



**LITIGATION DOCKET**  
**March, 2022**

***Abney v. DHCS***

**Denial of health care based on income never received**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Adverse Party</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HEALTH</b>	State	State	Northern CA	San Francisco	Medi-Cal beneficiaries with garnished income

<i>Summary</i>	DHCS made Medi-Cal unaffordable to Debra Abney when it counted as her income money she never received: retirement benefits garnished to pay a tax debt. This violated Medi-Cal regulations permitting counting of income only when actually available to a recipient to meet current needs.				
<i>Filed</i>	2020				
<i>Current Status</i>	Trial court denied petition, and Ms. Abney has filed notice of appeal.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Bay Area Legal Aid				

***Alvarado v. Los Angeles Superior Court***

**Suit to protect poor traffic defendants from losing their drivers licenses**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Adverse Party</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>ACCESS TO JUSTICE</b>	State Court	State	Southern CA	Los Angeles	Tens of thousands of LA County poor traffic defendants

<i>Summary</i>	LA Superior Court refers traffic defendants to DMV for license suspension for failure to pay fines, but without determining ability to pay those fines. This violates the Vehicle Code, which permits suspensions only for "willful" failure to pay.				
<i>Filed</i>	2016				
<i>Current Status</i>	Case settled, including attorneys' fees, which have been paid. Implementation work will continue.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Neighborhood Legal Services, ACLU-SC, USC Gould School of Law Clinic, Rapkin & Associates; Schonbrun, Seplow, Harris, & Hoffman, Neighborhood Legal Services				

### The Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles v. City of Los Angeles

#### Protecting LA eviction COVID-19 eviction moratorium

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Adverse Party</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	Other	Federal	Southern CA	Los Angeles	Thousands of LA tenants facing eviction because of loss of income during pandemic
<i>Summary</i>	LA enacted ordinances prohibiting evictions for non-payment of rent related to COVID-19; freezing rents for a year; and prohibiting evictions and threats of evictions for certain other grounds. AAGLA sued in federal court.				
<i>Filed</i>	2020				
<i>Current Status</i>	Tenant rights organizations filed a motion to intervene, which the court granted. The district court denied AAGLA's motion for preliminary injunction and the Ninth Circuit affirmed. AAGLA has petitioned the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari, and both the City and Intervenors have responded.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Public Counsel; Public Interest Law Project, Susman Godfrey				

### Banda v. County of San Bernardino

#### Illegal barriers to receiving subsistence benefits

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>PUBLIC BENEFITS</b>	County	State	Southern CA	San Bernardino	General Relief applicants in San Bernardino County
<i>Summary</i>	San Bernardino County has erected so many barriers to access its General Relief program that as of January 2020 there were fewer than 200 GR recipients in the county. This lawsuit challenges many of the illegal barriers.				
<i>Filed</i>	2019				
<i>Current Status</i>	During the course of the litigation, the County raised grants and took many of the actions demanded in the complaint. The parties have now settled, with the County agreeing to raise grants by more than 50% over the next five years. Fee negotiations pending.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Inland Counties Legal Services; Public Interest Law Project				

**Black Parallel School Board v. Sacramento City Unified School District**

**Segregating and punishing black students with disabilities**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>ACCESS TO JUSTICE</b>	Other	Federal	Northern CA	Sacramento	Black students and all students with disabilities in Sacramento

<i>Summary</i>	The Sacramento City Unified School District has effectively segregated students with disabilities, particularly Black students; and disproportionately punishes Black students, particularly those with disabilities. This violates state and federal law.				
<i>Filed</i>	2019				
<i>Current Status</i>	Suit filed and structured settlement negotiations ongoing. District has already agreed to important changes.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Equal Justice Society; National Center for Youth Law; Disability Rights California				

**Etter v. Board of Supervisors for L.A. County**

**Enforcement of County’s obligation to provide medical services to indigent residents.**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HEALTH</b>	County	State	Southern CA	Los Angeles	Indigent LA County residents

<i>Summary</i>	This class action enforced the County’s obligation under Welfare and Institutions Code section 17000 to provide medical care to indigent county residents commensurate with the person’s ability to pay and to affirmatively advise patients of the availability of care based on ability to pay.				
<i>Filed</i>	1985				
<i>Current Status</i>	Monitoring work ongoing.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Pre-1996, co-counsel had been NLS-LA (formerly San Fernando Valley Neighborhood Legal Services); LAFLA; ACLU and NHeLP. Dating back to at least 2011, WCLP has been the only remaining plaintiff’s counsel engaged in monitoring the county’s compliance with the permanent injunction.				

