SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CIVIL DIVISION

RESERVE MANAGEMENT COMPANY, INC.,
1250 Broadway
New York, NY 10001

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 0000178-09

DECHERT LLP,
1775 I St NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

and

K&L GATES LLP,
1601 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Defendants. /

COMPLAINT

Reserve Management Company, Inc. ("Reserve" or "RMCI") sues the law firms of Dechert LLP ("Dechert") and K&L Gates LLP ("K&LGates") for professional malpractice, alleging as follows:

Nature of Malpractice Claims

1. The basis for this claim is that Dechert and K&L Gates (at different times) failed to provide their clients RMCI, and the Reserve Funds ("the Funds"), with the most basic, fundamental, and elementary advice regarding mutual fund regulations, exposing Reserve with the disgorgement of all of its gross profits earned over a period of approximately six years, and requiring the expenditure of millions of dollars to mitigate the harm caused by the Defendants' negligence in failing to provide correct and timely legal advice to Reserve.

2. Specifically, Dechert and K&L Gates, although fully advised of the relevant facts, not once, but on repeated occasions, negligently failed to advise RMCI and the Boards of Trustees of the mutual funds managed by RMCI that the Boards were not in compliance with the of the requirements of an exemption from Section 15(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 ("1940 Act") and rule 18f-2, which permitted the Funds to enter into and materially amend investment management agreements with the Funds' subadvisors without shareholder approval. Section 15(a) of the Act and rule 18f-2 imposed certain independence requirements on the Boards of Trustees in order to qualify for and utilize the exemption. Further, the October 8, 1997 Order of the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") which permitted the Funds to utilize this exemption, included conditions related to the independence of the Boards of Trustees. Defendants Dechert and then K&L Gates failed to inform Reserve and the Funds that the Boards, as constituted, did not comply with the exemption.

3. Having failed to recognize and advise Reserve and the Funds of the independence issues related to the composition of the Boards, Dechert and K&L Gates proceeded to advise Reserve and the Funds to take actions that violated the 1940 Act – actions the Funds were not legally permitted to take because of the "interested person" status of various Trustees on the Boards, which caused the Board to be improperly constituted under the 1940 Act.

4. It was only when successor counsel identified the errors of Dechert and K&L Gates and the devastating consequences of their negligence materialized that RMCI could begin to remedy the violations of the 1940 Act.

5. Upon such discovery, Reserve and the Funds acted immediately and responsibly to take remedial steps to mitigate the harmful effects of Dechert and K&L Gates' malpractice. Specifically, RMCI and the Funds engaged in an incredibly time-consuming, burdensome, and

expensive proxy solicitation to provide for shareholder ratification of all actions previously taken by the Boards that were not valid or may not have been valid because of Dechert and Kirkpatrick & Lockhart negligence in failing to recognize and advise RMCI and the Funds of the requirements for the exemption.

6. RMCI and the Funds immediately reported to the SEC the unwitting 1940 Act violations, resulting from the negligent legal advice of Dechert and K&L Gates. The SEC's reaction was swift and severe. The SEC threatened to order RMCI to *disgorge all of its profits earned* during the relevant years in which its Boards had not been properly constituted, based on the fact that actions taken by the Boards were illegal, void and ineffective. As a result, RMCI was forced to expend significant management time and attention and incur significant legal fees in negotiating with the SEC for the right to retain the profits it had earned.

7. RMCI ultimately was able to convince the SEC to retreat from its initial insistence on the disgorgement of all gross fees earned. This was due to the hard work, time and expense incurred by Reserve and its successor counsel; and the fact that Reserve had, on its own and at great expense, engaged in a proxy solicitation of the shareholders to ratify the contracts which had previously been approved by improperly constituted Boards.

8. But for the remedial actions of Reserve, the malpractice of Dechert and K&L Gates would have cost RMCI hundreds of millions of dollars and resulted in the imposition of fines and potentially adverse actions by the SEC.

9. RMCI thus seeks in excess of $4 million dollars, for the expenses it incurred in rectifying the errors caused by the malpractice of Dechert and K&L Gates, as well as the repayment of all fees paid to Dechert and K&L Gates for their negligent legal work on these matters.

