1 2	STANLEY R. PARRISH State Bar No. 137624 P.O. Box 302	FILED Superior Court Of California	
3	Fair Oaks, CA 95628 (916) 536-0330	Sacramento	
4	(916) 961-4636 (fax)	05/20/2010 martates	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff BETTY LOU RUTHERFORD REVOCABLE TRUS		
6	ROY RUTHERFORD, TRUSTEE AND ACTING	AGENT Case Number: 34-2010-00078349	
7			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA	A, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO	
9		Department Assignments	
10	BETTY LOU RUTHERFORD REVOCABLE TRUST BY ROY RUTHERFORD, TRUSTEE	CASE NO. Case Management 45 Law and Motion 53	
11	AND ACTING AGENT,	COMPLAINT FOR	
12	Plaintiff,	1) BREACH OF CONTRACT, 2) NEGLIGENCE	
13	vs.	3) CONSTRUCTIVE FRAUD (INSURANCE CODE SECTION	
14	MJB/BIXBY CONSTRUCTION, INC., AND DOES 1-20	1573) 4) UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT	
15	Defendants.	VIOLATIONS (CIVIL CODE SECTION 51)	
16	/	5) DECEPTIVE PRACTICES (CIVIL CODE SECTIONS 1770	
17		AND 1780)	
18		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
19			
20	COME NOW Plaintiff, BETTY LOU	RUTHERFORD REVOCABLE TRUST BY	
21	ROY RUTHERFORD, TRUSTEE AND ACTING AGENT, who for causes of action against defendants and each of them, alleges as follows:		
22			
23	THE ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO	ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	
24	1. Plaintiff, BETTY LOU RUTHERFORD REVOCABLE TRUST BY ROY		
25	RUTHERFORD TRUSTEE AND ACTING AGENT,	, herein after known as	
26	"RUTHERFORD", is a Trust created and	d existing under the laws of	
27		-	
28			
	COMPLAINT FOR BREAC	H OF CONTRACT	

State of California. BETTY LOU RUTHERFORD, whose date of birth 1 2 is March 13, 1924, is the sole beneficiary of said Trust during her lifetime. She is legally blind, non-ambulatory and lives with 3 her son and daughter-in-law at their home located at 8600 Gunner 4 Way, Fair Oaks, CA 95628. Defendant, MJB/BIXBY CONSTRUCTION INC, 5 herein after "BIXBY", is a Corporation legally created under the 6 7 laws of State of California with its principle place of business located in Sacramento, California. Bixby is licenced by the 8 9 State of California to operate as a building contractor.

10 2. The true names and capacities, whether individual, 11 corporate, associate or otherwise, of the defendant designated herein by fictitious names are unknown to plaintiff who therefore 12 13 sues said defendants by such fictitious names, and prays for leave of court to amend this complaint to set forth their true 14 15 names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. 16 Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based on such 17 information and belief, allege that each of the defendants 18 designated herein by a fictitious name, is legally responsible in 19 some manner for the events and happenings referred to herein, and 20 partially caused the damage to plaintiff as alleged in this 21 complaint.

3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on such
information and belief, allege that at the time referred to
herein, defendants, and each of them, with agents and/or
employees of each of the remaining defendants, and at relevant
times were acting within the course and scope of such agency and
or employment.

4. Plaintiff and the defendant are both residents of
 Sacramento County. The Contract giving rise to this litigation
 was formed and signed in Sacramento County and for all times
 relevant herein, defendant has been a resident of Sacramento
 County.

Roy Rutherford and his wife, Tangie Rutherford, own a 6 5. home located at 8600 Gunner Way, Fair Oaks, California. BETTY LOU 7 RUTHERFORD resides with her son, Roy, and daughter in-law, 8 Tangie, at that address where they provide for and take care of 9 10 her. On February 19, 2009, Roy and Tangie RUTHERFORD entered 11 into a home improvement construction Contract with BIXBY. A major 12 portion of that Contract was to remodel the house in such a way as to provide separate living guarters for Betty Lou within the 13 14 same premises. That Contract is currently in litigation in 15 Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 34-2009-00066239.