### Freeman v. County of Riverside

#### Stopping collection from parents illegally forced to pay juvenile court fees

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>ACCESS TO JUSTICE</b>	County Other	State	Southern CA	Riverside	Low-income parents of institutionalized minors

*Summary* | Western Center-sponsored SB 90 prohibits counties from continuing to assess parents for the costs of support for their children locked up in juvenile facilities. But the legislation did not address debt collection, and some counties, including Riverside, continued to seek collection against parents. Riverside's practice was illegal because it did not consider ability to pay and the County did not secure necessary court orders.

*Filed* | 2020

*Current Status* | After pre-litigation claim filed, Riverside stopped collection efforts. Remaining issue is whether the County may be forced to reimburse parents for previous collections. Complaint was amended, County sought dismissal, and court allowed most of the complaint to proceed. The court granted plaintiffs' motion for class certification, prompting settlement negotiations..

*Co-Counsel* | National Center for Youth Law

### Grupo Comunitario v. Harmony Communities

#### Illegal closure and planned conversion of mobilehome park

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	Other	State	Southern CA	Fresno	Low-income mobilehome owners

*Summary* | After taking over a mobilehome park lived in by a largely Mixteco community, a park owner raised rents by 50% and began threatening evictions for drying clothes outside, locking gates at night, and similar purported violations of park rules. These actions violate the Mobilehome Residency Law and other statutes.

*Filed* | 2019

*Current Status* | Court denied preliminary injunction against retaliatory rent increases and other harassing actions. Court also overruled demurrer and denied motion to strike; discovery ongoing.

*Co-Counsel* | California Rural Legal Assistance; Morrison & Forester

### **Hepner v. County of Santa Clara**

#### **Suit to require hospitals to offer discount and charity pricing**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HEALTH</b>	County	State	Northern CA	Santa Clara	Low income hospital patients in Santa Clara County
<i>Summary</i>	The Hospital Fair Pricing Policies Act requires hospital to limit charges to patients under 350% of the poverty line to the amount that the hospital would receive from government programs such as Medi-Cal. A county hospital has violated that statute by over-charging petitioners and others, without notifying them of their potential eligibility for charity care.				
<i>Filed</i>	2019 (Western Center associated in 2021)				
<i>Current Status</i>	Discovery and settlement negotiations ongoing.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Consumer Law Center, Inc.				

### **Hunger Action Los Angeles v. County of Los Angeles**

#### **Suit to require county to timely provide emergency food aid**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>PUBLIC BENEFITS</b>	County	State	Southern CA	Los Angeles	Very low income applicants for emergency food aid in LA County
<i>Summary</i>	LA County is violating state law, which requires that emergency CalFresh (formerly food stamps) benefits be provided within three days for applicants who are extremely low income and resources or cannot meet their monthly housing expense. During the Summer of 2021, more than half of all applicants were forced to wait beyond the three-day deadline for the County to provide benefits.				
<i>Filed</i>	2021				
<i>Current Status</i>	Suit and motion for preliminary injunction filed. Settlement negotiations ongoing.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County; Public Interest Law Project; Akin Gump				

### Huntington Beach v. State of California

#### Intervention to protect affordable housing legislation

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	City	State	Southern CA	Los Angeles	Low-income tenants statewide

*Summary* | After Western Center-sponsored legislation made affordable housing protections applicable to charter cities, Huntington Beach sued, arguing this was a violation of charter cities' rights to home rule on local issues.

*Filed* | 2019

*Current Status* | The trial court granted our motion to intervene on behalf of two advocacy groups. Following briefing and argument, court ruled in our favor, upholding the legislation. The court also denied the City's motion to strike our costs memorandum. The court awarded attorneys' fees and the City has appealed.

