER was and is a unique vehicle with a unique and unequalled history. The RAMCHARGER is the last RAMCHARGERS

 Team Car ever raced, and is the only surviving RAMCHARGERS Team Car that has been fully authenticated from the racing era spanning from 1959 to 1988.
- 16. The *RAMCHARGER* was also authenticated by the National Hot Rod Association (NHRA) as the car which dominated the SS/DA Division from 1974 to 1988.
 - 17. The VIN of the *RAMCHARGER* is BS23ROB159450.

- 18. The Consignment Agreement included a covenant of good faith and fair dealing which obligated Counter-Defendants (hereinafter "Barrett-Jackson") to act with honesty and fairness towards ThumbCo and Clabuesch and to not seek to deprive ThumbCo or Clabuesch of the entitlements and benefits of the Consignment Agreement.
- 19. The Consignment Agreement obligated Barrett-Jackson to use reasonable efforts to obtain the highest possible sale price for the *RAMCHARGER*.
 - 20. The auction proceedings were televised.
- 21. The sale of the *RAMCHARGER* occurred during a commercial, and therefore was not broadcasted. However, upon information and belief, a videotape of the actual sale exists and is in the possession of Barrett-Jackson.
- 22. By auctioning the *RAMCHARGER* during a commercial, Barrett-Jackson prevented telephone bidders from participating in the sale of this vehicle.
- 23. Upon information and belief, the sale of the *RAMCHARGER* was completed within two minutes and eleven seconds. This time included the description of this prestigious vehicle before the auction of the vehicle itself. This time was substantially less than sales of comparable vehicles. This time was unreasonably brief given the value and prestige of the *RAMCHARGER* and the fact that one or more bidders were still attempting to make higher bids.
- 24. The auctioneer never stated "going once", "going twice", "fair warning" or other words to that effect prior to terminating the purported sale of the *RAMCHARGER*.

- 25. The auctioneer and auctioneer's assistants were either the employees or agents of Barrett-Jackson acting within the scope of his/her authority and/or employment. Barrett-Jackson is vicariously liable for the actions of these persons, as well as any other employee, servants or agents.
- 26. All Counter-Defendants acted jointly and in concert as part of a joint enterprise. Each Counter-Defendant is responsible for the actions of the other, and each is jointly and severally liable for the damages herein.
- 27. Barrett-Jackson failed to properly select, train, supervise, monitor or otherwise control its auctioneer, auctioneer's assistants, and/or other personnel working at the auction.
- 28. The sale of the *RAMCHARGER* ended prematurely, and while at least one bidder was still attempting to make a bid. The failure to accept the higher bid(s) represents negligence and/or intentional misconduct.
- 29. Clabuesch and at least one bidder immediately protested the purported sale of the *RAMCHARGER* and demanded a "re-run" of the auction. Barrett-Jackson failed to re-run the auction of the *RAMCHARGER*, failed to investigate, and otherwise failed to uphold its contractual and fiduciary duties.
- 30. Barrett-Jackson promised to meet with Clabuesch to discuss his protest of the purported sale, but then failed to do so. In the meantime, Barrett-Jackson wrongfully and improperly released the vehicle to the purported purchaser Thomas Kazamek. Upon

information and belief, Barrett-Jackson did not intend to keep its promise at the time of its making.

31. The actions of Barrett-Jackson were willful, wanton and malicious and represent the actions of an evil hand guided by an evil mind. Barrett-Jackson is liable for punitive damages.

Count One (Breach of Contract)

- 32. Clabuesch incorporates by this reference all Paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Counterclaim.
- 33. Barrett-Jackson breached its contractual obligations under the Consignment Agreement in at least the following ways: by failing to conduct a proper and reasonable auction of the *RAMCHARGER*; by failing to accept higher bids; and by failing to take proper measures after the protest of the sale.
- 34. Clabuesch immediately put Barrett-Jackson on notice of these breaches of contract and demanded that Barrett-Jackson preserve and safeguard the *RAMCHARGER*. Barrett-Jackson failed to do so and improperly released the *RAMCHARGER* to the purported buyer Thomas Kazamek. This was an additional breach of contract by Barrett-Jackson.
- 35. These breaches of contract damaged Clabuesch in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 36. This action arises out of contract, and Clabuesch is entitled to recover its attorneys' fees pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-341.01.

