

1 **PICCUTA LAW GROUP, LLP**
Charles Tony Piccuta, Esq. (#258333)
2 Charles Albert Piccuta, Esq. (#56010)
3 400 West Franklin Street
Monterey, CA 93940
4 Telephone: (831) 920-3111
Facsimile: (831) 920-3112
5 charles@piccutalaw.com

6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
7 ROY BAKKILA and KARRIE BAKKILA

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **WESTERN DIVISION**

10 ROY BAKKILA and KARRIE BAKKILA,) Case No.:
11)
11 Plaintiffs,) Honorable:
12)
12 v.) **Complaint For:**
13)
13 CISCO’S SPORTFISHING, INC d/b/a) **1) Negligence**
14 CHANNEL ISLANDS SPORTFISHING) **2) Loss of Consortium**
15 CENTER, a California Corporation; ROBERT) **3) Negligent Misrepresentation**
16 VALNEY, an individual; JOHN FUQUA, an) **4) Intentional Misrepresentation**
individual; and DOES 1-10,)
17 Defendants.)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)

23 COMES NOW the Plaintiffs, by and through their undersigned counsel, and complain
24 and allege as follows:

25 **INTRODUCTION**

26 This action arises from a maritime injury that occurred on the navigable waters of the
27 United States. Specifically, Plaintiff, Roy Bakkila (“Mr. Bakkila”), was a passenger on a
28 chartered fishing trip on a vessel named the Seabiscuit. While Mr. Bakkila was aboard the vessel,

1 another chartered passenger was reeling in a fishing line stuck in seaweed. As the passenger
2 reeled in the line, it was under tension. The line snapped and a metal sinker attached to the line
3 came back toward the boat at a high velocity. The metal projectile struck Mr. Bakkila in the right
4 eye like a bullet. Mr. Bakkila's right globe was destroyed resulting in a complete loss of vision in
5 the eye.
6

7 Defendants are all responsible for the injury and damages suffered by Plaintiffs. All
8 Defendants were negligent and their negligence was a direct and proximate cause of Plaintiffs'
9 injuries and damages. These negligent acts include but are not limited to: failing to safeguard the
10 passengers from injury, failing to instruct the passengers so as to prevent injuries to others,
11 failing to cut the line that was under tension, failing to supervise the passengers to ensure that
12 their actions were safe and reasonable, failing to adequately staff the crew to prevent dangerous
13 conditions, failing to provide proper medical attention, failing to provide proper medical
14 supplies, failing to properly report the injury to the Coast Guard, failing to warn of the perils
15 associated with the activity, failing to notify the passengers of what safety equipment they should
16 bring, failing to require the passengers to wear proper safety equipment, among other things as
17 described further below. In addition, Defendants misrepresented that the chartered fishing trip
18 was safe and suitable for novices and beginners.
19

20 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

21
22 1. This Court has original jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
23 1333(1). This is a civil case of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction because it involves a tort
24 claim that occurred locally, on the navigable waters of the United States, and a sufficient
25 relationship exists between the incident that caused the injury and maritime activity.

26 2. The tort injury was to a paying passenger of a chartered fishing boat that
27 operated on the navigable waters of the United States. The effect of that injury includes the
28 potential effect of requiring other vessels to assist, calling upon the United States Coast Guard

1 for assistance, requiring deckhands/crewmembers of the vessel to assist with the injured
2 passenger, the increased potential for a collision with other vessels in transporting the injured
3 passenger back to shore for emergency medical treatment, among other things.

4 3. To the extent there are other grounds for the Court’s jurisdiction, and to the
5 extent necessary, the Plaintiffs designate their claims as admiralty and maritime claims,
6 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(h).

8 4. The acts and omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims occurred within the
9 navigable waters of the United States. Specifically, in the North Pacific Ocean, off the California
10 Coast near Ventura, in the Santa Barbara Channel, 1NM E of Santa Cruz Island. Therefore, the
11 appropriate venue for this action is in the United States District Court for the District of
12 California, Western Division.

13 **IDENTIFICATION OF PARTIES**

14 5. Plaintiff, Roy Bakkila (hereinafter “Mr. Bakkila”), is an adult and natural person
15 who currently and at all times relevant hereto resided in Maricopa County, Arizona.