*Co-Counsel* | CRLA Foundation

### Katie A. v. Bonta

#### Mental health services for foster care children

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HEALTH</b>	State	Federal	Southern CA	Los Angeles	Foster care children in California

*Summary* | This class action was filed in 2001 in federal court against State officials and Los Angeles County challenging the lack of mental health treatment outside of institutions afforded to foster children under the Medi-Cal program. Plaintiffs settled with the County, though monitoring the settlement is ongoing. The parties have agreed on conditions for exit from agreement.

*Filed* | 2001

The parties reached a settlement agreement, which was approved December 5, 2011. Agreement includes \$3.75 million in attorneys' fees for all counsel. Fees have been paid in full.

*Current Status* | While the court no longer has jurisdiction over the case against the state, implementation work remains on LA County issues. The County announced plans to seek an end to court jurisdiction. The District Court rejected the County's attempt to unilaterally fire the outside panel of experts which has been overseeing County compliance, but the County then filed a Rule 60(b) motion to end jurisdiction.

Tentative settlement reached after mediation, including attorneys' fees. It awaits court approval.

*Co-Counsel* | Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Public Counsel, National Health Law Program

### ***La Clinica v. Trump***

#### **Punishing immigrants for receiving government assistance**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>PUBLIC BENEFITS HEALTH</b>	Federal	Federal	Northern CA	San Francisco	Immigrants who receive any government aid
<i>Summary</i>	Federal statutes permit the government to deny immigrants the right to change immigration status if they are “public charges.” For many decades, this has been interpreted only to exclude people totally reliant on government aid. The Administration enacted a new regulation punishing immigrants who, for any of three out of 36 months, have used any means-tested government assistance, including Medicaid and Section 8 housing.				
<i>Filed</i>	2019				
<i>Current Status</i>	District court in related lawsuits brought by cities and State of California, issued preliminary injunction that has since been stayed by the Ninth Circuit. In our case, the court denied relief on the ground that the non-profit organizations we represent are not in the “zone of interest” under the APA. Government motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. Public charge rules has been rescinded, but case has not been dismissed because of attempts by Texas and other states to intervene in litigation elsewhere and resurrect the rule.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	National Immigration Law Center; National Health Law Program; Munger, Tolles & Olson				

### ***Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County v. Department of Finance***

#### **Refusal to honor contract to fund affordable housing**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	State	State	Northern CA	Sacramento	Low income Redwood residents and possibly low income people throughout State
<i>Summary</i>	Legal Aid Society reached agreement with city to fund affordable housing as required by redevelopment statute. With dissolution of redevelopment agencies, only recognized obligations may be funded. Department of Finance refuses to recognize agreement as enforceable.				
<i>Filed</i>	2013				
<i>Current Status</i>	Suit filed against Department of Finance to require recognition of agreement as enforceable. After briefing and argument, court ruled against Legal Aid Society, which appealed. Five years after briefing was completed, Court of Appeal ruled in our favor in a published opinion. The trial court awarded attorneys’ fees and the Department of Finance has appealed.				
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Public Interest Law Project				

### ***Lilley v. County of Alameda***

#### **Illegal delays in providing food benefits**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>PUBLIC BENEFITS</b>	County	Federal	Northern CA	Alameda	Food stamp applicants in Alameda County

<i>Summary</i>	Despite a requirement in federal law to determine applications for food stamps within 30 days, Alameda County has a backlog of more than 10,000 applicants. Plaintiffs contend this violates federal law.
<i>Filed</i>	2015
<i>Current Status</i>	Court issued permanent injunction in favor of plaintiffs and fee award pursuant to stipulation, and fees have been paid. The County, having achieved greater than 99% timeliness, successfully moved to vacate the injunction. Monitoring continues.
<i>Co-counsel</i>	Public Interest Law Project, Pillsbury

### ***Mankinen v. County of Orange***

#### **Wholesale Illegals in General Relief Program**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>PUBLIC BENEFITS</b>	County	State	Southern CA	Orange	Indigent residents in Orange County

