Assigned for all purposes to: Spring Street Courthouse, Judicial Officer: 1 Michael Reck, State Bar No. 209895 mreck@andersonadvocates.com 2 Michael G. Finnegan, State Bar No. 241091 Mike@andersonadvocates.com 3 JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES PA 12011 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 700 4 Los Angeles, California 90049 Tel: 310-357-2425 5 Fax: 651-297-6543 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff KRISTINA CHARLOTTE HIRSCH 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 9 10 Case No.: 22STCV35225 This Matter Relates to: 11 **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR:** KRISTINA CHARLOTTE HIRSCH, an 12 individual, (1) SEXUAL BATTERY (CIVIL CODE §1708.5); 13 Plaintiff, (2) SEXUAL ASSAULT; (3) VIOLATION OF PENAL CODE 14 VS. §647.6(A). 15 DEFENDANT DOE; and DOES 2 through **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** DOE 50, inclusive, 16 Defendant. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Plaintiff KRISTINA CHARLOTTE HIRSCH ("Hirsch") brings this action against Defendants DEFENDANT DOE, and individual, and DOES 2 through 50, inclusive (collectively, "Defendants"), and based on information and belief alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff Hirsch, is a survivor of childhood sexual abuse, sexual battery, assault, molestation and abuse at the hands of DEFENDANT DOE. When Plaintiff Hirsch was just a 14-year-old child, DEFENDANT DOE used his role, status, and power as a well-known Hollywood Star to gain access to, groom, manipulate, exploit, and coerce sexual contact from her over the course of several months in the State of California. As a result of DEFENDANT DOE'S sexual abuse and assault, Plaintiff Hirsch has suffered severe emotional, physical and psychological distress, including humiliation, shame, and guilt. Plaintiff brings this action to hold DEFENDANT DOE accountable for the serious harm he has caused her.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff is an adult female residing in the State of Louisiana. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff was residing in Los Angeles County, California, and was a minor throughout the period of child sexual assault alleged herein. Plaintiff Hirsch brings this Complaint pursuant to California *Code of Civil Procedure* Section 340.1, as amended by Assembly Bill 218, for the child sexual assault she suffered at the hands of Defendants. Thus, Plaintiff Hirsch's claims for damages suffered as a result of childhood sexual assault are timely filed as they are filed within three years of January 1, 2020. Plaintiff Hirsch is over the age of forty (40) years old. Therefore, the Plaintiff has filed a declaration from a mental healthcare practitioner, and an attorney declaration for each named defendant in this action, pursuant to the requirements of *Code of Civil Procedure* §340.1.
- 3. The Plaintiff was a resident of the State of California, during the time when the childhood sexual abuse, harassment and/or assault occurred.
- 4. The childhood sexual abuse, harassment, and/or assault occurred within the State of California.

- 5. DEFENDANT DOE, the perpetrator, at all times mentioned herein was and is an adult male individual, who Plaintiff is informed and believes lived in Los Angeles County during the period of time during which the sexual abuse, harassment, and molestation alleged herein took place, and is currently a resident of the State of California. By 1973, DEFENDANT DOE was a renowned and well-known actor and producer. By 1973, DEFENDANT DOE had acted in television and several Hollywood films, including portraying Clyde in "Bonnie and Clyde," a major box-office success that earned DEFENDANT DOE an Academy Award nomination for Best Actor. By 1973 DEFENDANT DOE had acquired wealth, stature and power as a result of his career and status as a movie star.
- 6. The Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, of Defendants named herein as DOES 2 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to the Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend the Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when such have been ascertained. Upon information and belief, each of the said Doe Defendants is responsible in some manner under *Code of Civil Procedure* §§340.1(a)(1), (2), (3), and 340.1(c) for the occurrences herein alleged, and were a legal cause of the childhood sexual assault which resulted in injury to the Plaintiff as alleged herein.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, there existed a unity of interest and ownership among Defendants and each of them, such that any individuality and separateness between Defendants, and each of them, ceased to exist. Defendants and each of them, were the successors-in-interest and/or alter egos of the other Defendants, and each of them, in that they purchased, controlled, dominated and operated each other without any separate identity, observation of formalities, or other manner of division. To continue maintaining the facade of a separate and individual existence between and among Defendants, and each of them, would allow Defendants to perpetrate a fraud and an injustice.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants and each of them were the agents, representatives and/or employees of each and every other Defendant. In doing the things hereinafter alleged, Defendants

and each of them, were acting within the course and scope of said alternative personality, capacity, identity, agency, representation and/or employment and were within the scope of their authority, whether actual or apparent. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants and each of them were the trustees, partners, servants, joint venturers, shareholders, contractors, and/or employees of each and every other Defendant, and the acts and omissions herein alleged were done by them, acting individually, through such capacity and within the scope of their authority, and with the permission and consent of each and every other Defendant and that said conduct was thereafter ratified by each and every other Defendant, and that each of them is jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff.

GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. Plaintiff met DEFENDANT DOE in Los Angeles County on the set of a movie DEFENDANT DOE was filming in approximately early 1973, when Plaintiff was 14-years-old and DEFENDANT DOE was approximately 35-years-old. Plaintiff's neighbor brought Plaintiff to the movie set where she was working at the time. On the set, DEFENDANT DOE paid undue attention to the young Plaintiff, commented repeatedly on her looks, gave her his phone number, and instructed her to call him when she was near the hotel in Los Angeles County, California, where he was living at the time. Plaintiff was thrilled by the attention and invitation from DEFENDANT DOE. The teenage Plaintiff did as the movie star instructed her to, and called DEFENDANT DOE soon after their first meeting.
- 10. Over the course of 1973, DEFENDANT DOE called Plaintiff on numerous occasions and summoned the teenager to the hotel where he was living to spend time with him.
- 11. DEFENDANT DOE brought Plaintiff with him on car rides, offered to help her with her homework, and spoke to Plaintiff about losing her virginity on multiple occasions.
- 12. Over the course of 1973, when Plaintiff was 14 and 15 years old, DEFENDANT DOE used his position and status as an adult, and a Hollywood movie star to coerce sexual contact with Plaintiff on multiple occasions, including oral sex, simulated sex and finally coerced sexual intercourse with the minor child.

- 13. Due to DEFENDANT DOE's stature, position of authority, predatory grooming and manipulation of Plaintiff, as well as Plaintiff's young age, Plaintiff was initially thrilled that DEFENDANT DOE was interested in her, and believed she was involved in a romantic relationship with a movie star.
 - 14. The abuse of Plaintiff by DEFENDANT DOE continued until late 1973.
- 15. The grooming, sexual abuse, harassment and/or assaults were committed by DEFENDANT DOE for his sexual gratification and was based upon the gender of the Plaintiff.
- 16. The grooming, sexual abuse, harassment and/or assaults were committed by DEFENDANT DOE in Los Angeles County, California.
- 17. The grooming, sexually abusive, harassing and/or assaultive acts by the DEFENDANT DOE were committed in violation of the California *Penal Code*, which proscribes sexual acts and misconduct against minor children.
- 18. As a direct and proximate result of the childhood sexual assault, harassment and abuse committed against the Plaintiff by DEFENDANT DOE, Plaintiff has suffered personal physical injury of sexual assault, and has and will continue to suffer, psychological, mental and emotional distress, and all associated economic injury.
- 19. These damages were all suffered as general, special and consequential damages of Plaintiff, in an amount to be proven at trial, but in no event less than the minimum jurisdictional amount of this Court.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION <u>SEXUAL BATTERY (CIVIL CODE §1708.5)</u> (Against DEFENDANTS DOE and DOES 2 through 50)

- 20. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein each and every allegation contained herein above as though fully set forth and brought in this cause of action.
- 21. During approximately 1973, DEFENDANT DOE and DOES 2 through 50, intentionally, recklessly and wantonly did acts which were intended to, and did result in harmful and offensive contact with intimate parts of Plaintiff's person. Plaintiff was subjected to at least one instance of sexual assault by DEFENDANT DOE, during Plaintiff's time as a minor.

///

///

28 ///

- 22. DEFENDANT DOE did the aforementioned acts with the intent to cause a harmful or offensive contact with an intimate part of Plaintiff's person and would offend a reasonable sense of personal dignity. Further, said acts did cause a harmful or offensive contact with an intimate part of Plaintiff's person that would offend a reasonable sense of personal dignity.
- 23. Because of DEFENDANT DOE's position of authority over Plaintiff, and Plaintiff's mental and emotional state, and Plaintiff's young age which was under the age of consent, Plaintiff was unable to, and did not, give meaningful consent to such acts.
- 24. As a direct, legal, and proximate result of the acts of DEFENDANT DOE, Plaintiff sustained serious and permanent injuries to his person, all of which are damages in an amount to be shown according to proof and within the jurisdiction of the Court.
- 25. As a direct result of the sexual battery by DEFENDANT DOE, Plaintiff has difficulty in reasonably or meaningfully interacting with others, including those in positions of authority over Plaintiff including supervisors, and in intimate, confidential and familial relationships, due to the trauma of childhood sexual assault inflicted upon Plaintiff by Defendants. This inability to interact creates conflict with Plaintiff's values of trust and confidence in others, and has caused Plaintiff substantial emotional distress, anxiety, nervousness, anger and fear. As a direct result of the molestation by DEFENDANT DOE, Plaintiff has had issues with her personal life, such as issues with trust and control. These feelings have caused Plaintiff substantial emotional distress, guilt, anxiety, nervousness and fear.
- 26. In subjecting the Plaintiff to the wrongful treatment herein described, DEFENDANT DOE, acted willfully and maliciously with the intent to harm Plaintiff, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, so as to constitute malice and oppression under California *Civil Code* §3294. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to the recovery of punitive damages, in an amount to be determined by the court, against DEFENDANT DOE, in a sum to be shown according to proof.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION <u>SEXUAL ASSAULT</u> (Against DEFENDANTS DOE, and DOES 2 through 50)