Count Two(Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)

- 37. Clabuesch incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through 36 of Counterclaim.
- 38. Barrett-Jackson failed to uphold its obligation to act with honesty and fairness towards Clabuesch before, during and after the purported sale of the *RAMCHARGER*. The actions of Barrett-Jackson constituted a breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing.
- 39. These breaches of covenant of good faith and fair dealing damaged Clabuesch in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 40. This action arises out of contract, and Clabuesch is entitled to recover its attorneys' fees pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-341.01.

<u>Count Three</u> (Breach of Fiduciary Duty)

- 41. Clabuesch incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1-40 of this Counterclaim.
- 42. The actions described above constituted a breach of fiduciary duty by Barrett-Jackson.
- 43. These breaches of fiduciary duty damaged Clabuesch in an amount to be determined at trial.
 - 44. Included in these damages, Barrett-Jackson is liable for surcharge.
 - 45. Included in these damages, Barrett-Jackson is liable for punitive damages.

46. This action arises out of contract, and Clabuesch is entitled to recover its attorneys' fees pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-341.01.

Count Four (Conversion)

- 47. Clabuesch incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1-46 of this Counterclaim.
- 48. Clabuesch protested the sale of the *RAMCHARGER* and this created a duty on the part of Barrett-Jackson to safeguard the *RAMCHARGER* until the parties to the purported sale could resolve the protest.
- 49. Until the protest was resolved, ThumbCo and Clabuesch had the right to control the *RAMCHARGER*.
- 50. Until the protest was resolved, Barrett-Jackson did not have the right to release the *RAMCHARGER* to any other party.
- 51. Barrett-Jackson wrongfully released the *RAMCHARGER* to Thomas Kazamek and thereby improperly interfered with ThumbCo's and Clabuesch's right to control the *RAMCHARGER*.
- 52. The actions of Barrett-Jackson damaged Clabuesch in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 53. This action arises out of contract, and Clabuesch is entitled to recover its attorneys' fees pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-341.01.

Count Five

(Negligence)

- 54. Clabuesch incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1-53 of this Counterclaim.
- 55. Barrett-Jackson owed a duty of reasonable care to ThumbCo and Clabuesch.
- 56. Barrett-Jackson's actions before, during and after the purported sale of the *RAMCHARGER* violated its duty of reasonable care and were negligent.
- 57. The negligence of Barrett-Jackson proximately caused injury to Clabuesch, in an amount to be proven at trial.
 - 58. Clabuesch demands trial by jury on all claims and Counts herein.
- 59. Clabuesch reserves the right to allege additional or different claims or counts as the support or bases become known through investigation and/or discovery in this matter.

WHEREFORE, Counterclaimant David L. Clabuesch prays for Judgment against Counter-Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, as follows:

- A. For an award of compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial.
- B. For an award of surcharge.
- C. For an award of punitive damages as determined by the jury.
- D. For an award of attorneys' fees.
- E. For an award of taxable costs.
- F. For any other relief deemed appropriate by the Court or by the jury.

1	DATED this 16 th day of April, 2007.
2	HOLDEN & ARMER, P.C.
3	
4	By:/s/ Scott A. Holden .
5	Scott A. Holden
6	DeeDee Armer Holden 6101 South Rural Road, Suite 118
7	Tempe, Arizona 85283
8	e-mail: <u>sholden@holdenarmer.com</u> Attorneys for Counterclaimants and Third
9	Party Plaintiffs
10	ORIGINAL filed with Clerk of Court this 16 th day of April, 2007.
11	
12	George Brandon, Esq. Brian M. McQuaid, Esq.
13	SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY
14	Two Renaissance Square 40 North Central Avenue, Suite 2700
15	Phoenix Arizona 85004-4498
16	Attorneys for Barrett-Jackson Auction Company, L.L.C.
17	Brian Pollock, Esq.
18	LEWIS & ROCA 40 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900
19	Phoenix, Arizona 85004
20	Attorneys for Defendant David L. Clabuesch
21	Peter Boyle, Esq.
22	JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 800
23	Phoenix Arizona 85012
	Attorneys for Defendant ThumbCo
24	/s/ Gina Seymour .
25	
26	