JURISDICTION

10. Jurisdiction of this court is founded on D.C. Code Annotated, 1973 edition, as amended, Sec. 11-921.

PARTIES

11. Plaintiff RMCI is a New Jersey corporation with its principal place of business in New York, New York. RMCI is in the business of managing mutual funds.

12. Defendant Dechert is one of the largest law firms in the world with over 1,000 lawyers in 17 offices worldwide, according to the firm's website. Dechert is a limited liability partnership, which maintains an office in the District of Columbia. Dechert's marketing materials, available on their website, claim that Dechert provides "definitive advice" and "practical guidance" to their clients, and that this has brought them top rankings on surveys of international law firms. Dechert further asserts on its website that "[w]ith in-depth industry knowledge and legal experience, we're able to identify the crux of the most complicated issues and focus on what matters most to our clients."

13. Defendant K&L Gates is also one of the largest law firms in the world, with over 1,400 lawyers in 22 offices worldwide, according to its website. K&L Gates is a limited liability partnership which maintains an office in the District of Columbia. K&L Gates' marketing materials, available on its website, assert that its lawyers practice at the "peak" of their profession, with "a deep appreciation for our clients' concerns, challenges and business objectives," and "offer a unified commitment to providing the highest level of client service and quality legal counsel in all our offices."

14. Both Dechert and K&L Gates have significant practice groups that specialize in advising the mutual fund industry on regulatory requirements, particularly with respect to compliance with the 1940 Act and regulations promulgated thereunder.

15. Dechert, for example, has a "Financial Services Group," which, according to its marketing materials, is specifically dedicated to providing counsel and advice to mutual funds and their management concerning the 1940 Act. Dechert's Financial Services Group boasts that its attorneys "have years of experience as in-house counsel and as regulators themselves, and their experience allows us to anticipate, recognize, and address challenges before they become problems. Dechert's Financial Services Group claims that it works "with clients to build and defend a strong record for business integrity, regulatory compliance, and thus their reputation."

16. K&L Gates also has a Financial Services Group, which, according to the Firm's website, specializes in providing legal advice and counsel to the mutual fund industry. According to its website, K&L Gates' Financial Services Group is "one of the largest and most experienced Investment Management groups in the United States."

"Interested Persons" in the 1940 Act

17. The 1940 Act requires that there be a sufficient number of independent persons on the mutual fund's board of directors who provide independent review, analysis, and approval of contracts with service providers for the benefit of the shareholder/investors.

18. Specifically, Section 2 of the 1940 Act, creates and defines the term "interested person," and includes a variety of ways in which a director may be deemed not independent and not acting purely for the sake of the shareholders. *See* 15 U.S.C. §80a-2(a)(19).

19. The 1940 Act provides various ways in which an individual can be deemed an "interested person." Of significance here, the 1940 Act provides, in substance, that any person

affiliated with a broker-dealer that distributes shares for the mutual fund is legally deemed to be an "interested person" of the mutual fund for purposes of the 1940 Act. *See* 15 U.S.C. §80a-2(a)(19)(A)(v).

20. Once it is determined which Trustees or directors are "interested persons" and which are non-"interested persons," the 1940 Act requires, as a threshold requirement, that the board of a fund may not have more than 60% of its members be "interested persons," at any time. In other words, at least 40% of a fund's board must be, at all times, non-"interested persons." *See* 15 U.S.C. §80a-10(a).

21. However, the SEC has adopted exemptive rules which provide more stringent requirements for board composition, requiring that independent directors constitute a majority of a fund's board, in order for actions to be taken on certain contracts. If a fund relies on one of these rules, as Reserve's Funds do, the fund may not enter into, or renew, a contract with an investment advisory or sub-investment advisory company, unless the contract or renewal is approved by a board consisting of a majority of non-"interested persons." *See* 15 U.S.C. §80a-15a-4(b)(2). Similarly, to rely on these rules, a mutual fund may not enter into, or renew, a distribution agreement with an underwriter, unless the contract or renewal is approved by a board consisting of a majority of non-"interested persons." *See* 15 U.S.C. §80a-10f-3.

22. Thus, for a fund, such as any of Reserve's Funds relying on the above-referenced exemptive rules when taking actions on such investment management, sub-investment management, and distribution contracts, the 1940 Act requires that the majority of the directors on the fund's board be non-"interested persons."