17 6. Plaintiff, Karrie Bakkila, (hereinafter “Mrs. Bakkila”), is an adult and natural
18 person. She is the wife of Mr. Bakkila. Currently, and at all times relevant to this Complaint,
19 Mrs. Bakkila resided in Maricopa County, Arizona.

20 7. Defendant, CISCO’S SPORTFISHING, INC d/b/a CHANNEL ISLANDS
21 SPORTFISHING CENTER (hereinafter “CISCOS”), is a California Corporation who is
22 authorized to do, and does, business in Ventura County, California. CISCOS operates a charter
23 fishing trip business with its principal location at 4151 South Victoria Avenue, Oxnard,
24 California 93035. Upon information and knowledge, CISCOS is principally located and
25 domiciled in Ventura County, California.

27 ///

28 ///

1 8. Defendant, Robert Valney (hereinafter “Valney”), is a natural person and adult
2 who, at all times relevant to this Complaint, owned the Seabiscuit. The Seabiscuit is a 55 foot
3 passenger ship and charter fishing vessel (U.S.C.G. ID #507630) that Valney used, and uses, for
4 chartered fishing trips arranged through CISCOS. It was also the vessel on which Mr. Bakkila
5 was a passenger during the chartered fishing trip where he sustained the eye injury that is the
6 subject of this Complaint.
7

8 9. Defendant, John Fuqua, is the ship captain or “skipper” (hereinafter “Fuqua”) that
9 was operating the Seabiscuit and overseeing the chartered fishing trip of which Mr. Bakkila was
10 a passenger. Upon information and belief, he was hired by Valney or CISCOS for this purpose
11 and was working in an employment or agency capacity at the time of the acts described herein.
12

13 10. The true names and capacities of the defendants DOE 1 through 10 are unknown
14 to Plaintiffs at this time. These individuals may include, but are not limited to, the other
15 deckhands that were working at the time of Mr. Bakkila’s injury and the passenger who was
16 reeling in the fishing line that broke. Therefore, Plaintiffs sue these defendants by such fictitious
17 names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that each of the defendants designated as a DOE
18 acted wrongfully and/or negligently and is responsible in some fashion for Plaintiffs’ injuries as
19 herein alleged.
20

21 11. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe that at all times mentioned herein and
22 at all other relevant times, each and every defendant was the agent, servant, employee and/or
23 representative of each and every other defendant and in doing the things herein complained of,
24 was acting within the course and scope of said agency, service, employment and/or
25 representation, and each and every defendant is jointly and severally liable for all injuries and
26 resulting damages incurred by Plaintiffs.
27

28 ///

///

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1
2 12. On or about July 28, 2016, Mr. Bakkila and his son boarded the Seabiscuit for a
3 chartered fishing trip organized, arranged and chartered through CISCOS.

4 13. Mr. Bakkila and his son had planned on participating in a chartered fishing trip
5 for several years. Mr. Bakkila researched chartered fishing trips off the coast of California and
6 discovered CISCOS offering such trips. Mr. Bakkila had only been on one such trip before and
7 did not have significant experience with open ocean fishing. Mr. Bakkila chose to use CISCOS
8 because it held itself out as a provider of chartered fishing trips for individuals of all levels and
9 ages. Specifically, CISCOS advertised that its chartered fishing trips were safe for beginners,
10 children and others who lacked significant experience fishing on the ocean. (See pages from
11 CISCOS website soliciting children and novices to participate in fishing trips attached hereto as
12 **Exhibit 1**).
13

14 14. Mr. Bakkila contacted CISCOS by telephone and chartered a fishing trip on the
15 Seabiscuit. The Seabiscuit currently, and at the time, was one of several vessels that CISCOS
16 offered for chartering fishing trips to the general public.
17

18 15. Mr. Bakkila, chose the Seabiscuit because of its availability on the date that he
19 wanted to charter the trip. Mr. Bakkila scheduled the trip for July 28, 2016.
20

21 16. Prior to going on the chartered fishing trip, Mr. Bakkila reviewed the CISCOS
22 website. Nowhere on the website did it mention anything regarding safety, the perils and hazards
23 associated with fishing, or advise that safety equipment, such as protective eyewear, was
24 recommended, much less required.
25