- 27. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein each and every allegation contained herein as though fully set forth and brought in this cause of action.
- 28. DEFENDANT DOE, in doing the things herein alleged, including intending to subject Plaintiff to numerous instances of sexual abuse and molestation, intended to cause harmful or offensive contact with Plaintiff's person, or intended to put Plaintiff in imminent apprehension of such contact.
- 29. In doing the things herein alleged, Plaintiff was put in imminent apprehension of a harmful or offensive contact by DEFENDANT DOE, and actually believed DEFENDANT DOE had the ability to make harmful or offensive contact with Plaintiff's person.
- 30. Plaintiff did not consent to DEFENDANT DOE's intended harmful or offensive contact with Plaintiff's person, or intent to put Plaintiff in imminent apprehension of such contact. Additionally, because Plaintiff was a minor during the time herein alleged, they lacked the ability to consent to sexual contact with any person.
- 31. In doing the things herein alleged, DEFENDANT DOE violated Plaintiff's right, pursuant to *Civil Code* §43, of protection from bodily restraint or harm, and from personal insult. In doing the things herein alleged, DEFENDANT DOE violated his duty, pursuant to *Civil Code* §1708, to abstain from injuring the person of Plaintiff or infringing upon Plaintiff's rights.
- 32. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress including embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliations, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered and will continue to suffer and was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity, and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.
- 33. Plaintiff is informed and based thereon alleges that the conduct of DEFENDANT DOE was oppressive, malicious and despicable in that it was intentional and done in conscious

disregard for the rights and safety of others, and were carried out with a conscious disregard of Plaintiff's right to be free from such tortious behavior, such as to constitute oppression, fraud or malice pursuant to California *Civil Code* §3294, entitling Plaintiff to punitive damages against DEFENDANT DOE in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of DEFENDANT DOE.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF PENAL CODE § 647.6(a)(1) (Against DEFENDANT DOE only)

- 21. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein each and every allegation contained herein as though fully set forth and brought in this cause of action.
- 22. California *Penal Code* §647.6(a)(1) provides that "[e]very person who annoys or molests any child under 18 years of age shall be punished by a fine not exceeding five thousand dollars (\$5,000), by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding one year, or by both the fine and imprisonment."
- 23. DEFENDANT DOE sexually molested and annoyed the Plaintiff while Plaintiff was under eighteen (18) years of age, in violation of California *Penal Code* §647.6(a)(1).
- 24. Under California law, victims of childhood sexual abuse are entitled to bring civil actions for violations of *Penal Code* provisions that prohibit adults from engaging in sexual acts with minors, including *Penal Code* §647.6(a)(1). *See Angie M. v. Superior Court (Hiemstra)*, (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 1217, 1224-25.
- 25. DEFENDANT DOE's above-noted actions in annoying and molesting the minor Plaintiff were the proximate and legal causes of physical, psychological, emotional, and economic damages which Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer to this day. It also has resulted in Plaintiff incurring, and will require Plaintiff to incur into the future, expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.
- 26. The above-described conduct of DEFENDANT DOE was oppressive, malicious and despicable in that it was intentional and done in conscious disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff, and was carried out with a conscious disregard of Plaintiff's right to be free from such tortious behavior, such as to constitute oppression, fraud or malice pursuant to California

1	Civil Code §3294, entitling Plaintiff to punitive damages against DEFENDANT DOE in an			
2	amount appropriate to punish and set an example of DEFENDANT DOE.			
3	PRAYER FOR RELIEF			
4	Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for Judgment against Defendants as follows:			
5	1.	For past, present and future	general damages in an amount to be determined at	
6		trial;		
7	2.	For past, present and future	special damages, including but not limited to past,	
8		present and future lost earning	ngs, economic damages and others, in an amount to be	
9		determined at trial;		
10	3.	Any appropriate statutory da	amages, including but not limited to attorneys' fees;	
11	4.	For costs of suit;		
12	5.	For pre- and post- judgment interest as allowed by law;		
13	6.	For attorneys' fees pursuant to the aforementioned statutes and otherwise		
14		allowable by law:		
15		a. California <i>Code of C</i>	Civil Procedure §1021.5;	
16	7.	For exemplary and punitive	damages in an amount to be determined at trial; and	
17	8.	For such other and further re	elief as the court may deem proper.	
18				
19	DATED: Nov	vember 7, 2022	JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES PA	
20			Mike Reck	
21			MICHAEL RECK	
22			Attorney for Plaintiff	
23			KRISTINA CHARLOTTE HIRSCH	
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL A trial by jury is hereby demanded by Plaintiff. DATED: November 7, 2022 **JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES PA** Mike Reck MICHAEL RECK MICHAEL FINNEGAN Attorneys for Plaintiff KRISTINA CHARLOTTE HIRSCH