

CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILE Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles

Sherri H. garan, LACOULTE UINCE/Clerk

Deputy

| 1 2 3 4 5 6 | SINGH, SINGH & TRAUBEN, LLP MICHAEL A. TRAUBEN (SBN: 277557) 400 S. Beverly Drive, Suite 400 Beverly Hills, California 90212 Tel: 310-856-9705 Fax: 888-734-3555 mtrauben@singhtraubenlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs SANDBOX LLC and JUSTIN BUNNELL | CONFORMED CO ORIGINAL FILE Superior Court of Calif County of Los Angel DEC 2 8 2015 Sherri H. Janes, Lacouste off By: Ishayla Chambers | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 7 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 8 | COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT | | | | |
| 9 | |) [Unlimited Jurisdiction] | | | |
| 10 | and JUSTIN BUNNELL, an individual, |) Case No.: BC 6 0 5 3 8 6 | | | |
| 11 | Plaintiffs, |)) COMPLAINT FOR: | | | |
| 12 13 14 15 16 | v. CONNOR FREFF COCHRAN, an individual, CONLAN PRESS, INC., a California corporation, AVICENNA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, a California corporation, and DOES 1-10, inclusive, | CONVERSION; BREACH OF AGREEMENT; BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY; UNJUST ENRICHMENT; FRAUD IN THE INDUCEMENT; and for an ACCOUNTING | | | |
| 17 18 | Defendants. |)) .) | | | |
| 19 | Plaintiffs, Sandbox LLC ("Sandbo | Plaintiffs, Sandbox LLC ("Sandbox") and Justin Bunnell ("Bunnell") (collectively | | | |
| 20 | "Plaintiffs"), sue Defendants Connor Freff Cochran ("Cochran"), Conlan Press, Inc. ("Conlar | | | | |
| 21 | Press"), Avicenna Development Corporation ("Avicenna"), and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive | | | | |
| 22 | (collectively "Defendants") and, in support thereof, state as follows: | | | | |
| 23 | NATURE OF ACTION | | | | |
| 24 | 1. This is a civil action for conversion, breach of agreement, breach of fiduciary | | | | |
| 25 | duties, and fraud arising out of Defendants' unlawful misappropriation and conversion of | | | | |

Plaintiffs' funds, all in direct contravention of the parties' written agreement.

THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Sandbox is an unregistered California partnership.

Singh, Singh & Trauben, LLP

26

27

28

COMPLAINT

8

15

13

16

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

Singh, Singh & Trauben, LLP

- 3. Plaintiff Bunnell is a citizen and resident of Los Angeles County, California.
- Upon information and belief, Defendant Cochran is an individual residing in 4. Bellingham, Washington. During the commencement of the acts alleged herein, Cochran resided in San Francisco, California. Sometime thereafter, upon information and belief, Cochran moved to Montara, California, residing there from in or around March 2011 through 2015, whereby Cochran moved to Bellingham, Washington.
- 5. Upon information and belief, Defendant Conlan Press is a corporation created and existing under the laws of California, with its principal place of business now identified at a commercial mail-drop located at 1050 Larrabee Avenue #104-811, Bellingham, Washington, 98225. However, Defendant Conlan Press was initially formed in San Francisco, California, and the agent for service of process is currently located at 906 St. Francis Blvd., #1104, Daly City, California 94015.
- 6. Upon information and belief, Defendant Avicenna is a corporation created and existing under the laws of California, with its principal place of business now identified at a commercial mail-drop located at 1050 Larrabee Avenue #104-811, Bellingham, Washington, 98225. However, Defendant Avicenna was initially formed in San Francisco, California, and the agent for service of process is currently located at 906 St. Francis Blvd., #1104, Daly City, California 94015.
- 7. Upon information and belief, Defendant Cochran owns, operates and wholly controls Defendants Conlan Press and Avicenna (collectively the "Company Defendants").
- 8. In addition, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege that Defendant Cochran is the "alter ego" of the Company Defendants and that there exists, and at all times mentioned herein existed, a unity of interest and ownership between Defendant Cochran and the Company Defendants such that any individuality and separateness between all Defendants have ceased and Defendant Cochran controls the business and activities of the Company Defendants.
- 9. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege that at all times herein mentioned, the Company Defendants were and are a mere shell, instrumentality and conduit