23. Compliance with these rules requires that the trustees be properly classified as "interested persons" or non-"interested persons" in order to ascertain whether the Board is properly constituted.

24. Further, on October 8, 1997, the SEC issued an Order under Section 6(c) of the 1940 Act granting an exemption for the Funds from Section 15(a) of the 1940 Act and rule 18f-2. That Order permitted Reserve and the Funds to enter into and materially amend investment management agreements with the Funds' subadvisors without shareholder approval.

25. The October 8, 1997 Order was based upon representations made by Reserve and the Funds as to how the Boards would be constituted to comply with the non-interested persons rule. The conditions to obtaining that Order included that a majority of each Board of Trustees of each Fund would be non-interested persons. Reserve and the Funds commenced operations pursuant to the October 8, 1997 Order.

Malpractice of Dechert and K&L Gates

26. Dechert and K&L Gates were each retained due to their claims of superior knowledge and competence in the regulations comprising the 1940 Act. Dechert and K&L Gates, each had a duty to Reserve and the Funds to anticipate, recognize and prevent regulatory and compliance issues.

27. Defendants' negligence included the failure to advise RMCI and the Funds that two members of the Boards of Trustees (referred to hereinafter as "Trustee-1," "Trsutee-2," or collectively "the Two Trustees") of the mutual funds managed by RMCI should be classified as "interested persons" when in fact they were clearly "interested persons."

28. Despite the fact that their affiliations were clearly and specifically disclosed in board minutes and fund filings, Dechert and K&L Gates negligently failed to advise Reserve

and the Funds that the Two Trustees were "interested persons," due to their affiliation with entities that did business with the Funds.

29. As a result of the Defendant law firms' malpractice, from 1997 until 2005, the Boards of the Funds managed by RMCI, at various times, did not comply with the non-"interested persons" rule and the October 8, 1997 Order, rendering such Boards legally unable to approve contracts or renewals of contracts for investment management services, sub-investment management services and/or distribution agreements in accordance with the 1940 Act. Nevertheless, Dechert and K&L Gates negligently and improperly advised and counseled approval of the contracts and renewals, in direct violation of the 1940 Act, resulting in void or potentially void contracts and the threatened disgorgement of all profits for that six-year period.

30. Dechert and K&L Gates' continuous failures to correctly advise Reserve caused Reserve to suffer damages in excess of $4 million dollars, including the expenses incurred in mitigating the harm caused by their malpractice. In addition, Reserve is entitled to repayment of all legal fees paid to Dechert/K&L Gates during the period of their negligent representation.

Dechert's Specific Acts of Malpractice

31. Reserve hired Dechert to advise it and the Funds regarding compliance and regulatory matters in which Dechert claimed to have exceptional knowledge specifically with respect to the 1940 Act and the regulations issued thereunder.

32. Dechert acted as counsel to Reserve and the Funds including the years 1997 through 2002. A Dechert partner attended, either in person or by phone, every Board of Trustees meeting during the time of Dechert's representation of Reserve and the Funds.

33. Dechert was responsible for providing legal advice and counseling concerning the 1940 Act and in other areas as well. Dechert's billing records show that Dechert billed for "General Securities Advice," which primarily related to the 1940 Act.

34. Dechert also assisted Reserve and the Funds in the preparation and submission of the application to the SEC that led to the October 8, 1997 Order.

35. Trustee 1 disclosed in his 1999 Trustee Questionnaire, and in each subsequent Trustee Questionnaire that he completed until his resignation in 2005, that he was a member of the Board of Directors of a major investment bank. That investment bank, pursuant to services agreements with the Funds, received significant revenue from Reserve in 1999 and in each year from 1999 until Trustee 1's resignation in 2005. Trustee 1's affiliation with the investment bank was also disclosed in the Statement of Additional Information for each fund which was filed with the SEC and publicly available. Copies of those questionnaires were available to Dechert in each year it served as counsel to Reserve and the Funds. However, Dechert never advised Reserve that Trustee 1 should be considered an "interested person" despite knowing this information.