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 17. Mr. Bakkila never received any documents, emails or other writings from any
2 Defendants advising them of safety procedures, safety concerns or potential perils or hazards
3 associated with deep-sea fishing with any specificity. Mr. Bakkila certainly did not receive any
4 notice of the potential for severe eye injuries and the need for protective eyewear to protect
5 against such injuries.
6

7 18. Upon information and belief, none of the passengers on the Seabiscuit, on July 28,
8 2016, ever received any documents, emails or other writings from any Defendants advising them
9 of safety procedures, safety concerns or potential perils or hazards associated with open ocean
10 fishing with any specificity. Upon information and belief, the passengers certainly did not
11 receive any notice of the potential for severe eye injuries and the need for protective eyewear to
12 protect against such injuries.
13

14 19. Mr. Bakkila never received any safety briefing, safety instructions, “safe fishing
15 practices” instruction or any instruction whatsoever from any Defendants prior to boarding the
16 vessel. He certainly did not receive any instruction on how to handle or reel in a line that was
17 caught in kelp, seaweed or otherwise entangled.

18 20. None of the passengers on the Seabiscuit, on July 28, 2016, ever received any
19 safety briefing, safety instructions, “safe fishing practices” instruction or any instruction
20 whatsoever from any Defendants prior to boarding the vessel. The passengers certainly did not
21 receive any instruction on how to handle or reel in a line that was caught in kelp, seaweed or
22 otherwise entangled.
23

24 21. Mr. Bakkila never received any safety briefing, safety instructions, “safe fishing
25 practices” instruction or any instruction whatsoever from any Defendants after boarding the
26 vessel. He certainly did not receive any instruction on how to handle or reel in a line that was
27 caught in kelp, seaweed or otherwise entangled.
28

1 22. None of the passengers on the Seabiscuit, on July 28, 2016, ever received any
2 safety briefing, safety instructions, “safe fishing practices” instruction or any instruction
3 whatsoever from any Defendants after boarding the vessel. The passengers certainly did not
4 receive any instruction on how to handle or reel in a line that was caught in kelp, seaweed or
5 otherwise entangled.

6 23. The only briefing that Mr. Bakkila and the other passengers received once on the
7 vessel and prior to embarking on the trip was a summary of where the vessel would attempt to go
8 and what fish they would attempt to catch.

9 24. On July 28, 2016, Bakkila and the other passengers boarded the vessel and began
10 the trip from Ventura Harbor at approximately 5:00 AM.

11 25. On the date of the trip, the vessel had on board approximately 24 paying
12 passengers. The captain of the vessel was Fuqua. There were also three other individuals that
13 made up the crew, including one individual primarily tasked with preparing food in the galley
14 and two deckhands who were apparently tasked with assisting and overseeing the passengers
15 who were fishing. Upon information and belief, these deckhands were also fishing on the date of
16 the trip.

17 26. Upon information and belief, Valney and CISCOS hired Fuqua and the crew.
18 Upon information and belief, Valney and CISCOS were responsible for training the crew on how
19 to perform their tasks and duties, including but not limited to, how to manage and oversee the
20 passengers to prevent injuries to themselves and others.

21 27. Fuqua was responsible for overseeing his crew on the date of the injury to prevent
22 injuries to others. CISCOS and Valney are, and were, vicariously liable for the negligent acts of
23 Fuqua and the crew as they were authorized agents or employees of CISCOS and Valney
24 operating in the scope of their employment or agency.

1 28. On July 28, 2016, at approximately 10:30 AM, the vessel was anchored or
2 stopped near Santa Cruz Island in the Pacific Ocean and the passengers were fishing. At or near
3 this time, one of the passenger's fishing line became entangled in kelp or seaweed. The
4 passenger was adjacent to Mr. Bakkila and the passenger attempted to reel in the line by pulling
5 on his fishing pole in an upward and sideways manner. In doing so, the passenger repeatedly
6 lifted the tip of his pole upward at an angle toward his shoulder as opposed to reeling it in with
7 the line below the top of the boat hull. The passenger did this repeatedly over the span of two to
8 three minutes and was, or should have been, observed and stopped by the deckhands tasked with
9 assisting, instructing and supervising the passengers. Eventually, the line snapped and broke and
10 a metal sinker or weight came back toward the boat from the ocean at a high velocity. Since the
11 passenger was pulling the line in an upward direction, above the boat hull, when the line broke it
12 traveled back above the boat hull and struck Mr. Bakkila in the right eye like a bullet. The
13 projectile immediately exploded his globe causing Mr. Bakkila a significant eye injury.