<i>Summary</i>	For years, Orange County systematically excluded applicants from its General Relief program through hostile attitudes, burdensome and unnecessary requests for information, and other barriers. Plaintiffs' counsel confronted the County and after 11 months reached an agreement on reforms to the program.
<i>Filed</i>	2012
<i>Current Status</i>	As part of the agreement, plaintiffs filed a class action, and then asked the court to approve the settlement agreement. The court did so. The agreement raises the GR grant; amends dozens of objectionable aspects of the program; and adds accommodations for applicants and recipients with disabilities. Fees were negotiated and paid. Implementation work ongoing.
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Public Interest Law Project; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund

### ***Martinson v. County of Humboldt***

#### **Tearing down housing for jail parking lot without paying reloaction benefits**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	County	State	Northern CA	Humboldt	Tenants in Humboldt

<i>Summary</i>	County cut a deal to buy a low-income apartment complex to tear down and expand parking for a jail. The County has failed to comply with its statutory relocation obligations.
<i>Filed</i>	2019
<i>Current Status</i>	The County decided not to go ahead with the purchase, but claimed it owed no obligation to tenants who moved out as a result of the jail expansion plans. Settlement on the merits reached requiring County to comply with relocation laws and to pay damages to tenants. A fee settlement was reached, and fees have been paid. This case will not appear on the next Docket.
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Legal Services of Northern California; Disability Rights California

### ***Padres Buscando el Cambio v. Harbor Regional Center***

#### **Challenge to racial discrimination in provision of regional center services**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HEALTH</b>	Other, State	State	Southern CA	LA	Latinx families needing regional center services

<i>Summary</i>	Harbor Regional Center spends far less money on services for Latinx individuals with developmental disabilities than for white individuals, and engages in discriminatory practices. This violates statutes prohibiting racial discrimination in the provision of government-funded services.
<i>Filed</i>	2021
<i>Current Status</i>	Suit filed and discovery ongoing..
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Disability Rights California; Akin Gump.

## Rivera v. Douglas

### Relief for Medi-Cal applicants caught in backlog

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HEALTH</b>	State	State	Northern CA	Alameda	All Medi-Cal applicants

<i>Summary</i>	Hundreds of thousands of Medi-Cal applicants were caught in a backlog when this suit was filed, waiting weeks or months after the state law 45-day deadline to decide applications.
<i>Filed</i>	2014
<i>Current Status</i>	Backlog has been reduced and in response to preliminary injunction motion State has adopted procedures providing services to many applicants pending application determinations.  The trial court issued a writ on the main issues and entered judgment for petitioners. The Court of Appeal reversed on June 27, 2019, but the Supreme Court granted review on October 9. After briefing was completed, Supreme Court, on July 8 issued an order transferring the matter back to the Court of Appeal in light of the Department's concession on the two issues presented. Favorable settlement reached, fees have been paid, and final judgment entered. Case will not appear on next Docket.
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Bay Area Legal Aid; Central CA Legal Services; Multiforum Advocacy Solutions; Neighborhood Legal Services; NHeLP

### Rogel v. City of Lynwood

#### Affordable housing; attorneys' fee claim

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
HOUSING	City	State	Southern CA	Los Angeles	Low Income tenants in Lynwood

<i>Summary</i>	Plaintiffs won a major affordable housing settlement against the Lynwood Redevelopment Agency and then moved for attorneys' fees. The trial court (Los Angeles Superior Court) granted the motion, and then reduced the fees by 80% because of its view that in light of the Agency's limited resources the money could better be spent in Lynwood. The reduction was also based in part on the pro bono representation of plaintiffs and some garden variety criticisms of the hours claimed.
<i>Filed</i>	2010
<i>Current Status</i>	The Court of Appeal reversed in a published opinion. Plaintiffs' counsel are also actively monitoring implementation of the settlement agreement, with regular court appearances. There was final judgment on the merits and parties reached agreement on fees. But Department of Finance refused to recognize payment of fees as an enforceable obligation of the defendant Redevelopment Agency, which triggered separate litigation. See <i>Rogel v. Department of Finance</i> below.  After <i>Rogel v. Department of Finance</i> was settled, Finance approved payment of the fee award, but the Successor Agency did not seek payment of the amounts owed on the merits. After threats of further litigation, payments have begun. As payments are in multi-year installments, case will remain on Docket.
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Public Interest Law Project; Public Counsel; Gibson, Dun & Crutcher; O'Melveny & Myers