through which Defendant Cochran carried on his business in the corporate name, exactly as he would have had there been no corporation at all, exercising complete control and dominance over such business to the point where any individuality or separateness between Cochran and the Company Defendants does not, and at all times herein mentioned, did not, exist.

- 10. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendant Cochran further comingled and continues to comingle his assets with the Company Defendants, controlled and continues to control the Company Defendants' finances in their entirety, treated and treats the Company Defendants' assets as his own, and further engaged and engages in such zealous controlling conduct towards the Company Defendants that the Company Defendants were and remain nothing more than a mere instrumentality of Defendant Cochran.
- 11. Upon information and belief, the Company Defendants are and were extremely undercapitalized as all, or most, of the revenues and monies yielded from the Company Defendants' business were and have been drained from the Company Defendants and transferred to Defendant Cochran and, further, Defendant Cochran has and continues to use the assets of the Company Defendants for his own personal use and has wrongfully diverted from their intended use significant sums of money properly to be paid by the Company Defendants to Plaintiffs.
- 12. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege that the Company Defendants are unable to satisfy any judgment against them.
- 13. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of Defendant Cochran as an individual separate and distinct from the Company Defendants would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and would sanction fraud or promote injustice in that Defendant Cochran might escape liability for the causes of action set out herein and would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and produce an inequitable result.
- 14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege that the Company Defendants share any and all liabilities as the companies share, among other things, the same staff and maintain the same principal place of business, specifically, 1050 Larrabee Avenue #104-811, Bellingham, Washington, 98225.
 - 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege that at all relevant

times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest, and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below.

- 16. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, and aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants
- 17. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, partnership, associate, or otherwise, of the Defendants named herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are presently unknown to Plaintiffs, who therefore sues these Defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiffs will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities as soon as they are ascertained. Plaintiffs further allege, on information and belief, that each of these fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the acts alleged herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 18. The harms and obligations sued upon were incurred and occurred in Los Angeles County. This Court is the proper court for the trial of this action.
- 19. Jurisdiction is premised upon the fact that the damages suffered by Plaintiffs are in excess of the minimum sum required for jurisdiction in the Superior Court of the State of California.
- 20. Further, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants on the grounds that all Defendants live and/or conduct or transact business and contract to supply goods or services in this State and Defendants have purposefully availed themselves of the jurisdiction of this Court by transacting business in this State.
 - 21. Venue and jurisdiction are proper in this county as a substantial amount of the

transactions and resulting harm incurred have occurred in this State.

- 22. At all times relevant, and per the parties' governing agreement, Defendants' contractual payment obligations owed to Plaintiffs were to occur in Los Angeles County, California and, as such, Defendants' obligations under the agreement were to be performed in Los Angeles County, California.
- 23. Defendants were to perform their contractual obligations by making all payments contractually owed to Plaintiffs in Los Angeles County, California.
- 24. Venue and jurisdiction are also proper in this county as, upon information and belief, Defendants reside and/or transacts business in this County.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 25. Plaintiffs are entrepreneurs and financiers.
- 26. Upon information and belief, Defendant Cochran is an editor.
- 27. Defendant Conlan Press filed its Articles of Incorporation on or around January 14, 2008.
- 28. Defendant Avicenna likewise filed its Articles of Incorporation on or around January 14, 2008. However, upon information and belief, Avicenna has filed only one Statement of Information since that time, and has paid zero taxes to the California Franchise Tax Board.
- 29. Upon information and belief, Defendant Conlan Press was initially created by Cochran in 2005 as a sole proprietorship publishing business to enable Cochran to exploit the work of the esteemed author Mr. Peter S. Beagle ("Beagle"), an internationally-acclaimed award-winning author of fantasy and science fiction books, stories, songs, screenplays, and other literary works.
- 30. Specifically, Defendants allege to be the owner of all rights, title, and interest in the novel *The Last Unicorn* (the "Last Unicorn" or "Novel") as authored by Beagle in or around 1968.
- 31. Defendants further allege to hold the equitable and legal rights in the certain animated feature-length film based upon the Last Unicorn (the "Picture").
 - 32. As of November 11, 2015, Beagle initiated a legal action as against Defendants