14
15
16 29. The injury was reported to Fuqua who then contacted the United States Coast
17 Guard to report a maritime casualty. Upon information and belief, Fuqua discussed a medical air
18 evacuation with the United States Coast Guard. Upon information and belief, Fuqua failed to
19 adequately describe the injury to the United States Coast Guard and its air surgeon/medic.
20 Instead, Fuqua advised that a passenger had caught a hook in his eye, not that his globe had been
21 exploded by a projectile at high velocity. As a result, the air surgeon/medic, recommended
22 against an air evacuation and instead instructed the boat to head back to shore.

23
24 30. Fuqua pulled up the anchor and headed back to the Ventura harbor. The trip took
25 approximately one hour and twenty minutes. During that time, Mr. Bakkila was attended to by a
26 passenger and at least one of the deckhands. However, the first aid kit on the vessel was
27 inadequate and in disarray and lacked the supplies necessary to provide Mr. Bakkila with optimal
28 emergency treatment.

1 31. Upon information and belief, none of the crew on the boat had first aid
2 certifications, first aid training or medical training that would allow them to render appropriate
3 aid to a passenger who sustained a serious injury, such as Mr. Bakkila.

4 32. Upon returning to shore, Mr. Bakkila was transported by ambulance to a local
5 trauma hospital for treatment of his eye. Despite multiple surgeries to his injured eye, Mr.
6 Bakkila lost vision in it. Mr. Bakkila is permanently blind in his right eye as a result of the injury
7 he sustained on the Seabiscuit. He can no longer partake in his normal tasks of daily living
8 including driving and any other activity that requires depth perception or visual acuity.
9

10 33. Upon information and belief, had Mr. Bakkila received better medical treatment
11 sooner, he may have been able to save the vision in his right eye.

12 34. At the time of the injury, Defendants did not have a policy requiring passengers to
13 wear protective eyewear while on their chartered fishing trips, much less any notice or
14 advisement of the potential for serious eye injuries while participating in their chartered fishing
15 trips.
16

17 35. Within days following the injury to Mr. Bakkila and with knowledge of the
18 significant injury Mr. Bakkila suffered, the Defendants were running other chartered fishing trips
19 without requiring that passengers wear protective eyewear and without providing any notice or
20 advisement of the potential for serious eye injuries while participating in their chartered fishing
21 trips. This included passengers without any fishing experience as well as children.
22

23 36. Within days following the injury to Mr. Bakkila and with knowledge of the
24 significant injury Mr. Bakkila suffered, the Defendants were running other chartered fishing trips
25 without providing any safety instructions, instructions on “best or safest fishing practices,” or
26 instructions on what a passenger should do if his or her line becomes entangled. This included
27 passengers without any fishing experience as well as children.
28

1 37. Since the injury to Mr. Bakkila, the Defendants have run over a hundred chartered
2 fishing trips with knowledge of the significant injury to Mr. Bakkila, and still did not require that
3 passengers wear protective eyewear or provide any notice or advisement of the potential for
4 serious eye injuries while participating in their chartered fishing trips. This included passengers
5 without any fishing experience as well as children.

6
7 38. Since the injury to Mr. Bakkila, the Defendants have run over a hundred chartered
8 fishing trips with knowledge of the significant injury to Mr. Bakkila, and still did not provide
9 any safety instructions, instructions on “best or safest fishing practices,” or instructions on what a
10 passenger should do if his or her line becomes entangled. This included passengers without any
11 fishing experience as well as children.

12
13 39. Currently, the Defendants run chartered fishing trips with knowledge of the
14 significant injury to Mr. Bakkila and still do not require that passengers wear protective eyewear
15 or provide any notice or advisement of the potential for serious eye injuries while participating in
16 their chartered fishing trips. This includes passengers without any fishing experience as well as
17 children.