36. Trustee 2 joined the Board of Trustees in 2002. At the time he joined the Board, Trustee 2 completed a Trustee Questionnaire in which he disclosed that he was a Director and Shareholder in a trust company. In 2002, the trust company was also receiving distributions from the Funds pursuant to services agreements. Trustee 2's affiliation with the trust company was also disclosed in the Statement of Additional Information for each fund which was filed with the SEC and publicly available. Trustee 2's questionnaire for 2002 was available to Dechert yet Defendant never advised Reserve and the Funds that Trustee 2 should be considered an "interested person."

37. Further, entries in the billing records demonstrate that Dechert undertook to research and advised Reserve and the Funds about proper board composition, and the definition of an "interested person" under the 1940 Act. For example, the following are among the entries in the Dechert billing records:

- "Research interested person definition regarding broker-dealer."
- "Conference call . . . regarding matters pertaining to Board of Trustees composition, forthcoming meeting, and subadvisory agreements."
- "Research regarding interpretation of affiliated person."
- "Telephone conference . . . regarding Board composition."

38. Dechert produced at least four memoranda, articles and letters discussing and analyzing at length these provisions of the 1940 Act provisions pertaining to "interested persons" and their related exemptions, prior to and during Dechert's representation of RMCI and the Funds. Indeed, in a letter to the Washington, D.C. office of the SEC February 2, 2000, Dechert stated that "it is an appropriate practice to use annual questionnaires to fund directors to inquire whether they are aware of circumstances that may pose conflicts of interest . . . ."

39. Moreover, at each of the Fund Board meetings attended by a Dechert partner, there was a specific discussion that Trustee-1 "was a member of the board of directors of an investment bank and the Funds were prohibited from purchasing any securities during an underwriting syndicate in which that investment bank was a principal underwriter unless such purchase was in accordance with the exemptive provisions of Rule 10f-3."

40. The June 2002 board minutes further reflect that the Dechert partner discussed the Funds' obligation to approve proposed Investment Advisory Department with a "disinterested majority of the Board, the Dechert partner further directed the Board's attention to the

memorandum provided by his firm and the information provided by Reserve that was included in their Board materials."

41. Additionally, the June 2002 Board minutes reflect that during that Board meeting, the attending Dechert partner "noted that he had been retained by Management to assist the Board in many matters, including this one [referring to the Investment Advisory Agreements], but that the Board has the right to engage separate independent counsel, if they deem necessary." It was decided after "a lengthy discussion" that separate counsel was not necessary.

42. Despite Dechert's access to the disclosures contained in the trustees' "Eligibility Questionnaires," the information filed with the SEC in the Statements of Additional Information and the discussions at the board meetings, and its claimed "in-depth industry" knowledge, Dechert negligently failed to recognize the "interested person" status of the Two Trustees.

K&L Gates' Specific Acts of Malpractice

43. K&L Gates was hired in 2003, as successor counsel to provide legal advice regarding compliance and regulatory matters in which K&L Gates claimed to have "extensive and varied knowledge" enabling the firm to provide "comprehensive legal services" to its clients such as Reserve.

44. K&L Gates was responsible for providing Reserve and the Funds with legal advice and counseling concerning the 1940 Act and in other areas as well.

45. In their 2002 Trustee Questionnaires, which were available to K&L Gates, both Trustee 1 and Trustee 2 further disclosed affiliations that caused them to be "interested persons" under the 40 Act. Trustee 1 and Trustee 2 disclosed such affiliations in the Trustee Questionnaires which each of them completed in the years 2003, 2004, and 2005. Trustee 1's affiliation with the investment bank and Trustee 2's affiliation with the trust company were also

disclosed in the Statement of Additional Information for each fund which was filed with the SEC in 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 and publicly available. K&L Gates, counsel to RMCI and the Funds for 2003 and 2004, never advised Reserve or the Funds that either Trustee 1 or Trustee 2 should be considered an "interested person" despite knowing this information.

46. K&L Gates' billing records evidence that in preparing for the 2003 board meeting, the attending partner billed for the "review of board materials." Those materials included the "Eligibility Questionnaires" which would have provided K&L Gates with all of the information necessary to determine whether the individual directors were "interested persons" for purposes of the 1940 Act.