16 6. An asset of the RUTHERFORD TRUST includes an older, 17 small commercial property located at 106 Mill Street, Grass Valley, California. Roy Rutherford had located a potential new 18 19 tenant for the property, but before they could take possession 20 and open the planned yogurt shop, certain improvements and necessary code upgrades had to be made to the subject property. 21 22 Roy Rutherford had agreed with a contractor in the Grass Valley area on a cost to complete the remodeling as necessary. 23

7. BIXBY learned of Rutherford's plans for remodeling the Grass Valley property and requested that RUTHERFORD give BIXBY a chance to bid on the remodel. BIXBY even volunteered the use of his attorney to help Rutherford defeat the Agreement made with

1 the prior contractor. BIXBY convinced RUTHERFORD that since he 2 was already doing work for RUTHERFORD on Gunner Way in Fair Oaks, it would be easier and cheaper if he used the same contractor for 3 the Grass Valley project. BIXBY further convinced RUTHERFORD 4 5 that he could do a better and more thorough job for the same 6 cost. In order to secure the Contract on the Mill Street job, 7 BIXBY further promised that he would not charge RUTHERFORD extra fees for mileage or travel time. 8

9 BIXBY finally convinced RUTHERFORD to enter into a 8. 10 Contract for the limited remodel of the commercial property in 11 Grass Valley. A copy of that Contract as presented to and signed 12 by RUTHERFORD on May 29, 2009, is attached hereto as Exhibit "1". For a total contract amount of \$34,364, BIXBY agreed to complete 13 14 all of the repair/remodel as requested by RUTHERFORD. As part of 15 that promise, BIXBY agreed to do the necessary demolition, 16 install a 3 Ton HVAC system, replace and re-enforce the floor as 17 necessary to carry additional refrigeration units, install self 18 coving sheet vinyl, install a drywall ceiling along with crown 19 molding, paint and seal the interior and upgrade the electrical 20 service as mandated by PG&E. RUTHERFORD and BIXBY both signed 21 the eleven page typed Contract prepared by BIXBY to which was 22 attached Exhibit "A", a single page breakdown of the scope of 23 repair to be completed.

Sometime after the initial Contract was signed, BIXBY
 faxed RUTHERFORD four additional pages entitled Preliminary
 Estimate/Contract wherein some of the costs are broken out and a
 number of items listed on the scope of repair are listed as open

1 items. Three of the four additional pages require date and the 2 initials of both parties and/or signatures. RUTHERFORD never 3 signed or agreed to the content listed in these four additional 4 pages.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## BREACH OF CONTRACT

7 10. Plaintiff incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1-9
8 above as though fully set forth herein.

Exhibit "1" attached hereto identifies the documents of 9 11. 10 the Contract as the eleven page written agreement and the six pages attached as Exhibit "A" identified as the plans and 11 12 specifications. Plaintiff was never provided a complete copy of the plans and specifications identified as Exhibit "A". The 13 contract also references Exhibit "B" which is identified as the 14 "Schedule of Values", however, before obtaining plaintiff's 15 16 signature on the Contract and up to the present time, BIXBY has 17 yet to provide plaintiff with a Schedule of Values.

18 12. The Contract specifically provides that in exchange for 19 \$34,364.00, subject only to costs incurred for changes made 20 necessary by city or county governmental agencies, BIXBY would complete the remodel and repairs requested by plaintiff. The 21 22 Contract further specifies that the contractor, in this case 23 BIXBY, shall not perform any changes in the work requested until 24 the owner has approved, in writing, a Change Order prepared by 25 BIXBY that sets forth the exact amount of additional charges to be made. The Contract further provides that should an event occur 26 which the contractor believes justifies an equitable adjustment 27

28

5

in the contract price, the contractor shall give written notice
 within a reasonable amount of time to RUTHERFORD.