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

24 25

26

27

Singh,

22 23

28

for, among other things, elder abuse, fraud, breach of fiduciary duty and conversion.

- 33. Prior to these public revelations regarding Defendants' proclivity to commit fraudulent acts, in particular, as directly related to the subject Novel and Picture, Defendants similarly and fraudulently induced Plaintiffs to enter into a certain financial arrangement.
- 34. Specifically, on or around February 15, 2012, Defendant Avicenna and Plaintiff Sandbox entered into a written joint venture agreement whereby, in exchange for Sandbox's remittance of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000.00) to Defendants, Defendant Avicenna agreed to, among other things, oversee the distribution and marketing of the Picture through a "special limited release film tour" and remunerate Plaintiff, at a minimum, Four Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$450,000.00) and, thereafter, twenty-five percent (25%) of all profits derived from the the film tour and/or the exploitation of the Picture (the "Joint Venture Agreement'). A true and correct copy of the parties' Joint Venture Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".
- 35. Pursuant to the parties' Joint Venture Agreement, Defendant Avicenna was obligated to, among many other things, maintain all books and records of the joint venture, in addition to collecting and reporting all income from third-parties.
- 36 Nonetheless, Defendants completely failed to maintain the books and record of the joint venture and purported tour, including the collection and reporting of income from thirdparties and, instead, simply converted all such funds Plaintiffs remitted for personal use.
- 37. All conditions precedent to this action have occurred, been waived or have been performed.

COUNT I **CONVERSION** (As Against All Defendants)

- Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 38. through 37 as if fully set forth herein.
- 39 On or around February 15, 2012, Defendant Avicenna and Plaintiff Sandbox entered into the Joint Venture Agreement, providing that Defendants would, among other things, oversee the distribution and marketing of the Picture through a "special limited release film tour"

and remunerate Plaintiff, at a minimum, the sum of Four Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$450,000.00) and, thereafter, twenty-five percent (25%) of all profits derived from the film tour and/or the exploitation of the Picture.

- 40. Shortly after the execution of the Joint Venture Agreement, based upon Defendants' representations and promises, Plaintiff Sandbox caused the agreed upon sum of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000.00) to be delivered to Defendants.
- 41. Plaintiffs were the rightful owners of the \$300,000.00, the monies entrusted in Defendants' custody and care.
- 42. Defendants have completely failed and/or refused to account for the use of Plaintiffs' funds and have completely failed and/or refused to return any of Plaintiffs' funds.
- 43. Instead, to satisfy their personal debts and/or living expenses, Defendants wrongfully and unlawfully intentionally converted Plaintiffs' funds for Defendants' personal use in their entirety.
 - 44. Plaintiffs in no manner consented to Defendants' misappropriation of their funds.
- 45. Plaintiffs have performed all of the conditions, covenants, and promises required on their part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Joint Venture Agreement.
- 46. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conversion of Plaintiffs' monies, Plaintiffs have suffered significant economic damages.
- 47. Plaintiffs have been damages in an amount to be determined at trial, but not less than the sum of \$300,000.00 plus prejudgment interest.

