### SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

ARCHIE GARGA-RICHARDSON, an individual; and DOES 1 through 25, Inclusive

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): INTERNET SOLUTIONS CORPORATION, a Nevada corporation

SUM-100 FOR COURT USE ONLY Los Angeles Superior Court

JUL 7 0 2008

John A. Clarke,	Egoautive Office	r/Cleri
3v	Executive Office	Beauf
B.M.	WAIN	:

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A lotter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper logal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courte Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selftelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nonrest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee walver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.

Tieno 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que so ontregue una copia al domandante. Una certa o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por oscrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desoa que processan su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que ustad pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y més información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfholp/espanol/), on la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cueta de presentación, pida al secretario de le corte que lo de un formulario de exención de pego de cuetas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corto le podrà quitar su sueldo, dinere y biones sin més advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pager a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios logales gratuitos de un programa de servicios logales sin finos de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin finos de lucro en el sitlo web de California Logal Services, (www.lawholpgalifornia.org), on el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de Colifornia,

(www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfnelp/sapanol/	) a poniéndose en c	ontacto con la corte o el c	ologio do abogados local	les.
The name and address of the court is:				- IND
(El nombre y diracción de la corte es):			CASE NUMBER:	0704100
Los Angeles County Superior Co	ourt		(Número del Caso):	6374102
111 North Hill Street				
Los Angeles, California 90012				
The name, address, and telephone num (El nombre, la dirección y el número de	teléfono del aboga	do del demandante, o del	an attomey, is: ' demandante que no tie	ene abogađo, es):
W. Gary Kurtz, CSB #57546, La 2625 Townsgate Road, Suite 330	w Omces of w. Westlake W <b>ilk</b>	. Gary Kuriz Se CA 91361 Tele	onhone: 805_449_87	165
2023 Townsgate Road, State 330	, Westigne Char	ugo, 021 7 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		
DATE:	John A. Cit	Clerk, by		Deputy (Adjunto)
(Fecha) [m] 1 0 2008	$y_{O_L}$	(Secretario)		(Adjunto)
(For proof of service of this summons, u. (Para prueba de entrega de esta citation NOTIC [SEAL] 1. 2.	use el formulario l E TO THE PERSO ) as an individual d	Proof of Service of Summ N SERVED; You are sen	ons, (POS-010)). red	
3.	on behalf of (spe	cify):		
und	CCP 416	5.10 (corporation) 5.20 (defunct corporation) 3.40 (association or partn	CCP 416	5.60 (minor) 5.70 (conservatee) 5.90 (authorized person)
4.	other (sp by personal deliv	= :		Page 1 of
Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of Cellifornia		SIMMONS		Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 453

**SUMMONS** 

SUM-100 [Rev. January 1, 2004]

American LegalNet. Inc. | www.USCountforms.com

1 2	W. GARY KURTZ, State Bar # 57546 LAW OFFICES OF W. GARY KURTZ 2625 Townsgate Road, Suite 330	CONFORMED COPY
3	Westlake Village, California 91361 Telephone: (805) 449-8765 Fax: (805) 449-1626	OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court
4	Email: wgarykurtz@earthlink.net	JUL. 1 0 2008
5	Attorneys for Internet Solutions Corporation	John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk
6		By Dom Swan
7		D.M. SWAIN Deputy
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE ST	TATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	COUNTY OF LOS	ANGELES
10	CENTRAL DIVISIONSTANLE	
11		BC394102·
12	INTERNET SOLUTIONS CORPORATION, a) Nevada Corporation,	Case No.
13	Plaintiffs,	COMPLAINT FOR (1) LIBEL PER QUOD; (2) LIBEL PER SE;(3)
14	vs.	INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH BUSINESS RELATIONS; (4)
15	ARCHIE GARGA-RICHARDSON, an individual;)	INJURIOUS FALSEHOODTRADE LIBEL; (5) VIOLATION OF BUSINESS
16	and DOES 1 through 25, Inclusive, )  Defendants	AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 ET SEQ; AND (6) INJUNCTIVE
17	Defendants )	RELIEF
18		
19		
20	Plaintiff INTERNET SOLUTIONS CORPO	RATION (hereinaster "ISC" or "Plaintiss")
21	alleges:	
22	NATURE OF A	CTION
23	<ol> <li>This is an action for damages and injun</li> </ol>	ctive relief as a result of Defendant ARCHIE
24	GARGA-RICHARDSON's (hereinafter "Richardson	n" or "Defendant") malicious, willful and
25	intentional defamation, interference with business rela	tionships, trade libel and wholesale violation
26	of the Unfair Competition Act. Via his website, www	v.scamfraudalert.com, Richardson published
27	and actively continues to publish false and inflammato	ry statements designed to intentionally attack
28	and discredit ISC. Defendant's repeated attacks an	d false statements have caused damages to