47. Additionally, K&L Gates' billing records include the following entries:

- "Preparation for board meeting; review of 2002 materials"
- "Reserve Funds; Board preparation for and attendance at board of trustees annual meeting"
- "Reserve Board Drafting Executive session minutes"
- "Drafting 15(c) memo"[1]
- "Review of 15(c) memo; distribution to the Reserve"
- "Review of board materials"
- "Preparation for and attendance at board meeting"

---

[1] The memorandum specifically provided that advisory agreements may continue from year to year only if such continuance is approved by, among others, a majority of the company's full board of directors. Further, as specific evidence of Kirkpatrick & Lockhart's knowledge of the exact regulations, Kirkpatrick & Lockhart's memorandum set forth the statutory language of 15 U.S.C. §80a-15(a) and stated that "Section 15(a) of the 1940 Act prohibits any registered investment company from entering into, renewing, or performing an investment advisory contract, 'unless the terms of [the contract] and any renewal thereof have been approved by the vote of a majority of trustees, who are not parties to such contract or agreement or *interested persons* of any such party. . . .'" (emphasis added).

- "Preparation for board meeting; review of board materials"

48. As examples of K&L Gates' specific knowledge that the board was not properly constituted so as to contain the requisite number of independent trustees to fit within the exemptive provisions of the 1940 Act, the minutes of the Board of trustees meetings reflect that a partner from K&L Gates was present at the 2003 and 2004 Board of trustees meetings during which Reserve's compliance with these provisions was discussed.

49. At the June 2003 Board of Trustees meetings attended by the K&L Gates partner, there was a specific discussion that Trustee-1 "was a director of the investment bank" and that Trustee-2 owned 2% and is a director of the trust company which "ha[d] money fund accounts for its clients with Reserve under standard terms and conditions and receives 12b-1 payments comparable to other intermediaries such as brokers that offer the Reserve funds to their clients."

50. Despite K&L Gates' access to the disclosures contained in the trustees' "Eligibility Questionnaires," the discussions at the board meetings, and the "extensive experience" it boasts of the investment management industry, K&L Gates negligently failed to recognize the "interested person" status of the Two Trustees.

RMCI's Discovery and Consequences of Dechert and K&L Gates' Errors

51. In March 2005, RMCI was informed by successor counsel that the Two Trustees whom RMCI considered as non-"interested persons" based on its good faith reliance on Dechert /K&L Gates' legal guidance, were in fact "interested persons" under Section 2(a)(19) of the 1940 Act.

52. The reclassification of the Two Trustees as "interested persons" resulted in the Board of Trustees not being composed of a majority of independent trustees for significant periods during the representation of Reserve and the Funds by both Dechert and K&L Gates.

53. After learning of this violation of the 1940 Act, Reserve with the assistance of successor counsel, conducted a further analysis of the operations of the Funds and learned of violations of the 1940 related to the independence rules governing Board composition all the way back to 1997.

54. As a consequence of the Defendant law firms' negligent advice, certain plans and agreements entered into and periodically approved from 1997 to 2005 lapsed and/or were deemed not to be properly approved at all.

55. Upon discovery of the Board's improper composition, the two "interested" board members immediately resigned to ensure that the Board was properly constituted so that it could function in compliance with the 1940 Act.

56. Further, independent counsel was hired to represent the directors in order to ensure against any potential conflicts of interest between the Funds and the Directors.

57. Once RMCI reached preliminary conclusions concerning the impact of the board of directors not being properly composed, it notified the trustees of each Fund, the Funds' independent auditors and the SEC. Reserve contacted the SEC preemptively and on its own initiative.

58. On March 22, 2005, RMCI presented the Funds' Boards with a memorandum outlining the nature of the problem and the measures it recommended the Board take to correct prior deficiencies.

59. The appropriately reconstituted Boards met on June 30, 2005 to approve the contracts which had lapsed or were invalid because of their prior acceptance or approval by the improperly composed Board. The Funds continued to operate in this manner throughout 2006 and into 2007, recognizing that shareholder approval of their decisions had to be obtained.

60. RMCI undertook to create and file with the SEC preliminary proxy materials so that a meeting of the shareholders of the Funds could be held at which time the shareholders would vote on the actions taken by the "new" board.

61. Discussions between the SEC and RMCI continued from December 2006 until revised preliminary proxy materials for the meeting of shareholders were approved by the SEC on February 2, 2007.