COUNT II BREACH OF AGREEMENT (As Against All Defendants)

- 48. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 47 as if fully set forth herein.
- 49. On or around February 15, 2012, Defendant Avicenna and Plaintiff Sandbox entered into the Joint Venture Agreement, providing that Defendant would, among other things,

| oversee the distribution and marketing of the Picture through a "special limited release film tour |
|--|
| and remunerate Plaintiff, at a minimum, the sum of Four Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollar |
| (\$450,000.00) and, thereafter, twenty-five percent (25%) of all profits derived from the the film |
| tour and/or the exploitation of the Picture. |

- 50. Shortly after the execution of the Joint Venture Agreement, Plaintiff Sandbox caused the agreed upon sum of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000.00) to be delivered to Defendants.
- 51. Plaintiffs have performed all of the conditions, covenants, and promises required on their part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Joint Venture Agreement.
- 52. Defendants have failed and/or refused to perform their obligations in full accordance with the Joint Venture Agreement.
- 53. To date, and despite numerous requests, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiffs with a full accounting in connection with the profits and/or losses of the Picture tour.
- 54. In addition, Defendants breached the parties' Joint Venture Agreement through the premature termination of the tour.
- 55. Upon information and belief, and in direct contravention of the parties' Joint Venture Agreement, Defendants have disbursed funds and/or profits of the Joint Venture to themselves, failing and/or refusing to properly remunerate Plaintiffs their contractual portion of all such revenues.
- 56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' material breaches of the Joint Venture Agreement, Plaintiffs have been damaged in an amount in an amount no less than \$500,000.00 plus prejudgment interest.

COUNT III BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY (As Against All Defendants)

- 57. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 56 as if fully set forth herein.
 - 58. By entering into and forming a Joint Venture pursuant to the laws of the Sate of

California, a partnership relationship existed between Defendants and Plaintiffs. Inherent in and arising from this partnership are the fiduciary duties of loyalty, integrity, candor and good faith.

- 59. Defendants breached their fiduciary duties by engaging in acts and omissions alleged herein including, among other things, failing to account to Plaintiffs and failing to remunerate Plaintiffs pursuant to the parties' Joint Venture Agreement.
- 60. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breaches of fiduciary duties owed to Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs have suffered damage in an amount to be proved at trial, but in no event less than \$500,000.00.

COUNT IV UNJUST ENRICHMENT (As Against All Defendants)

- 61. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 60 as if fully set forth herein.
- 62. As a result of the breaches by and wrongful acts of Defendants, Defendants have been unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiffs. Defendants have derived and continue to derive a benefit from failing to perform their contractual obligations pursuant to the parties' Joint Venture Agreement.
- 63. Defendants are under an obligation to pay Plaintiffs forthwith all amounts by which they have been unjustly enriched, which sum is not less than \$300,000.00.

COUNT V FRAUD IN THE INDUCEMENT (As Against All Defendants)

- 64. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 63 as if fully set forth herein.
- 65. Defendants, to induce Plaintiffs to enter into and execute the parties' Joint Venture Agreement and agree to remit the sum of \$300,000.00 to Defendants, made material misrepresentations and false assurances to Plaintiffs, including, without limitation, the promise that no monies derived from the exploitation of the tour would be distributed to Defendants until one hundred and fifty percent (150%) of Plaintiffs' initial payment of \$300,000.00 was fully recouped and paid to Plaintiffs, and that Defendants would not convert such funds for

LLP

Singh, Singh & Trauben, LLP Defendants' personal use.