COMPLAINT FOR (1) LIBEL PER QUOD; (2) LIBEL PER SE, ETC.

Plaintiff in the past and such damages will continue in the future unless enjoined by this Court.

#### PARTIES AND JURISDICTION

- 2. Plaintiff alleges based upon information and belief, that jurisdiction is proper in this Court since (a) the Defendant Richardson resides in Los Angeles County, California and (b) the damages alleged exceed the jurisdictional minimums of this Court.
- 3. ISC is a Nevada corporation authorized to do business in Florida with its principal place of business in Orlando, Florida. Plaintiff ISC is not required to qualify to do business in California for purposes of availing itself of the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court since the claims pursued herein do not arise out of business operations conducted by it in California.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Richardson is the owner, moderator, author and host of the Internet website www.scamfraudalert.com.
- 5. Plaintiff does not presently know the true identities of defendants DOES 1 through 25, inclusive, and will amend this complaint at such time as the same are ascertained.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believe and based thereon allege that each of the defendants named herein as DOES 1 through 25 was acting as the agent of the remaining defendants in performing the wrongful acts herein alleged. Plaintiff is further informed and believe and based thereon alleges, that defendants, and each of them, engaged in a conspiracy with each other to cause Plaintiff to sustain the injuries herein alleged.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believe and based thereon allege that defendants DOES 1 through 25, inclusive, in performing the acts set forth below, were acting under the direct authority and direction of Richardson and within the scope of their employment. Alternatively, Plaintiff allege that the conduct of DOES 1 through 25 was ratified by Richardson.

#### FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 8. ISC operates an internet marketing business under various fictitious names, including but not limited to, the following:
  - A. VeriResume;
  - B. World Voice News (formerly known as USA Voice); and
  - C. Instant Human Resource.

Printed on recycled paper

- 9. ISC is not the subject of any criminal or government action relating to its business practices.
- 10. Richardson's website, www.scamfraudalert.com, purports to be dedicated to internet security and exposing internet scams and fraudulent internet employment advertisements.
- 11. Via his website, www.scamfraudalert.com, Richardson willfully published and continues to publish to the public false, derogatory and defamatory statements regarding ISC.
- 12. Via his website, www.scamfraudalert.com, Richardson published internet postings that falsely claim that ISC participates in, *inter alia*, phishing (*i.e.*, attempting via use of the Internet to obtain personal information from an individual under false pretenses), identity theft and perpetration of fraudulent employment scams.
- 13. On his website, www.scamfraudalert.com, Richardson published internet postings that falsely claim ISC is operated by "thugs" and "crooks, criminals, scumbags targeting the unemploy [sic], elderly, students, stay-at-home moms, retirees and the innocent. Luring them into cashing fraudulent checks."
- 14. Richardson published and continues to publish the aforementioned defamatory statements regarding Plaintiff in an attempt to cause injure ISC's business operations.
- 15. Prior to filing this Complaint, Plaintiff's attorney contacted Richardson, via email and written correspondence, and informed Richardson of the false, defamatory and injurious statements posted on the www.scamfraudalert.com website and requested that Richardson remove the defamatory statements from the www.scamfraudalert.com website. Nonetheless, Richardson refused and continues to refuse to remove the defamatory statements regarding ISC from the www.scamfraudalert.com website.
- 16. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that at all times material hereto, Richardson posted the false and defamatory statements regarding ISC in an attempt to lure advertisers and readers to his website in order to realize advertising income and personally benefit from his willful and malicious conduct.