62. At the meetings, the shareholders ratified the Boards' approvals and decisions regarding the contracts entered into from 1999 until the shareholders' meeting.

63. RMCI's swift response and good faith mitigation of this matter saved Reserve and the Funds from incurring losses in the hundreds of millions of dollars. By responding in a positive and proactive manner, RMCI was able to avoid the SEC's threatened sanctions, including the disgorgement of all of the Funds' profits for the period of time during which its board was not properly constituted and the imposition of substantial fines.

64. However, RMCI still suffered losses in excess of $4 million dollars as a result of the malpractice of Dechert and K&L Gates.

65. RMCI undertook all of the costs of correcting the regulatory deficiencies caused by Dechert and K&L Gates' negligent representation. None of these costs were passed on to the shareholders of the Funds.

66. All conditions precedent to filing this suit have occurred or been waived.

COUNT I
(Legal Malpractice Against Dechert)

67. The allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 66 are hereby realleged as if fully stated herein.

68. Dechert had a duty to provide Reserve and the Funds with the correct and competent legal advice relating to the 1940 Act.

69. Dechert failed to provide even the most basic and rudimentary guidance to Reserve regarding these provisions.

70. Dechert breached its duties to Reserve and the Funds, by failing to recognize, time and time again, deficiencies in complying with the 1940 Act, and by failing to advise their clients as to how to adequately comply with the law.

71. Dechert's negligent representation subjected RMCI and the Funds to substantial monetary harm, forcing RMCI to expend over $4 million dollars on professional and other fees and the costs associated with correcting its compliance issues, including the costs of preparing and distributing proxy materials, in order to avoid threatened SEC sanctions such as the disgorgement of its profits. RMCI also was damaged in the amount of fees paid to Dechert for its negligent representation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, the Reserve Management Company, Inc., respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment in its favor and against Dechert, and award it compensatory damages, a repayment of all fees paid to Dechert for its negligent representation, and such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT II
(Legal Malpractice Against K&L Gates)

72. The allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 66 are hereby realleged as if fully stated herein.

73. K&L Gates had a duty to provide RMCI and the Funds with correct and competent legal advice relating to the 1940 Act.

74. K&L Gates failed to provide even the most basic and rudimentary guidance to Reserve and the Funds regarding those provisions.

75. Additionally, K&L Gates breached its duties to its clients, by failing to recognize, time and time again, deficiencies in complying with the 1940 Act, and by failing to advise their clients as to how to adequately comply with the law.

76. K&L Gates' negligent representation subjected RMCI and the Funds to substantial monetary harm, forcing RMCI to expend over $4 million dollars on professional and other fees, and the costs associated with correcting its compliance issues, including the costs of preparing and distributing proxy materials, in order to avoid threatened SEC sanctions such as the disgorgement of its profits. RMCI also was damaged in the amount of fees paid to K&L Gates for its negligent representation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, the Reserve Management Company, Inc., respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in its favor and against K&L Gates, and award it compensatory damages, repayment of all fees paid to K&L Gates for its negligent representation of Reserve, and such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Demand For Jury Trial

The Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury as to all issues so triable by right.

Dated: January 13th, 2009.

TEW CARDENAS LLP
JOSEPH A. DEMARIA, ESQ.
Of Counsel for Plaintiff
1441 Brickell Avenue, 15th Floor
Miami, Florida 33131-3407
Telephone: (305) 536-1112
Facsimile: (305) 536-1116

TEW CARDENAS LLP
Counsel for Plaintiff
700 12th Street, N.W., Suite 1150
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 904-2050
Facsimile: (202) 904-2051

By: _____
MATIAS R. DORTA
D.C. BAR NO. 427768

518156.1

Superior Court of the District of Columbia

CIVIL DIVISION - CIVIL ACTIONS BRANCH

INFORMATION SHEET

Reserve Management Company, Inc.

vs

Dechert LLP, and K&L Gates LLP

Case Number: 0000178-09

Date: January 13, 2009

Name: (please print) Matias Dorta, Esquire	Relationship to Lawsuit ☑ Attorney for Plaintiff
Firm Name: Tew Cardenas LLP	☐ Self (Pro Se)
Telephone No.: (202) 904-2050 Six digit Unified Bar No.: 427768	Other:

TYPE OF CASE: ☐ Non-Jury ☑ 6 Person Jury ☐ 12 Person Jury

Demand: $ 4 million Other:

PENDING CASE(S) RELATED TO THE ACTION BEING FILED

Case No.: Judge: Calendar #:

Case No.: Judge: Calendar #:

NATURE OF SUIT: *(Check One Box Only)*

A. CONTRACTS

- ☐ 01 Breach of Contract
- ☐ 02 Breach of Warranty
- ☐ 06 Negotiable Instrument
- ☐ 15

- ☐ 07 Personal Property
- ☐ 09 Real Property-Real Estate
- ☐ 12 Specific Performance

COLLECTION CASES

- ☐ 14 Under $25,000 Pltf. Grants Consent
- ☐ 16 Under $25,000 Consent Denied
- ☐ 17 OVER $25,000

B. PROPERTY TORTS

- ☐ 01 Automobile
- ☐ 02 Conversion
- ☐ 07 Shoplifting, D.C. Code § 27-102(a)
- ☐ 03 Destruction of Private Property
- ☐ 04 Property Damage
- ☐ 05 Trespass
- ☐ 06 Traffic Adjudication

C. PERSONAL TORTS

- ☐ 01 Abuse of Process
- ☐ 02 Alienation of Affection
- ☐ 03 Assault and Battery
- ☐ 04 Automobile-Personal Injury
- ☐ 05 Deceit (Misrepresentation)
- ☐ 06 False Accusation
- ☐ 07 False Arrest
- ☐ 08 Fraud
- ☐ 09 Harassment
- ☐ 10 Invasion of Privacy
- ☐ 11 Libel and Slander
- ☐ 12 Malicious Interference
- ☐ 13 Malicious Prosecution
- ☑ 14 Malpractice Legal
- ☐ 15 Malpractice Medical (Including wrongful death)
- ☐ 16 Negligence-(Not Automobile, Not Malpractice)
- ☐ 17 Personal Injury – (Not Automobile, Not Malpractice)
- ☐ 18 Wrongful Death (Not malpractice)
- ☐ 19 Wrongful Eviction
- ☐ 20 Friendly Suit
- ☐ 21 Asbestos
- ☐ 22 Toxic/Mass Torts
- ☐ 23 Tobacco
- ☐ 24 Lead Paint

SEE REVERSE SIDE AND CHECK HERE ☐ IF USED

INFORMATION SHEET, Continued

C. OTHERS I. ☐ 01 Accounting ☐ 02 Att. Before Judgment ☐ 04 Condemnation (Emin. Domain) ☐ 05 Ejectment ☐ 07 Insurance/Subrogation Under $25,000 Pltf. Grants Consent ☐ 08 Quite Title ☐ 09 Special Writ/Warrants DC Code § 11-941	☐ 10 T.R.O./Injunction ☐ 11 Writ of Replevin ☐ 12 Enforce Mechanics Lien ☐ 16 Declaratory Judgment ☐ 17 Merit Personnel Act (OEA) (D.C. Code Title 1, Chapter 6) ☐ 18 Product Liability ☐ 24 Application to Confirm, Modify, Vacate Arbitration Award (D.C. Code § 16-4315)	☐ 25 Liens: Tax/Water Consent Granted ☐ 26 Insurance/Subrogation Under $25,000 Consent Denied ☐ 27 Insurance/Subrogation Over $25,000 ☐ 28 Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award (Collection Cases Only) ☐ 26 Merit Personnel Act (OHR) ☐ 30 Liens: Tax/Water Consent Denied
II. ☐ 03 Change of Name ☐ 06 Foreign Judgment ☐ 13 Correction of Birth Certificate ☐ 14 Correction of Marriage Certificate	☐ 15 Libel of Information ☐ 19 Enter Administrative Order as Judgment [D.C. Code § 2-1802.03(h) or 32-1519(a)] ☐ 20 Master Meter (D.C. Code § 42-3301, et seq.)	☐ 21 Petition for Subpoena [Rule 28-I (b)] ☐ 22 Release Mechanics Lien ☐ 23 Rule 27 (a)(1) (Perpetuate Testimony)

Attorney's Signature

1-13-09

Date