- 66. Defendants further represented that they maintained all of necessary rights and were able and willing to begin the agreed-upon Picture tour in the year 2012.
- 67. Defendants' misrepresentations and assurances in this regard were designed to entice Plaintiffs, at Plaintiffs' significant detriment and expense, to pay Defendants the sum of no less than \$300,000.00.
- 68. Moreover, Defendants, at all times, knew that Plaintiffs were heavily relying upon the foregoing representations in agreeing to remit the sum of no less than \$300,000.00 to Defendants
- 69. At the time the Defendants made the foregoing material representations and promises to Plaintiffs, such representations and promises were false and, in addition, Defendants had no intention of fully performing under the terms of the parties' Joint Venture Agreement, and knew that all such representations were false when made.
- 70. Defendants made such representations pertaining to promising future action with no intention of performing or with a positive intention of not performing on such promises.
- 71. Plaintiffs acted in justifiable reliance upon the Defendants' material misrepresentations, promises and assurances as, at the time Defendants made such representations, Plaintiffs did not know of the falsity of the representations and, in addition, were not aware of Defendants' complete lack of intention to fully perform under the parties' Joint Venture Agreement, and could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have discovered Defendants' positive intention of not performing.
- 72. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiffs' justifiable reliance upon Defendants' fraudulent misrepresentations, Plaintiffs have suffered significant and extensive damages and financial injury.

COUNT VI ACCOUNTING (As Against All Defendants)

73. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 72 as if fully set forth herein.

- 74. An agreement exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants wherein Defendants agreed to compensate Plaintiffs based upon a percentage of revenues Defendants earned from the film tour. This relationship allows for an appropriate claim for accounting to be made by Plaintiffs.
- 75. As the Joint Venture Agreement involves, among other things, a duty to account for all income, revenues and profits derived from Defendants' exploitation of the Picture, and Defendants continue to fail and/or refuse to provide any such accounting to Plaintiffs, it is not clear that the remedy at law would be as full, adequate, and expeditious as it is in equity.
- 76. Defendants have received, and continue to receive, profits and revenues in connection with the film tour and/or exploitation of the Picture.
- 77. As a result of the parties' Joint Venture Agreement, Defendants have received money, a portion of which is due to Plaintiffs.
- 78. The amount of money due from Defendants to Plaintiffs is unknown to Plaintiffs and cannot be ascertained without an accounting of the business receipts. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the amount due to Plaintiffs exceeds \$500,000.00.
- 79. Plaintiffs have demanded an accounting of the aforementioned receipts of the business from Defendants and payment of the amount found due, but Defendants have failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to render such an account and pay such sum.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs Sandbox LLC and Justin Bunnell respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in their favor and as against Defendants Connor Freff Cochran, Conlan Press, Inc., and Avicenna Development Corporation as follows:

- (a) That all Defendants are jointly and severally liable;
- (b) For conversion of Plaintiffs' funds, and that Defendants have been unjustly enriched, in an amount no less than \$300,000.00, plus pre-judgment interest on all damages, at the legal rate;
- (c) For breach of the parties' Joint Venture Agreement and the contractual obligations contained therein, and that Plaintiffs be awarded all actual and compensatory damages suffered from these breaches in an amount to be

| 1 | - | determined at trial, plus interest and costs, but in no event less than \$500,000.00, | | |
|----|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 2 | | plus pre-judgment interest at the legal rate; | | |
| 3 | (d) | For a full and complete accounting of all Defendants' revenues, costs and profits | | |
| 4 | | in connection with the film tour and/or exploitation of the Picture; | | |
| 5 | (e) | For punitive damages based upon Defendants' fraudulent conduct and breaches of | | |
| 6 | | fiduciary duty owed to Plaintiffs; | | |
| 7 | (f) | For all costs of suit incurred herein; and | | |
| 8 | (g) | For such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate. | | |
| 9 | DATED: Dece | ember 28, 2015 Respe | mber 28, 2015 Respectfully submitted, | |
| 10 | | SING | h, Singh & Trauben, LLP | |
| 11 | | Mice | IAEL A. TRAUBEN | |
| 12 | | By: | MI | |
| 13 | | Бу | Michael A. Trauben | |
| 14 | | | neys for Plaintiffs | |
| 15 | | SANI | DBOX LLC and JUSTIN BUNNELL | |
| 16 | | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| 18 | | | Å. | |
| 19 | | | | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 21 | | | | |
| 22 | | | | |
| 23 | | | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | | | | |
| 28 | | | | |

Singh, Singh & Trauben, LLP