18
19 40. Currently, the Defendants run chartered fishing trips with knowledge of the
20 significant injury to Mr. Bakkila and still do not provide any safety instructions, instructions on
21 “best or safest fishing practices,” or instructions on what a passenger should do if his or her line
22 becomes entangled. This includes passengers without any fishing experience as well as children

23 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
24 **Negligence**
(Against All Defendants)

25 41. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate all the allegations in paragraphs 1-40 above as
26 if the same were repeated herein.

27 42. Defendants owed Mr. Bakkila a duty of reasonable care to keep his safe from
28 harm and serious injury on the vessel.

- 1 43. Defendants breached their duty of care owed to Mr. Bakkila by:
- 2 A. Failing to safeguard him from injury;
- 3 B. Failing to reasonably instruct the passengers so as to prevent injuries to others
- 4 including Mr. Bakkila;
- 5 C. Failing to adequately staff the crew to prevent dangerous conditions and minimize
- 6 perils to the passengers including Mr. Bakkila;
- 7
- 8 D. Failing to observe the passengers and promptly cut the line that was under tension;
- 9 E. Failing to observe the passengers and stop unsafe fishing practices;
- 10 F. Failing to have crew with proper medical training to deal with emergency injuries;
- 11 G. Failing to provide proper medical attention;
- 12 H. Failing to have proper medical supplies on the vessel;
- 13 I. Failing to properly report the severity of the injury to the U.S. Coast Guard for air
- 14 evacuation;
- 15
- 16 J. Failing to warn passengers, including Mr. Bakkila, of the perils associated with the
- 17 activity;
- 18 K. Holding out that fishing with Defendants was safe for all ages including beginners
- 19 and novices;
- 20
- 21 L. Failing to require passengers, including Mr. Bakkila, to wear safety equipment
- 22 including protective eyewear; and
- 23 M. Failing to notify passengers, including Mr. Bakkila, to bring safety equipment
- 24 including protective eyewear.

25 44. Mr. Bakkila suffered injuries and damages as a direct and proximate cause of

26 Defendants' breach of their duty, including but not limited to, permanent injury, blindness in his

27 right eye, pain, suffering, emotional distress, medical expenses, lost wages, among other things.

28

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

**Loss of Consortium
(Against All Defendants)**

1
2
3 45. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate all the allegations in paragraphs 1-40 above as
4 if the same were repeated herein.

5 46. Mr. and Mrs. Bakkila were a legal married couple on July 29, 2016 when he was
6 injured on the Seabiscuit and still are.

7 47. Mr. Bakkila suffered the injury alleged above resulting in the loss of vision in his
8 right eye.

9 48. Mr. Bakkila is now severely limited in his everyday life functions including any
10 activity that requires depth perception and visual acuity. This includes but is not limited to
11 driving, household functions, climbing ladders, descending stairs and certain home repairs, etc.

12 49. Mrs. Bakkila has been, and will be, required to take on extra work and services as
13 the result of the injury. Mrs. Bakkila is now required to drive Mr. Bakkila to any place he desires
14 or is required to go. In addition, Mrs. Bakkila has been required to take on household chores and
15 repairs that Mr. Bakkila had customarily performed. Mrs. Bakkila has further been required to
16 care for Mr. Bakkila and has been deprived of the benefit of his full able-bodied abilities.

17 50. Mr. Bakkila's injury has affected him emotionally and this has further put a strain
18 on his marriage to Mrs. Bakkila.

19 51. Mrs. Bakkila has suffered a loss of Mr. Bakkila's services and society as a direct
20 and proximate cause of Defendants' acts as alleged in this Complaint.

21 52. The acts of Defendants as alleged in this Complaint have directly and proximately
22 caused Mrs. Bakkila damages.

23
24
25
26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Negligent Misrepresentation
(Against All Defendants)

1
2
3 53. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate all the allegations in paragraphs 1-40 above as
4 if the same were repeated herein.

5
6 54. Defendants represented to Mr. Bakkila that their chartered fishing trips were safe
7 and appropriate for beginners and others with little to no experience.

8
9 55. Defendants further failed to represent that there were significant dangers and
perils associated with their chartered fishing trips including serious injury and death.

10
11 56. Defendants further failed to divulge that at least some passengers who had taken
their chartered fishing trips in the past had suffered serious injuries and/or death.

12
13 57. Defendants further failed to represent that safety equipment, including protective
14 eyewear, should be worn to prevent serious eye injuries.

15
16 58. Defendants' representation that their chartered fishing trips were safe and
17 appropriate for beginners and others with little to no experience or that safety equipment
including protective eyewear was not needed was not true.

18
19 59. Defendants failure to present that there were significant dangers and perils
20 associated with their chartered fishing trips, including serious injury and death, and that other
21 passengers who had taken their chartered fishing trips had suffered serious injury or death was a
22 concealment of the truth.

23
24 60. Defendants may have honestly believed that the representations made were true
but had no reasonable grounds for believing the representations were true.

25
26 61. Defendants intended that Mr. Bakkila rely on the representations they made and
27 or failed to make and these representations or failure to make representations were material to
28 Mr. Bakkila.

1 62. Mr. Bakkila reasonably relied on Defendants' representations about the safety of
2 the fishing charters and Defendants' failure to make accurate representations regarding the
3 dangers associated with the charters.

4 63. Mr. Bakkila booked and went on the fishing charter as a result of this reliance and
5 was harmed as a result.

6 64. Mr. Bakkila's reliance on Defendants' representations regarding the safety of the
7 fishing charters and the need for safety equipment, and failure to accurately represent the dangers
8 associated with the fishing charter, was a substantial factor in causing his harm, injury and
9 resulting damages.
10

11 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
12 **Intentional Misrepresentation**
13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 65. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate all the allegations in paragraphs 1-40 above as
15 if the same were repeated herein.

16 66. Defendants represented to Mr. Bakkila that their chartered fishing trips were safe
17 and appropriate for beginners and others with little to no experience.

18 67. Defendants further failed to represent that there were significant dangers and
19 perils associated with their chartered fishing trips including serious injury and death.

20 68. Defendants further failed to divulge that at least some passengers who had taken
21 their chartered fishing trips in the past had suffered serious injuries and/or death.

22 69. Defendants further failed to represent that safety equipment including protective
23 eyewear should be worn to prevent serious eye injuries.

24 70. Defendants' representation that their chartered fishing trips were safe and
25 appropriate for beginners and others with little to no experience or that safety equipment
26 including protective eyewear was not needed was not true.
27
28

1 71. Defendants failure to present that there were significant dangers and perils
2 associated with their chartered fishing trips, including serious injury and death, and that other
3 passengers who had taken their chartered fishing trips had suffered serious injury or death was a
4 concealment of the truth.

5 72. Defendants knew that the representations made were false and that the
6 concealment of the other facts was intentional or done with reckless disregard.

7 73. Defendants intentionally made the false representations or concealed the truth so
8 that they could appeal to more consumers and potential passengers and to increase the sales of
9 their chartered fishing trips. Mr. Bakkila was one of the consumers and potential passengers that
10 defendants intended to have rely on their representations and concealment of the truth.

11 74. The representations made by Defendants and the facts concealed were material to
12 Mr. Bakkila in his decision to book and go on the charter and he reasonably relied on those
13 representations and concealed facts in deciding to do so.

14 75. Mr. Bakkila booked and went on the fishing charter as a result of this reliance and
15 was harmed as a result.

16 76. Mr. Bakkila's reliance on Defendants' representations regarding the safety of the
17 fishing charters and the need for safety equipment, and concealment of the dangers associated
18 with the fishing charter, was a substantial factor in causing his harm, injury and resulting
19 damages.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs demand judgment against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 1. For judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and against Defendants;
- 2. For all available general and special damages in the amount of \$8,000,000.00 or according to proof at trial;
- 3. For Punitive damages in the amount sufficient to punish and deter Defendants from similar conduct in the future;
- 4. For all damages allowed by Rules or Code;
- 5. For interest at the maximum legal rate pursuant to law;
- 6. For awardable Costs;
- 7. For any other such relief, whether legal or equitable, that the Court deems just and appropriate.

Dated: December 4, 2017

PICCUTA LAW GROUP, LLP

/s/ *C.T. Piccuta*

Charles Tony Piccuta
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Roy Bakkila and Karrie Bakkila