//

1213

1415

16 17

18

19 20

2122

23

24

2526

27

28

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

### FOR LIBEL PER QUOD

### (Against all Defendants)

- 17. Plaintiff repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 16 as if fully restated herein.
- 18. Richardson has repeatedly made false and defamatory statements regarding Plaintiffs' business operations and professional conduct.
- 19. Richardson's publications of the false, defamatory and injurious statements were not subject to any available publication or legal privilege.
- 20. Richardson's false, defamatory and injurious statements exposed Plaintiff to distrust, hatred, contempt, and ridicule.
- 21. Richardson's false, defamatory and injurious statements harm the reputation of Plaintiff so as to lower the readers' opinion of Plaintiff and to deter third-persons from associating or dealing with Plaintiff.
- 22. Plaintiff is informed and believe that Richardson's false and defamatory statements were made with knowledge of their falsity or with reckless disregard of the truth or falsity of the statements and with the specific intent and knowledge that the statements would damage Plaintiff.
- 23. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that Richardson made the false and defamatory statements with actual malice toward Plaintiff with the specific intent to damage and harm Plaintiff.
- 24. Plaintiffs suffered substantial damages as a result of Defendant's actions in an amount not yet determined but in excess of the jurisdictional minimums of this Court
- 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the Defendant in making the false and defamatory statements is guilty of fraud, oppression and malice. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages against Defendant in an amount sufficient to punish Defendant and deter future misconduct.

4

//

//

	j	ı		
	۰	•	•	

### 3

# **4** 5

# 6 7

# 8

# 10

# 1 I

# 12

# 13

# 14

# 15

# 16

# 17 18

# 19

### 20

# 2122

## 23

### 24

# 2526

## 27

# 28

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR

#### LIBEL PER SE

### (Against all Defendants)

- 26. Plaintiff's repeat and reallege Paragraphs 1 through 16 and 18 through 23 as if fully restated herein.
- 27. Richardson has made false statements about Plaintiff which are per se injurious as they accuse the Plaintiff of ongoing criminal misconduct and criminal activity.
  - 28. The nature of the false statements is such that malice and actual damage is presumed.
- 29. Richardson published the false statements to third-parties via posting the statements on the Internet.
- 30. The falsity of these statements injured Plaintiffs' reputation in the business community and with the public.
- 31. As a direct and proximate consequence of Richardson's conduct, Plaintiffs suffered substantial damages in an amount not yet determined but in excess of the jurisdictional minimums of this Court.
- 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the Defendant in making the false and defamatory statements is guilty of fraud, oppression and malice. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages against Defendant in an amount sufficient to punish Defendant and deter future misconduct.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

### FOR INTERFERENCE WITH BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS

## (Against all Defendants)

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 16, 18 through 23 and 27 throughas if fully restated herein.
- 34. Plaintiff established business relationships with industry professionals, consumers, and advertisers through their various business ventures.

	35.	Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all times material hereto, Richardson knew
of the	existing	business relationships between Plaintiff and its advertisers, business affiliates,
employ	yees, ind	lependent contractors and internet consumers.

- 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Richardson intentionally interfered with the business relationships by posting false and defamatory statements for the express purpose of destroying Plaintiff's established and future business relationships.
- 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Richardson's interference with Plaintiff's business relationships was without legal or other justification.
- 38. As a result of Defendant's intentional and unjustified interference, Plaintiff has suffered damages to its existing business relationships and continue to suffer damages in an amount not yet determined but believed to be in an amount excess of the jurisdictional minimums of this Court.
- 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the Defendant in making the false and defamatory statements is guilty of fraud, oppression and malice. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages against Defendant in an amount sufficient to punish Defendant and deter future misconduct.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### FOR INJURIOUS FALSEHOOD-TRADE LIBEL

### (Against all Defendants)

- 40. Plaintiff repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 16, 18 through 23, 27 through 30 and 34 through 37 as if fully restated herein.
- 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Richardson intentionally made false statements about Plaintiffs' businesses and business practices which are untrue and disparaging as to the nature and manner in which Plaintiff conducts business.
- 42. Richardson published the aforementioned untrue and disparaging statements to third-parties through posting the statements via the Internet.
- 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Richardson knew that the false statements were likely to influence prospective users of Plaintiff's businesses to avoid using Plaintiff's businesses.