### SCRHA v. County of San Diego

#### Defense of eviction moratorium

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
Housing	Other	Federal	Southern CA	San Diego	San Diego tenants

<i>Summary</i>	An apartment owners' association has sued to challenge a San Diego County ordinance that bans most evictions during the pandemic. A tenants rights organization seeks to defend the ordinance.
<i>Filed</i>	2021
<i>Current Status</i>	Intervention granted, TRO denied, and preliminary injunction denied. Plaintiffs have appealed, with briefing and oral argument completed. Ninth Circuit issued order postponing further consideration until related cases have been decided.
<i>Co-Counsel</i>	Legal Aid Society of San Diego; Susman Godfrey

### ***Soza v. Lightbourne***

#### **Refusal to reimburse food stamp recipients when benefits stolen electronically**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>PUBLIC BENEFITS</b>	State	State	Southern CA	Los Angeles	CalFresh recipients whose benefits may be stolen

*Summary* | Petitioners had their welfare and CalFresh food stamp benefits electronically stolen while their benefit cards remained in their physical possession. State reimbursed loss of cash benefits, but refused to reimburse for CalFresh loss.

*Filed* | 2017

*Current Status* | Trial court denied writ and petitioners appealed. Court of Appeal reversed in published opinion. Judgment and writ issued. Fee award successfully negotiated, with payment awaiting.

*Co-Counsel* | Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles

### ***Speed v. First Class Capital***

#### **Defense of anti-price gouging statute**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	Other	Federal	Northern CA	Lake	Mobilehome residents and price-gouging victims statewide

*Summary* | Despite a statutory prohibition against raising prices more than 10% during a declared emergency, a mobilehome park owner raised rents up to 73% and then, when sued, removed the case to federal court, and moved to dismiss, arguing that the anti-price-gouging statute, Penal Code § 396, is unconstitutional.

*Filed* | 2021

*Current Status* | Following briefing and argument on motion to dismiss, federal court on its own motion remanded to state court. Settlement negotiations and discovery ongoing.

*Co-Counsel* | Legal Services of Northern California

### Venice Town Council v. City of Los Angeles

#### Affordable housing in Coastal Zone

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	City Other	State	Southern CA	Los Angeles	Low income renters in California

*Summary* | This suit resulted in an appellate victory and later a comprehensive settlement guaranteeing enforcement of the Mello Act, which preserves affordable housing in the Coastal Zone.

*Filed* | 1995

*Current Status* | Plaintiffs' counsel negotiated a settlement which will require a major development to include affordable housing, as required by the *Venice Town Council* settlement. Some monitoring continues.

*Co-Counsel* | Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles; McDermott, Will & Emory

### Warren v. City of Chico

#### Challenge to ordinances criminalizing homelessness

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	City	Federal	Northern CA	Butte	Unhoused people in Chico and elsewhere

*Summary* | Chico ordinances prohibit camping or sleeping in public places; and require confiscation of property perceived as worth less than \$100. This conflicts with controlling Ninth Circuit precedent.

*Filed* | 2021

*Current Status* | District court issued TRO, and later a preliminary injunction. Settlement was reached, including attorneys' fees, which have been paid. Implementation work continues..

*Co-Counsel* | Legal Services of Northern California

## York v. City of Fullerton

### Illegal denial of emergency shelter

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Who Benefits</u>
<b>HOUSING</b>	City	State	Southern CA	Orange	Homeless people in Fullerton

*Summary* | The Fullerton City Council voted 3-2 effectively to reject a homeless shelter that had been approved by the Planning Department and that would be funded by the County. The rejection violates, among other laws, a statute requiring specific findings when a city rejects an emergency shelter.

*Filed* | 2013

*Current Status* | After lengthy litigation, case settled. In addition to beneficial changes in land use practices made during the course of the litigation, the City agreed to put one million dollars into an affordable housing fund, assist the individual petitioners, and pay attorneys' fees. Monitoring ongoing.

While fees have been paid and most of the million dollars has been spent, monitoring continues.

*Co-Counsel* | Legal Aid Society of Orange County; Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton; Keller Andrade