1	James H. Casello, Esq. SBN 76021  CASELLO & LINCOLN  ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California, County of Orange				
2	525 Cabrillo Park Drive, Suite 104 01/04/2019 at 11:39:25 AM				
.3	Santa Ana, CA 92701 Telephone: (714) 541-8700  By Angelina Nguyen-Do, Deputy Cler	rk			
4	Facsimile: (714) 541-8707	ľ			
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff GOLDEN WEST PROPERTY MANAGEMENT INC.				
6					
7					
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9					
	COUNTY OF ORANGE, CENTRAL DISTRICT				
10	30-2019-01042113-CU-BT-CJC	ı			
11	GOLDEN WEST PROPERTY ) Case No.  MANAGEMENT INC., a California ) Judge Deborah Servino				
12	Corporation, ) COMPLAINT FOR DEFAMATION;				
13	Plaintiff, ) TRADE LIBEL; WAGES PAID ) (FAITHLESS SERVANT DOCTRINE);				
14	vs. ) ÌNTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTÍVE ) ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE; UNFAIR				
15	KIMBERLY DAWN NOLD, an individual; ) COMPETITION AND BREACH OF CERTIFIED HOA MANAGEMENT, INC., a ) FIDUCIARY DUTY				
16	California Corporation; and DOES 1-100, ) inclusive,				
17	<b>)</b>				
18	Defendants. )				
19					
20	Plaintiff GOLDEN WEST PROPERTY MANAGEMENT INC., (hereinafter GWPM)				
21	complains and alleges as follows:				
22	1. Plaintiff is a California corporation in good standing with its principal place of business				
23	in Cypress, California.				
24	2. Defendant KIMBERLY DAWN NOLD ("hereinafter NOLD") is an individual residing				
25	in the City of Huntington Beach, California within the County of Orange, California.				
26	3. Defendant, CERTIFIED HOA MANAGEMENT, INC. is a California Corporation				
27	doing business in the County of Orange, California. Hereinafter CERTIFIED HOA				
28	MANAGEMENT, INC. Shall be referred to as "CERTIFIED".				
	COMPLAINT	1			

- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the Defendant NOLD is the principal officer and the sole shareholder of Defendant CERTIFIED and at all material times herein mentioned was acting in the course and scope of her employment with said company and doing the acts hereinafter alleged.
- 5. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or the capacity of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100 inclusive and therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants named herein as a DOE are liable to the Plaintiff on the causes of action asserted herein. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to state the true names and capacities of said Defendants as soon the same has been ascertained.
- 6. At all times material hereto each of the Defendant was acting as the agent, servant, employee, partner, master and or principal of each of the remaining Defendants and at all times were acting in the course and scope of such agency, employment or partnership.
- 7. In and about April of 2013 Defendant NOLD was hired as a community manager by Plaintiff. As is the case with all employees of Plaintiff MS. NOLD executed a non-disclosure confidentiality agreement in which she agreed not to divulge to any third party any trade secretes, confidential information or other data in the company either during or after her termination of her employment. Plaintiff is informed and believe that the Defendant NOLD misappropriated from Plaintiff's company records said non-disclosure confidentiality agreement.
- 8. In the months prior to her departure GWPM Defendant NOLD and representatives of GWPM entered into discussions regarding the acquisition of Plaintiff by Defendant NOLD. In connection therewith, Defendant NOLD signed an additional agreement to not disclose information disclosed to her in the process of her doing due diligence with respect to the potential sale of the company to her.
- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that instead of purchasing GWPM Defendant NOLD decided to acquire the accounts for which she was responsible for "free" by actively soliciting Plaintiff's customers to become her clients immediately upon termination of her employment with GWPM. Defendant NOLD certified her new company with the California Secretary of State on September 20, 2018 which was her last date of employment with Plaintiff.

- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the Defendant NOLD prior to the termination of her employment, started informing GWPM'S customers that she was starting her own company and informing GWPM'S customers that one of the principals of GWPM had been convicted of a felony for embezzling funds from GWPM.
- 11. Immediately after NOLD'S termination of her employment, Plaintiff started receiving notices of termination from its customers that were being handled by Defendant NOLD. One such notice asserting that the termination was "for cause" even though Defendant NOLD had been handling that very same account while she was employed by Plaintiff. This confirms that Defendant NOLD was communicating the "embezzlement" allegation to GWPM'S customers in order to motivate them to go with her and her new company CERTIFIED.
- 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that while still working for Plaintiff Defendant NOLD used Plaintiff's property including its equipment, copiers, computers, telephones, emails, intellectual property and advertising materials to further her business and of the business of the Defendant CERTIFIED.
- 13. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and therefore alleges that while still working for GWPM the Defendant NOLD copied Plaintiff's files and forms and took copies with her to assist her in competing with Plaintiff and this was all done with the intent of obtaining an unfair competitive advantage against Plaintiff and to economically harm Plaintiff.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## **DEFAMATION**

## AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 14. Plaintiff realleges the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 13 as though set forth and full at this point.
- 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the Defendant NOLD and in her capacity as an officer and owner of Defendant CERTIFIED made the claim that one of GWPM'S principals had been convicted of embezzlement from GWPM with the express intent of motivating the customers of GWPM to become customers of her and her new company. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the allegation was made sometime shortly prior to September of 2018 and

COMPLAINT

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	for
6.	vio
7	rig
8	De
9	
10	cor
11	dar
12	req
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	24
18	
19	cus
20	
21	ref
22	<sub>b.c.</sub>

23

24

25

26

27

28

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

# WAGES PAID (FAITHLESS SERVANT DOCTRINE)

## AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 23. Plaintiff realleges the material allegations of paragraphs of 1 through 22 as though set forth and full at this point. The conduct of the Defendants as heretofore alleged is an egregious violation of her fiduciary obligations to Plaintiff and it works as a forfeiture of Defendant NOLD'S right to compensation from Plaintiff. Plaintiff is entitled to the return of all wages paid to Defendant during the period of her disloyalty.
- 24. In doing the acts above, Defendant NOLD acted with malice and oppression constituting despicable conduct toward Plaintiff thereby entitling Plaintiff to punitive or exemplary damage in an amount appropriate to punish and to make an example of said Defendant. Plaintiff request said sums according to proof.

## FORTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# INTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 25. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation of paragraphs 1 through 24 as though set forth in full.
- 26. Plaintiff had a prospective business interest in doing continued business for the customers of GWPM that were misappropriated by NOLD and Defendant CERTIFIED.
- 27. Defendants had actual knowledge of the existence of the economic relationship referred to in the preceding paragraph as a result of her actually servicing said customers during her employment with Plaintiff.
- 28. Through the actions of Defendants in each of them, which were both defamatory and a breach of her fiduciary obligations to Plaintiff, Defendants and each of them diverted prospective business from Plaintiff to themselves.
- 29. The acts of the Defendants and each of them were intended and designed to disrupt Plaintiff's relationship and did actually disrupt those relationships.
  - 30. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants and each of them Plaintiff has been

1	damaged in the amount to be proven at the time of trial. The acts of the Defendants and each of
2	them, were done with a specific and intent to deprive Plaintiff of the economic benefit of said
3	business' interests which lawfully belonged to them and were done with fraud, oppression and or
4	malice thereby justifying the award of punitive or exemplary damages.
5	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
- 6	UNFAIR COMPETITION
7	AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
8	31. Plaintiff realleges allegations of paragraphs of 1 through 30, inclusive, as though set
9	forth and full at this point.
10	32. The actions of Defendants, and each of them, are a form of unfair competition which
11	violate the terms of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.
12	33. As a proximate result the unfair business practices of Defendants, and each of them,
13	Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
14	SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
15	BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY
16	(AGAINST DEFENDANT KIMBERLY DAWN NOLD)
17	34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation of paragraphs of 1
18	through 33, inclusive, as though set forth and full at this point.
19	35. As an account/community manager for Plaintiff Defendant NOLD owed the duty of
20	care, loyalty, confidentiality, full disclosure, and the duty of good faith and fair dealing at all times
21	towards Plaintiff.
22	36. NOLDS' acts, as more fully described above, include self dealing, usurpation of
23	corporate opportunity, misappropriation of corporate property, misuse of confidential information,
24	failure to disclose and other actions which breached those duties which were done for the own
25	purpose of her own personal gain and that of her company Defendant CERTIFIED.
26	37. As a direct and proximate result of the acts of the Defendant NOLD as herein above
27	alleged, Plaintiff is damaged in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.
- 28	38. The acts of Defendant NOLD were done with specific intent to deprive Plaintiff of the

- 1	$\mathbf{A}$
1	economic benefit of their prospective business interests which belong to Plaintiff and were done
2	with fraud, oppression and malice thereby justifying an award of punitive and or exemplary
3	damages against Defendant NOLD.
4	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of them as follows:
5	1. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof but not less than
6	\$1,000,000.00;
7	2. For punitive damages in an amount according to proof but not less than 1,000,000.00;
8	3. For attorneys fees as permitted by statute or agreement;
9	4. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
10	5. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.
11	
12.	Dated: January 04, 2019 CASELLO & LINCOLN
13	
14	
15	BY: JAMES H. CASELLO,
16	Aftorney for/Plaintiff, GOLDEN/WEST PROPERTY
17	MANAGEMENT INC.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

COMPLAINT