3 13. Not at any time did BIXBY provide RUTHERFORD with 4 written notice of any event which might justify an increase in 5 the contract cost. Nor did BIXBY at any time provide RUTHERFORD with written Change Orders. However, without permission or 6 7 authorization, BIXBY materially deviated from the agreed scope of 8 proposed repairs, the Nevada County approved plans and PG & E's 9 designated and authorized repair procedure. Notwithstanding 10 BIXBY'S failure to provide written Change Orders, and in direct violation of the Contract as well as Business and Professions 11 Code Sections 7159(c)(3)(a) and (d), BIXBY invoiced RUTHERFORD 12 13 \$50,889.81 for what he claimed were oral Change Orders. When 14 RUTHERFORD questioned the need for the changes and the billing without a written Change Order, plaintiff was informed that if 15 16 they did not pay the invoices as submitted, BIXBY would stop 17 work, lien the job and the property would never get ready for plaintiff's new tenant. Said conduct breaches the terms and 18 conditions of the construction Contract. 19

20 14. BIXBY informed the Health Department for Nevada County 21 that he would install self coving sheet vinyl, but instead he 22 installed VCT flooring. Said conduct further breached the construction Contract by installing flooring which was not 23 24 approved by the Nevada County Building Department and the 25 applicable building codes. Not only was VCT flooring not 26 approved for a food establishment, it failed and has had to be replaced with the cost being shared by RUTHERFORD and the tenant. 27

1 15. When BIXBY talked RUTHERFORD into using BIXBY CONSTRUCTION to complete the repairs at Mill Street, he promised 2 he would be utilizing the same equipment as proposed by the 3 contractor first contacted by RUTHERFORD. That initial contract 4 which was given to Bixby provided for the installation of a 3 Ton 5 HVAC system. BIXBY has acknowledged that the competing estimate 6 7 provided for a 3 Ton HVAC unit, but intentionally instructed his workers to install a 2 ½ Ton unit. The 2 ½ Ton unit is inadequate 8 g to cool the building in the summer and has already broken down on at least three occasions, wherein RUTHERFORD has incurred repair 10 11 costs because BIXBY did not respond to the warranty call.

12 16. BIXBY has further breached the terms of the Contract by 13 deviating from the approved plans and requests of RUTHERFORD. 14 There were no requests for changes to the mezzanine area, either 15 downstairs or upstairs, yet BIXBY has invoiced RUTHERFORD for 16 over \$11,000 in Change Orders when there was no authorization to 17 initiate and/or complete such work. Said conduct further 18 breaches the construction Contract.

BIXBY has represented to RUTHERFORD that PG & E 19 17. requested changes to the initial electrical repairs contemplated 20 21 and approved. BIXBY, without authorization, deviated from the 22 electrical changes approved by PG & E, and without authorization and/or proper permit, installed an electrical panel upstairs. 23 The maximum cost to complete all the electrical repair necessary 24 for the remodel should have been about \$5,267.90. BIXBY created 25 false invoices and labor charges totaling \$35,597.61 for 26 27 electrical related work. BIXBY has overbilled the electrical by 28

1 a minimum of \$30,329.

2 18. In further breach of the promises and/or terms of the 3 Contract, BIXBY has charged RUTHERFORD travel time and mileage 4 costs from Sacramento to Grass Valley. This was an item of cost 5 that BIXBY specifically stated that he would not add to the 6 Contract price.

7 19. Plaintiff has performed all obligations required by the
8 terms of the construction contract except those obligations
9 plaintiff was prevented or excused from performing.

20. Upon completion of repairs at 106 Mill Street, BIXBY 11 insisted that he be paid in full for the Contract price plus 12 \$50,889.81 in oral Change Orders that were invoiced. Fearing 13 that the work would not be completed unless they paid the bill, 14 and because BIXBY promised to lien the property and prevent the 15 tenant from taking possession, RUTHERFORD had no choice but to 16 pay BIXBY's inflated Contract price.