44.	Plaintiffs	are	informed	and	believe	that	the	false	statements	materially	and
substantially	induced th	iird-p	arties not	to uti	lize Plai	ntiff	s bu	siness	es and to no	ot contract	with
Plaintiff.											

- 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes that as a result of Defendant publishing the false and defamatory statements to third parties, Plaintiff has suffered pecuniary loss in the form of lost business revenues and business contracts and lost business opportunities in an amount not yet determined but believed to be in an amount excess of the jurisdictional minimums of this Court.
- 46. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the Defendant in making the false and defamatory statements is guilty of fraud, oppression and malice. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages against Defendant in an amount sufficient to punish Defendant and deter future misconduct.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# FOR VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE

### SECTION 17200 ET SEQ

### (Against all Defendants)

- 47. Plaintiff repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 16, 18 through 23, 27 through 30, 34 through 37 and 41 through 44 as if fully restated herein.
- 48. Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq. defines "unfair competition" as meaning and including any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practice or act. Plaintiffs are informed and believes that the conduct described above, constitutes unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent business practices as defined by California's Unfair Competition Act.
- 49. Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief to compel Defendant to cease his unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent business practices.
- 50. Plaintiff requests that they be awarded their reasonable attorneys fees incurred in connection with enforcing their rights under Business & Professions Code section 17200 et seq.

Printed on recycled paper

•	ļ		

### 3

# 4

# 5

# 7

# 8

# 9

# 10

## 11

# 12

### 13

### 14

### 15

### 16

### 17

#### 18

### 19

## 20

# 2122

### 23

#### 24

### 25

#### 26

### 27

# 28

### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

### (Against all Defendants)

- 51. Plaintiff repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 16, 18 through 23, 27 through 30, 34 through 37, 41 through 44 and 48 through 49 as if fully restated herein.
- 52. Based on the facts as set forth herein, Plaintiff has a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of the asserted causes of action.
- 53. Plaintiff does not have an adequate remedy at law in order to prevent further harm and injury in the future.
- 54. Monetary damages are inadequate to protect the present and future business interests and reputation of the Plaintiff.
- 55. Injunctive relief would provide a benefit to, and is in the interest of, the public, as it would prevent defamation, libel and other actionable conduct through the use of the Internet.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that this Court grant the following relief:

- A. On the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Causes of Action, for an award of compensatory damages, punitive damages and prospective damages against Defendant;
  - B. On the Fifth Cause of Action:
- 1. For injunctive relief commanding the Defendant to cease its unlawful, unfair and fraudulent practices;
  - 2. For an award of Plaintiff's attorney's fees
  - C. On the Sixth Causes of Action,
- 1. For an immediate, preliminary injunction and permanent injunction enjoining Defendant from hosting, posting, or in any manner publishing or disseminating, whether under his legal identity or under any aliases, whether now created or created in the future, any false defamatory or injurious information regarding Plaintiff; and
- 2. For an Order compelling Defendant to immediately remove from his website, www.scamfraudalert.com, as well as any and all other media and communication conduits, all

Q

I	defamatory an	d action	nable statements posted or publish	ned regarding Plaintiff;
2	D.	On all	Causes of Action	
3		1.	An award of Plaintiff's costs inc	urred in prosecution of this action;
4		2.	For such other and further relief	as this Court deems just and proper.
5				
6	Dated:	July 9	, 2008 Re	spectfully submitted,
7			LA	W OFFICES OF W. GARY KURTZ
8				1.0
9			Ву	Yall
10			Au	torneys for Internet Solutions Corporation
11				
12				•
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
25				
·/				