17 Plaintiff is not absolutely certain that they have 21. 18 accounted for all over charges made by BIXBY, nor is plaintiff absolutely certain that they have been able to ascertain all the 19 20 damages caused by BIXBY's less than professional work. To date, 21 plaintiff can account for over \$35769.00 in damages caused by the breaches of contract alleged herein, but it is likely that amount 22 will increase as discovery commences. Plaintiff has also been 23 24 forced to incur attorney fees and costs to recover the amounts 25 due under the Contract, and said fees and costs are a recoverable 26 item per the terms of the contract.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants

28

1	and each of them as set forth below.
2	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
З	(Negligence)
4	22. Plaintiff incorporates paragraph 1 through 21 above as
5	though fully set forth herein.
6	23. BIXBY's conduct and work product as herein alleged
7	above falls below the standard of care required of licensed
8	general contractors and, as such, was negligent. BIXBY
9	negligently caused damage to the plaintiff by failing to
10	reasonably perform the duties owed RUTHERFORD under the Contract.
11	Before filing this lawsuit, plaintiff retained the services of a
12	licenced inspector, who is also a licenced contractor, to
13	complete and inspect the work performed by BIXBY. In addition to
14	the wrongful conduct alleged hereinabove, the inspection revealed
15	improper use of wood piers used to support the structural
16	foundation and the weakening of the structural system caused by
17	excessive cutting and notching of wooden beams. The report
18	further pointed out below standard patching of the PVC plumbing
19	system and leaking water pipes that had been recently installed.
20	In general, the independent inspection report reveals poor
21	workmanship that falls below the standard of care required, for,
22	but not limited to painting, tile work, molding and drywall.
23	24. As a legal result of BIXBY's negligence herein alleged,
24	RUTHERFORD has been further damaged to the extent that she has
25	spent money well in excess of the inflated Contract price to
26	repair and/or complete work started by BIXBY. RUTHERFORD'S tenant
27	has been inconvenienced because of the repairs that had to be
28	-9-
	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT

1 completed to BIXBY's work.

4

5

6

28

2 WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants3 and each of them as set forth below.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

## (Constructive Fraud) (Insurance Code Section 1573)

25. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates paragraph 1 7 through 24 above as though fully set forth herein.

9 26. Before agreeing to contract with BIXBY, RUTHERFORD 9 provided BIXBY with a copy of the Contract as written by a 10 competing contractor. BIXBY specifically represented to plaintiff 11 that he could do the same scope of repair for the contract amount 12 of \$34,364. BIXBY represented that he had the expertise to do the 13 subject remodel and had done similar jobs before.

27. At the time the Contract was signed, there was no 15 indication that BIXBY was going to request Change Orders and/or 16 that there had been items of cost that had yet to be determined. 17 Plaintiff has since learned that Bixby has a pattern and practice 18 of under bidding jobs to get the contract signed, and then uses 19 change orders to increase the total contract price. When BIXBY 20 represented to RUTHERFORD that he could do the job for \$34,364, 21 BIXBY knew that there were going to be significant additional 22 costs to complete the repairs, but he intentionally and/or 23 negligently failed to share that information with RUTHERFORD. 24 Said conduct by BIXBY caused considerable prejudice to RUTHERFORD 25 when BIXBY later insisted on additional unauthorized change order 26 payments of over \$50,000 in order to avoid a lien on the property 27

> \_\_\_\_\_ COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT

1	and before he final the job. Said conduct by BIXBY caused
2	plaintiff to incur significant economic damages well in excess of
3	the contracted amount.
4	WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants
5	and each of them as set forth below.
6	FORTH CAUSE OF ACTION
7	VIOLATIONS of UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT
8	(CIVIL CODE SECTION 51)
9	28. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates paragraph 1
10	through 27 above as though fully set forth herein.
11	29. BETTY LOU RUTHERFORD is the sole beneficiary of the
12	BETTY LOU RUTHERFORD TRUST. On the date her son entered into
13	this Contract on her behalf, she was 85 years old and disabled in
14	that she is legally blind and non-ambulatory. Plaintiff is
15	informed and believes and on that basis alleges, that defendant,
16	by and through the conduct herein alleged above, wrongfully
17	discriminated against plaintiff on the basis of her disabilities.
18	BIXBY's acts and/or omissions have denied plaintiff her rights
19	under Civil Code Section 51, to be free of discrimination based
20	on race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin and/or
21	disability.
22	30. As a legal result of defendant's conduct as alleged
23	herein, plaintiff has suffered economic damages in amounts to be
24	shown at the time of trial. As provided in Civil Code Section
25	52, in addition to the actual damages established by plaintiff,
26	defendant may be held liable for up to three times the actual
27	damages as determined by a court or jury, but in no case less
28	-11-
]	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT

1	than \$4000.00. Plaintiff is also be entitled to recovery of
2	attorney fees and costs as determined by the court.
3	WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants
4	and each of them as set forth below.
5	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
6	DECEPTIVE PRACTICES
7	(CIVIL CODE SECTION 1770-1780)
8	31. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates paragraphs 1
9	through 30 above as though fully set forth herein.
10	32. Based on information and belief, plaintiff alleges that
11	defendants conduct as herein stated above violates Civil Code
12	Section 1770 in that said conduct was an unlawful method of
13	competition, was unfair and/or a deceptive act. Specifically,
14	plaintiff alleges that defendant violated Civil Code Section 1770
15	(a) (15) by representing that a part, replacement or repair
16	service was needed when it was not. In this case, defendant's
17	oral change orders and invoices demand for payment for
18	remodeling, changes in scope, alleged code upgrades and or work
19	that was not necessary and or not done.
20	33. As a direct result of defendant's conduct as herein
21	alleged, the plaintiff has suffered economic damages to be
22	established at the time of trial. In addition to the economic
23	damages alleged herein above, plaintiff is entitled to punitive
24	damages, any other relief the court may deem proper, and since
25	plaintiff's designated beneficiary is a senior citizen who is
26	also disabled, plaintiff seeks an additional award of damages up
27	to \$5000.00 as provided in Civil Code Section 1780(a)(b).
28	-12-
	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT

,

Plaintiff is also entitled to the recovery of attorney fees and 1 costs if she proves deceptive practices. 2 WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against 3 30. defendants and each of them as set forth below. 4 5 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION - Breach of Contract 6 1. For reimbursement of Contract damages in the amount of 7 \$35,769 plus loss of interest at the legal rate of ten percent 8 per annum from 7/20/09 to the present; 9 2. For attorney fees and costs incurred by plaintiff; For such other relief as the court may deem proper; 10 3. 11 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION - Negligence For any and all economic losses incurred in excess of 12 1. 13 the contract damages, to be established at the time of trial; 14 2. For attorney fees and costs; 15 For such other relief as the court may deem proper; 3. 16 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION - Fraud 17 For any and all economic losses incurred in excess of 1. the contract damages, to be established at the time of trial; 18 19 2. For attorney fees and costs; 20 Punitive damages as the court may deem just and proper; 3. 21 4. For such other relief as the court may deem proper; 22 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION - UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT 23 For actual economic damages incurred as a result of 1. 24 defendant's discriminary conduct. 25 2. For damages three times the amount of actual damages 26 but no less than \$4,000.0. 27 3. For attorney fees as determined by the court; 28 -13-COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT

1	4. For such other relief as the court may deem proper;
2	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION - DECEPTIVE PRACTICES
3	<ol> <li>For actual out-of-pocket losses incurred;</li> </ol>
4	2. For punitive damages;
5	3. For attorney fees and costs;
6	4. An additional award of \$5,000 pursuant to Civil Code ,
7	Section 1751(f)(g);
8	5. For such other relief as the court may deem proper;
9	Dated: May 20, 2010 LAW OFFICES OF STANLEY R. PARRISH
10	ALIQI
11	By: Marly & June Stanley & Janus L
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff BETTY LOU RUTHERFORD
13	REVOCABLE TRUST BY JOE RUTHERFORD, TRUSTEE
14	AND ACTING AGENT
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	 COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT
l	"

,

1	DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY
2	Plaintiff demands trial by jury of all issues so triable.
3	Dated: May 2 2010 LAW OFFICES OF STANLEY R. PARRISH
4	
-	By: Stanley M. Came
6	STANLEY K. PARRISH Attorneys for Plaintiff
7	BETTY LOU RUTHERFORD REVOCABLE TRUST BY
8	JOE RUTHERFORD, TRUSTEE AND ACTING AGENT
9	
10	
11	
12	•
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	· ·
27	
28	<u>–15–</u>
	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT