

APPENDIX A- OPINION, COURT OF APPEAL**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED
IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE**

GARY HUMPHREYS et al.
Cross-complainants and Respondents.

G055075

v. (Super. Ct. No. 30-2015-00805807)
OPINION

ADAM BEREKI
Cross-defendant and Appellant

Appeal from a judgment of the Superior Court of
Orange County, David R. Chaffee, Judge. Affirmed.

Adam Bereki, in pro. per., for Plaintiff and
Appellant. William G. Bissell for Defendants and
Respondents.

This case involves the purported general contractor for a condominium remodel project, Adam Bereki, on one side, and the condominium owners, Gary and Karen Humphreys (the Humphreys), on the other. After the Humphreys terminated Bereki's involvement, a now defunct corporation formerly owned by Bereki, Spartan Associates, Inc. (Spartan Associates), sued Humphreys, claiming they still owed approximately \$83,000 for work on the project. The Humphreys denied the allegations and cross-complained against Bereki and Spartan Associates. Among the remedies they sought was disgorgement of all payments made for the project, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 7031, subdivision (b)¹, due to Bereki's alleged failure to possess a required contractor's license.

Following a bifurcated bench trial on the disgorgement cause of action, the trial court found in favor of the Humphreys and ordered Bereki to repay them all monies received in relation to the remodel work — \$848,000. Its ruling and a stipulation by the parties disposed of the remainder of the case and Bereki appealed. He challenges the disgorgement on a variety of constitutional, legal, and factual grounds. We find no merit in his contentions and, therefore affirm the judgment.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

I. FACTS

The Humphreys own a condominium on Lido Isle in the City of Newport Beach. It was originally two separate units. The couple hired Berek to do some remodeling which would, among other things, turn the two units into a single unit. After an on-site walkthrough, the Humphreys exchanged e-mails with Berek to confirm the scope of the project. In one of his e-mails, Berek stated he and his partner would perform the work for a specified rate.

The Humphreys agreed to the proposed scope and rates, and also inquired whether a written contract was necessary. Berek responded that it was not; their "words/commitment [was] enough." To start the project, Berek asked the Humphreys for a \$15,000 check deposit payable to him, personally.

Several months into the remodel the Humphreys, at Berek's request, started making their progress payments to Spartan Associates instead of paying Berek directly as an individual. Berek never gave them an explanation for the change or what, if any, involvement Spartan Associates had in the project, but the accountings he sent included the name "Spartan Associates."

After approximately a year and a half, the Humphreys terminated Berek's involvement and later hired a different general contractor to complete the project.

Believing the Humphreys still owed approximately \$82,800 for materials used in the remodel and labor performed, Spartan Associates sued to recover that

amount. The Humphreys generally denied the allegations in the complaint, and filed a cross-complaint against Berek, Spartan Associates, and a surety company. Among the allegations were causes of action for negligence, intentional misrepresentation, and negligent misrepresentation. The trial court later granted them leave to amend the cross-complaint to include a cause of action for disgorgement of funds paid to an unlicensed contractor, pursuant to section 7031, subdivision (b).

At the Humphreys' request, the trial court bifurcated the disgorgement claim from the remainder of the claims in the cross-complaint, and it held a trial on that issue first. During the course of the two-day bench trial on the disgorgement cause of action, the court heard testimony from the Humphreys and Berek.

Karen Humphreys testified it was her understanding, based on the initial e-mails exchanged with Berek, that she and her husband were contracting with Berek and his partner to do the work. They wanted a licensed contractor to do the work and obtain all the necessary permits, and she "took [Berek] at his word that he had a license."

She also testified there was no mention of Spartan Associates until months after the project began and insisted they never entered into a contract with Spartan Associates.

Gary Humphreys concurred with his wife's testimony about the remodel details, the series of events that transpired between them and Berek, and the agreement he believed they entered into with Berek.

In addition, he confirmed Bereki told him he was a licensed contractor and stated he would not have hired him if he knew it was otherwise.

In contrast, Bereki testified the contract for the couple's remodel project was between the Humphreys and Spartan Associates. He nevertheless acknowledged his initial e-mail communications to the Humphreys made no mention of Spartan Associates, including the one which set forth the proposed scope of work and hourly rates. When asked about contractor's licenses, he admitted he never possessed one as an individual or as a joint venture with his partner. Spartan Associates, however, did have a contractor's license at the time of the project.

As for the work done for the Humphreys, Bereki testified he believed Spartan Associates performed all of it. He testified that the three city permits for the project were all obtained by, and issued to, Spartan Associates. Additionally, he produced contracts with subcontractors who performed aspects of the remodel work. The majority of these contracts were between the given subcontractor and Spartan Associates².

The trial court found in favor of the Humphreys on the disgorgement cause of action based on its determination that Bereki, not Spartan Associates, was the contractor who performed all the remodel

² Bereki filed an unopposed motion to augment the record on appeal with certain exhibits admitted in the trial court. We deny the request because the exhibits already are "deemed part of the record" by Court Rule. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.122(a)(3).) We have considered the copies of the exhibits he provided in conjunction with our review of this appeal.

work. As a result, the court also found in favor of the Humphreys on Spartan Associate's complaint. The remainder of the cross-complaint was dismissed without prejudice at the Humphreys' request.

II. DISCUSSION

Bereki challenges the portion of the judgment disgorging all compensation paid to him for his work on the Humphreys' remodel project³. Though articulated in various ways, his arguments boil down to the following: (1) disgorgement under section 7031, subdivision (b), is unconstitutional or, alternatively, criminal in nature; (2) the trial court erred in ordering disgorgement because Spartan Associates, not Bereki, performed the work and Spartan Associates held a contractor's license; (3) even assuming Bereki performed the work, the state's contractor licensing requirement does not apply to him as a "natural person"; (4) there was insufficient evidence to support disgorgement, including no evidence of injury due to Bereki's failure to be individually licensed; (5) the court should have offset the disgorgement amount by the value the

³ Bereki appears to also challenge a postjudgment sanctions order the trial court issued based on Bereki's motion to compel a response to a demand for a bill of particulars filed after entry of judgment. The sanctions order is not encompassed by his earlier appeal from the judgment. And although such a postjudgment order is separately appealable (Code Civ. Proc., § 904.1, subds. (a)(2) & (b)), Bereki did not file another appeal. Accordingly, the issue is not before us. (*Silver v. Pacific American Fish Co., Inc.* (2010) 190 Cal.App.4th 688, 693 [court without jurisdiction to review postjudgment order from which no appeal is taken].)

Humphreys received through the remodel work; (6) it was improper to order full disgorgement because certain payments were not made from the Humphreys' personal accounts; and (7) the court Berek challenges the portion of the judgment disgorging all compensation paid to him for his work on the Humphreys' remodel project. 3 Though articulated in various ways, his arguments boil down to the following: (1) disgorgement under section 7031, subdivision (b), is unconstitutional or, alternatively, criminal in nature; (2) the trial court erred in ordering disgorgement because Spartan Associates, not Berek, performed the work and Spartan Associates held a contractor's license; (3) even assuming Berek performed the work, the state's contractor licensing requirement does not apply to him as a "natural person"; (4) there was insufficient evidence to support disgorgement, including no evidence of injury due to Berek's failure to be individually licensed; (5) the court should have offset the disgorgement amount by the value the Humphreys received through the remodel work; (6) it was improper to order full disgorgement because certain payments were not made from the Humphreys' personal accounts; and (7) the court erroneously failed to provide a written statement of

decision⁴. We find no merit to any of these contentions.

A. Disgorgement Remedy Under Section 7031

Relying heavily on *White v. Cridlebaugh* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 506, 517 (*White*), the decision in *Alatriste v. Cesar's Exterior Designs, Inc.* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 656, 664-666 (*Alatriste*) aptly summarizes the nature, purpose and scope of the litigation prohibition and the disgorgement remedy provided in section 7031, subdivisions (a) and (b).

"Section 7031 [, subdivision] (b) is part of the Contractors' State License Law (§ 7000 et seq.), which is a comprehensive legislative scheme governing the construction business in California. [This statutory scheme] provides that contractors

⁴ After briefing was complete, Bereki filed a motion asking that we take judicial notice of a plethora of items, among which are the federal Constitution and other foundational documents for this country, federal and state statutes, and a variety of case law. To begin, "[r]equests for judicial notice should not be used to 'circumvent []' appellate rules and procedures, including the normal briefing process." (*Mangini v. R. J Reynolds Tobacco Co.* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1057, 1064, overruled on another point as stated in *In re Tobacco Cases II* (2007) 41 Cal.4th 1257.) Further, "[a] request for judicial notice of published material is unnecessary. Citation to the material is sufficient." (*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co.* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 26, 45, fn. 9.) We therefore deny Bereki's request as unnecessary to the extent it included such materials. As for the remaining items, we likewise deny the request because we find them not properly the subject of a request for judicial notice and/or irrelevant to resolution of the matters before us. (Evid. Code, §§ 451, 452; *Schifando v. City of Los Angeles* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 1074, 1089, fn. 4 [appellate court will not take judicial notice of irrelevant material].)

performing construction work must be licensed unless exempt. [Citation.] "The licensing requirements provide minimal assurance that all persons offering such services in California have the requisite skill and character, understand applicable local laws and codes, and know the rudiments of administering a contracting business. [Citations.]" [Citation.] The [laws] are designed to protect the public from incompetent or dishonest providers of building and construction services [Citation.] [Citation.]

"This statutory scheme encourages licensure by subjecting unlicensed contractors to criminal penalties and civil remedies. [Citation.] The civil remedies 'affect the unlicensed contractor's right to receive or retain compensation for unlicensed work.' (Ibid.) The hiring party is entitled to enforce these remedies through a defensive 'shield' or an affirmative 'sword.' [Citation.]

"The shield, contained in section 7031 [subdivision] (a), was enacted more than 70 years ago, and provides that a party has a complete defense to claims for compensation made by a contractor who performed work without a license, unless the contractor meets the requirements of the statutory substantial compliance doctrine. [Citation.] Section 7031 [subdivision] (e), the substantial compliance exception, provides relief only in very narrow specified circumstances, and 'shall not apply ... where the [unlicensed contractor] has never been a duly licensed contractor in this state.' [Citation.]

"The California Supreme Court has long given a broad, literal interpretation to section 7031

[,subdivision] (a)'s shield provision. [Citation.] The court has held that [it] applies even when the person for whom the work was performed knew the contractor was unlicensed. [Citation.] . . . [It] explained that Section 7031 represents a legislative determination that the importance of deterring unlicensed persons from engaging in the contracting business outweighs any harshness between the parties, and that such deterrence can best be realized by denying violators the right to maintain any action for compensation in the courts of this state. [Citation.] ..."" [Citation.] "'Because of the strength and clarity of this policy [citation]," the bar of section 7031 [, subdivision] (a) applies "[r]egardless of the equities." ' [Citations.]

"In 2001, the Legislature amended section 7031 to add a sword remedy to the hiring party's litigation arsenal. This sword remedy, contained in section 7031 [,subdivision] (b), currently reads: 'Except as provided in subdivision (e), a person who utilizes the services of an unlicensed contractor may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction in this state to recover all compensation paid to the unlicensed contractor for performance of any act or contract.' By adding this remedy, the Legislature sought to further section 7031 [,subdivision] (a)'s policy of deterring violations of licensing requirements by 'allow[ing] persons who utilize unlicensed contractors to recover compensation paid to the contractor for performing unlicensed work. [Citation.]' [Citation.]" (*Alatriste, supra*, 183 Cal.App.4th at pp. 664-666, fns. omitted.)

Based on the statutory language and legislative history, both *Alatriste* and *White* "concluded that the Legislature intended that courts interpret sections 7031 [, subdivision] (a) and 7031[, subdivision] (b) in a consistent manner, resulting in the same remedy regardless of whether the unlicensed contractor is the plaintiff or the defendant." (*Alatriste, supra*, 183 Cal.App.4th at p. 666, citing *White, supra*, 178 Cal.App.4th at pp. 519-520.) These principles are well-settled under the law.

Bereki contends the disgorgement remedy is penal in nature and, therefore, a contractor defending against such a claim must be afforded all criminal rights and protections. Not so. Disgorgement is a civil consequence- "an equitable remedy"- for performing work without a required contractor's license. (*S.E. C. v. Huffman* (5th Cir. 1993) 996 F.2d 800, 802 (S.E.C.); see *Walker v. Appellate Division of Superior Court* (2017) 14 Cal.App.5th 651,657 [§ 7031 contemplates civil proceedings].) The Legislature created a separate criminal penalty. Specifically, section 7028 provides that acting or operating in the capacity of a contractor without a required license is a criminal misdemeanor subject to jail time, or fines, and restitution. (§ 7028, subds. (a)-(c), (h).)

For similar reasons, Bereki' s attempt to characterize disgorgement as an award of unconstitutional punitive damages is unavailing. As an equitable remedy, disgorgement is not punishment and, therefore, it does not implicate the excessive fines clause of the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. (S.E.C. *supra*, 996 F.2d at p. 802; see

US v Philip Morris USA (D.C. 2004) 310 F.Supp.2d 58, 62-63.)

B. Contractor Licensing Requirement

Before turning to application of section 7031, subdivision (b), we address Bereki's claim that he, in his individual capacity, did not need a contractor's license. His argument is twofold, one part legal and the other part factual. We reject both.

As for the legal argument, Bereki asserts that licensing requirements only apply to "fictitious" persons, not "natural" persons such as himself. He cites no authority for his unique interpretation of the relevant statutes. And, the statutes provide otherwise. Contractors who are required to obtain a license include "[a]ny person ... who ... undertakes, offers to undertake, purports to have the capacity to undertake, or submits a bid to construct any ... home improvement project, or part thereof." (§ 7026.1, subd. (a)(2).) In turn, "[p]erson" is defined to include "an individual[,"] as well as a variety of types of business entities and associations. (§ 7025, subd. (b).) "In ordinary usage[,] the word 'individual' denotes a natural person not a group, association or other artificial entity. (See Webster's Third New Internat. Diet. (2002 ed.) p. 1152 [giving a primary definition of 'individual' as 'a single human being as contrasted with a social group or institution'].)" (*City of Los Angeles v. Animal Defense League* (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 606, 623, disapproved of on other grounds in *City of Montebello v. Vasquez* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 409, 416.) There is nothing in the statutes that indicates a different, specialized meaning. (*Halbert's Lumber, Inc. v. Lucky Stores, Inc.* (1992) 6

Cal.App.4th 1233, 1238 ["In examining the language, the courts should give to the words of the statute their ordinary, everyday meaning [citations] unless, of course, the statute itself specifically defines those words to give them a special meaning"].)

Bereki's factual attack concerns the trial court's conclusion that he, not Spartan Associates, was the contractor who performed the remodel work for the Humphreys. Though he implores us to engage in de novo review of this issue, it is a factual determination which we review for substantial evidence. (*Escamilla v. Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation* (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 498, 514.) There is ample evidence in the record supporting the court's conclusion.⁵

Both of the Humphreys testified that on the first day they met Bereki for a walkthrough of the site, he informed them that he and his partner would act as the general contractor for the project. Bereki followed

⁵ Bereki filed a motion asking us to consider additional evidence not presented in the trial court, among which are two declarations, an e-mail correspondence and a letter. He believes the documents are relevant to establishing the identity of the contracting parties. We deny the motion as "[i]t has long been the general rule and understanding that 'an appeal reviews the correctness of a judgment as of the time of its rendition, upon a record of matters which were before the trial court for its consideration.'" (In re Zeth S. (2003) 31 Cal.4th 396, 405, italics added.) Circumstances warranting an exception to this rule are very rare and we do not find them extant here, particularly in light of the conflicting evidence weighed by the trial court. (See *Diaz v. Professional Community Management, Inc.* (2017) 16 Cal.App.5th 1190, 1213 [" The power to take evidence in the Court of Appeal is never used where there is conflicting evidence in the record and substantial evidence supports the trial court's findings."].)

up with a written proposal and estimate, which he sent to the couple from his personal e-mail address. When they inquired whether he had a contractor's license, he assured them he did, and when they asked him to whom they should make out their payment checks, he told them to put them in his name.

At no time during this series of events did Berekli ever mention Spartan Associates. Notably, Berekli did not apply to the State Board of Equalization to register Spartan as an employer until roughly three months after the remodel work began. Then, about four months into the project, he introduced the corporation into the mix by asking the Humphreys, without any explanation, to make future payments to Spartan Associates.

Based on what transpired, the couple believed they contracted with Berekli, in his individual capacity, to complete the remodel work.

While Berekli claims the Humphreys lied when they testified at trial because some of their factual statements purportedly contradicted those they made at the summary judgment stage, our role is not to resolve factual disputes or to judge the credibility of witnesses. (*Leff v. Gunter* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 508, 518.) The trial court bore that responsibility in this case, and our review of the record reveals substantial evidence to support its conclusion that Berekli, not Spartan Associates, was the contractor for the job.

C. Disgorgement Remedy Under Section 7031

Separate from his general attacks on section 7031 , subdivision (b) , Berekli challenges its application

under the specific facts of this case. He first asserts disgorgement is an improper remedy because it gives the Humphreys a double benefit- the remodel improvements and the money they otherwise would have paid for them. In the context of the statute at issue, however, courts have uniformly rejected such an argument and required disgorgement, even though this remedy often produces harsh results. (See, e.g., *Alatriste, supra*, 183 Cal.App.4th at pp. 672-673; *White, supra*, 178 Cal.App.4th at pp. 520-521; see also *Jeff Tracy, Inc. v. City of Pico Rivera* (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 510, 521.) Full disgorgement is required; offsets and reductions for labor and materials received are not permitted.

Equally meritless is Bereki 's contention that there was no justiciable claim under the statute because there was no evidence the Humphreys were injured by his lack of a contractor' s license. Bereki cites no authority for that novel proposition. Injury is not an element of a cause of action under the statute. The disgorgement consequence is not remedial in nature. Similar to the licensing requirement, it is a proactive measure intended to decrease the likelihood of harm due to "incompetent or dishonest providers of building and construction services." (*White, supra*, 178 Cal.App.4th at pp. 517.)

We also are not persuaded by Bereki's objection to the amount the court ordered him to repay to the Humphreys. He highlights evidence showing that some of the payment checks came from Gary Humphreys' corporation, and he argues the Humphreys are not entitled to those amounts given they did not pay them in the first instance. While we

do not necessarily see eye-to-eye with Berek's legal reasoning, we need not reach the legal aspect of his argument due to the trial court's factual findings.

The trial court, relying on Gary Humphreys' uncontradicted testimony, found that the contested payments ultimately were attributable to Gary Humphrey himself. Substantial evidence supports this conclusion. The Humphreys testified that the business is an S corporation, and at the relevant time Gary Humphreys was the sole shareholder and an employee. Gary Humphreys explained he was traveling often for business during the remodel, including at times when Berek insisted on needing money "right away." To facilitate the payments, Gary Humphreys had persons in his corporation with signing authority write checks from the corporate account. The amounts paid on the Humphreys behalf were then accounted for through a reduction in the regular income Gary Humphreys received from the corporation. He paid income taxes on those amounts because they were included in the figures listed on his annual W-2 form.

Under these circumstances, we find ample evidence to support the trial court's factual finding that although certain payments to Berek were made from the Humphreys' business account, they ultimately were accounted for in a way that ensured they were personal payments from the Humphreys, as individuals. Accordingly, the Humphreys were entitled to "all compensation paid." (§ 7031, subd. (b).)

We recognize that the provisions of section 7031, including the disgorgement remedy, are harsh and

may be perceived as unfair. As courts have explained, however, they stem from policy decisions made by the Legislature. (*MW Erectors, Inc. v. Niederhauser Ornamental & Metal Works Co., Inc.* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 412, 423; *Hydrotech Systems, Ltd. v. Oasis Waterpark* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 988, 995; *Lewis & Queen v. NM Ball Sons* (1957) 48 Cal.2d 141, 151; see *Judicial Council of California v. Jacobs Facilities, Inc.* (2015) 239 Cal.App.4th 882, 896; *Alatriste, supra*, 183 Cal.App.4th at p. 672.) "[T]he choice among competing policy considerations in enacting laws is a legislative function" (*Coastside Fishing Club v. California Resources Agency* (2008) 158 Cal.App.4th 1183, 1203), and absent a constitutional prohibition, we may not interfere or question the wisdom of the policies embodied in the statute. (*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Com.* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 1, 25; *Alatriste, supra*, 183 Cal.App.4th at p. 672.)

D. Statement of Decision

Though he admits he did not timely request a statement of decision, Berekí claims the trial court should have nevertheless provided one after he made an untimely request. To the contrary, "[n]o statement of decision is required if the parties fail to request one." (*Acquire It, Ltd. v. Colton Real Estate Group* (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th 959, 970; see also Code Civ. Proc., § 632.) The trial court's denial was proper. (See *In re Marriage a/Steinberg* (1977) 66 Cal.App.3d 815, 822 [upholding court's refusal to make findings of fact and conclusions of law due to party's failure to timely request them].)

III. DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed. Respondents are entitled to their costs on appeal.

ARONSON, J.

WE CONCUR:

O'LEARY, P.J.

GOETHALS, J.

APPENDIX B- TRIAL COURT

MINUTE ORDER

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ORANGE

CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

MINUTE ORDER

CASE NO: 30-2015-00805807-CU-CO-CJC CASE
INIT.DATE: 08/21/2015

CASE TITLE: THE SPARTAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
vs. HUMPHREYS

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE:
Contract - Other

APPEARANCES

J. Scott Russo, from Russo & Duckworth LLP,
present for Cross- Defendant, Plaintiff(s).

William G. Bissell, from Law Offices of William G.
Bissell, present for Defendant, Cross-
Complainant(s).

KAREN HUMPHREYS, Defendant is present.

GARY HUMPHREYS, Defendant is present.

Adam Bereki, self represented Cross - Defendant, present.

2nd day of trial

At 9:55a.m. Court reconvenes with plaintiff(s), defendant(s) and counsel present as noted above.

At 9:57 a.m. Mr. William G. Bissell presents closing argument on behalf of Cross-Complainants/Defendants, Karen & Gary Humphreys.

At 10:12 a.m. Mr. J. Scott Russo presents closing argument on behalf of Cross-Defendant, The Spartan Associates, Inc ..

Mr. Adam Bereki waived closing argument.

At 10:19 a.m. Court declares a recess.

At 10:52 a.m. Court reconvenes with plaintiff(s), defendant(s) and counsel present as noted above.

Having fully considered the arguments of all parties, both written and oral, as well as the evidence presented, the Court finds and determines that Mr. Adam Bereki is the contractor and he does not possess contractor's license.

The Court finds judgment for the Cross Complainants, Gary & Karen Humphreys (First Cause of Action, for Disgorgement of Funds Paid) and against cross-defendant, Adam Bereki.

The Court invites counsels to meet and discuss the plan for the remaining cause of actions and the complaint.

At 11:19 a.m. Court declares a recess.

At 11:37 a.m. Court reconvenes with plaintiff(s), defendant(s) and counsel present as noted above.

Legal discussions held with regards to remaining cross-complaint cause of actions and the complaint as set forth on the record.

Counsels are to resume discussions during lunch hour and report to the Court at 1:45 p.m.

At 11:47 p.m. Court declares a recess.

At 1:48 p.m. Court reconvenes with plaintiff(s), defendant(s) and counsel present as noted above.

Counsels reached an agreement as set forth on the record .

Mr. J . Scott Russo presents an offer of proof on plaintiff's complaint that if called Mr. Adam Bereki would be the witness and the testimony would be that Plaintiff, Spartan Associates had rendered goods and services to the defendants. The fair market value for the services and goods of \$82,821.53 to be backed up by invoices and testimony about the reasonable value of those services that would be the first cause of action Quantum Merit. For the 2nd cause of action, go and in hand that it was an open book accounting

was rendered to the defendants that they were given the accountings and the sum was \$82,821.53 that was still due.

Based on Mr. Russo's offer of proof, the Court understand that those claims are based upon the view of plaintiff Spartan Associates, Inc. was the general contractor on the project. The Court finds that Spartan Associates does not have standing as determined earlier today that Mr. Bereki was the purported general contractor on the contract. Spartan Associates, Inc. may have been apparently substituted but it is certainly not with the permission or agreement of the defendants. Based on that, the Court finds judgment for the defendants on the complaint.

The parties have discussed, agreed and stipulates on the record as follows: The entirety of remaining causes of action on the First Amended Cross-Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice. If judgment on the first cause of action becomes final, the dismissal without prejudice will be converted to dismissal with prejudice. Pending judgment on the first cause of action becoming final, the statute of limitations on the re-filing of an action of the dismissed causes of action is waived. If a new action is filed on the dismissed causes of action, discovery deemed completed and will not be re-opened and the newly filed case will be consolidated with the remanded case for trial.

Pursuant to Mr. Bissell's Motion, the Court orders the remaining causes of action, negligence, fraud, alter ego, penalty, attorney's fees and recovery

against the Contractor's license bond be dismissed without prejudice. The judgment on the First Amended Cross Complaint is on the 1st cause of action for discouragement only.

The Court directs Mr. William G. Bissell to prepare the judgment.

At 2:03 p.m. Pursuant to oral stipulation set forth on the record, exhibits are released and returned to the submitting parties/counsels for maintenance, custody and safekeeping pending any post-verdict or appeal proceedings. All identification tags and other identifying markings are to remain in place pending this period.

At 2:05p.m. The Court is adjourned in this matter.

APPENDIX C- SUPERIOR COURT

MINUTE ORDER

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,

COUNTY OF ORANGE

CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

MINUTE ORDER

TIME: 09:30:00 AM DEPT: C16

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Supervising
Judge James J. Di Cesare CLERK: Martha Diaz
REPORTER/ERM: Jamie Jennings CSR# 13434
BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: Loretta Schwary

CASE NO: 30-2015-00805807-CU-CO-CJC CASE
INIT.DATE: 08/21/2015

CASE TITLE: THE SPARTAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
vs. HUMPHREYS

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE:
Contract - Other

EVENT ID/DOCUMENT ID: 72990898

EVENT TYPE: Motion to Vacate
MOVING PARTY: Adam Bereki
CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Motion to Vacate Void Judgment, 02/19/2019

APPEARANCES

Law Offices of William G. Bissell, from Law Offices of William G. Bissell, present for Cross - Complainant, Defendant, Respondent on Appeal(s). Adam Bereki, self represented Defendant, present.

Tentative Ruling posted on the Internet and posted in the public hallway.

The Court having fully considered the arguments of all parties, both written and oral, as well as the evidence presented, now makes the tentative ruling final as follows:

MOTION TO VACATE

The Motion “to Vacate Void Judgment” filed by Mr. Adam Bereki is Denied. The arguments presented on this motion were already raised and rejected, and the appellate decision affirming the underlying judgment on the merits is now final. Upon remittitur, the trial court is revested with jurisdiction of the case only to carry out the judgment as ordered by the appellate court. (*People v. Dutra* (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 1359, 1365-1366.) Arguments on the merits of the underlying judgment cannot be entertained anew here. The Motion is therefore Denied.

Counsel for the Humphreys to give notice.

APPENDIX D- §7031 B&P**BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE - BPC**
DIVISION 3. PROFESSIONS AND VOCATIONS
GENERALLY [5000 - 9998.11] (*Heading of*
Division 3 added by Stats. 1939, Ch. 30.*)*CHAPTER 9. Contractors [7000 - 7191] (*Chapter***
9 added by Stats. 1939, Ch. 37.*)*ARTICLE 2. Application of Chapter [7025 -**
****7034] (*Article 2 added by Stats. 1939, Ch. 37.*)******7031.**

(a) Except as provided in subdivision (e), no person engaged in the business or acting in the capacity of a contractor, may bring or maintain any action, or recover in law or equity in any action, in any court of this state for the collection of compensation for the performance of any act or contract where a license is required by this chapter without alleging that he or she was a duly licensed contractor at all times during the performance of that act or contract regardless of the merits of the cause of action brought by the person, except that this prohibition shall not apply to contractors who are each individually licensed under this chapter but who fail to comply with Section 7029.

(b) Except as provided in subdivision (e), a person who utilizes the services of an unlicensed contractor may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction in this state to recover all compensation paid to the unlicensed contractor for performance of any act or contract.

(c) A security interest taken to secure any payment for the performance of any act or contract for which a license is required by this chapter is unenforceable if the person performing the act or contract was not a duly licensed contractor at all times during the performance of the act or contract.

(d) If licensure or proper licensure is controverted, then proof of licensure pursuant to this section shall be made by production of a verified certificate of licensure from the Contractors' State License Board which establishes that the individual or entity bringing the action was duly licensed in the proper classification of contractors at all times during the performance of any act or contract covered by the action. Nothing in this subdivision shall require any person or entity controverting licensure or proper licensure to produce a verified certificate. When licensure or proper licensure is controverted, the burden of proof to establish licensure or proper licensure shall be on the licensee.

(e) The judicial doctrine of substantial compliance shall not apply under this section where the person who engaged in the business or acted in the capacity of a contractor has never been a duly licensed contractor in this state. However, notwithstanding subdivision (b) of Section 143, the court may determine that there has been substantial compliance with licensure requirements under this section if it is shown at an evidentiary hearing that the person who engaged in the business or acted in the capacity of a contractor (1) had been duly licensed as a contractor in this state prior to the performance of the act or contract, (2) acted reasonably and in good faith to maintain proper licensure, and (3) acted promptly and in good faith to remedy the failure to

comply with the licensure requirements upon learning of the failure.

(f) The exceptions to the prohibition against the application of the judicial doctrine of substantial compliance found in subdivision (e) shall apply to all contracts entered into on or after January 1, 1992, and to all actions or arbitrations arising therefrom, except that the amendments to subdivisions (e) and (f) enacted during the 1994 portion of the 1993–94 Regular Session of the Legislature shall not apply to either of the following:

(1) Any legal action or arbitration commenced prior to January 1, 1995, regardless of the date on which the parties entered into the contract.

(2) Any legal action or arbitration commenced on or after January 1, 1995, if the legal action or arbitration was commenced prior to January 1, 1995, and was subsequently dismissed.

*(Amended by Stats. 2016, Ch. 244, Sec. 1. (AB 1793)
Effective January 1, 2017.)*

APPENDIX E- §7071.17 B&P**BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE - BPC**
DIVISION 3. PROFESSIONS AND VOCATIONS
GENERALLY [5000 - 9998.11] (*Heading of*
Division 3 added by Stats. 1939, Ch. 30.*)*CHAPTER 9. Contractors [7000 - 7191] (*Chapter***
9 added by Stats. 1939, Ch. 37.*)*ARTICLE 5. Licensing [7065 - 7077] (*Article 5***
added by Stats. 1939, Ch. 37.*)*7071.17.**

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the board shall require, as a condition precedent to accepting an application for licensure, renewal, reinstatement, or to change officers or other personnel of record, that an applicant, previously found to have failed or refused to pay a contractor, subcontractor, consumer, materials supplier, or employee based on an unsatisfied final judgment, file or have on file with the board a bond sufficient to guarantee payment of an amount equal to the unsatisfied final judgment or judgments. The applicant shall have 90 days from the date of notification by the board to file the bond or the application shall become void and the applicant shall reapply for issuance, reinstatement, or reactivation of a license. The board may not issue, reinstate, or reactivate a license until the bond is filed with the board. The bond required by this section is in addition to the contractor's bond. The bond shall be on file for a minimum of one year, after which the bond may be removed by submitting proof of

satisfaction of all debts. The applicant may provide the board with a notarized copy of any accord, reached with any individual holding an unsatisfied final judgment, to satisfy a debt in lieu of filing the bond. The board shall include on the license application for issuance, reinstatement, or reactivation, a statement, to be made under penalty of perjury, as to whether there are any unsatisfied judgments against the applicant on behalf of contractors, subcontractors, consumers, materials suppliers, or the applicant's employees. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if it is found that the applicant falsified the statement then the license will be retroactively suspended to the date of issuance and the license will stay suspended until the bond, satisfaction of judgment, or notarized copy of any accord applicable under this section is filed.

(b) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all licensees shall notify the registrar in writing of any unsatisfied final judgment imposed on the licensee. If the licensee fails to notify the registrar in writing within 90 days, the license shall be automatically suspended on the date that the registrar is informed, or is made aware of the unsatisfied final judgment.

(2) The suspension shall not be removed until proof of satisfaction of the judgment, or in lieu thereof, a notarized copy of an accord is submitted to the registrar.

(3) If the licensee notifies the registrar in writing within 90 days of the imposition of any unsatisfied final judgment, the licensee shall, as a condition to the continual maintenance of the license, file or have on file with the board a bond sufficient to guarantee

payment of an amount equal to all unsatisfied judgments applicable under this section.

(4) The licensee has 90 days from date of notification by the board to file the bond or at the end of the 90 days the license shall be automatically suspended. In lieu of filing the bond required by this section, the licensee may provide the board with a notarized copy of any accord reached with any individual holding an unsatisfied final judgment.

(c) By operation of law, failure to maintain the bond or failure to abide by the accord shall result in the automatic suspension of any license to which this section applies.

(d) A license that is suspended for failure to comply with the provisions of this section can only be reinstated when proof of satisfaction of all debts is made, or when a notarized copy of an accord has been filed as set forth under this section.

(e) This section applies only with respect to an unsatisfied final judgment that is substantially related to the construction activities of a licensee licensed under this chapter, or to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the license.

(f) Except as otherwise provided, this section shall not apply to an applicant or licensee when the financial obligation covered by this section has been discharged in a bankruptcy proceeding.

(g) Except as otherwise provided, the bond shall remain in full force in the amount posted until the entire debt is satisfied. If, at the time of renewal, the licensee submits proof of partial satisfaction of the financial obligations covered by this section, the board may authorize the bond to be reduced to the amount of the unsatisfied portion of the outstanding judgment. When the licensee submits proof of

satisfaction of all debts, the bond requirement may be removed.

(h) The board shall take the actions required by this section upon notification by any party having knowledge of the outstanding judgment upon a showing of proof of the judgment.

(i) For the purposes of this section, the term "judgment" also includes any final arbitration award where the time to file a petition for a trial de novo or a petition to vacate or correct the arbitration award has expired, and no petition is pending.

(j) (1) If a judgment is entered against a licensee, then a qualifying person or personnel of record of the licensee at the time of the activities on which the judgment is based shall be automatically prohibited from serving as a qualifying individual or other personnel of record on another license until the judgment is satisfied.

(2) The prohibition described in paragraph (1) shall cause the license of any other existing renewable licensed entity with any of the same personnel of record as the judgment debtor licensee to be suspended until the license of the judgment debtor is reinstated or until those same personnel of record disassociate themselves from the renewable licensed entity.

(k) For purposes of this section, lawful money or cashier's check deposited pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 995.710 of the Code of Civil Procedure, may be submitted in lieu of the bond.

(l) Notwithstanding subdivision (f), the failure of a licensee to notify the registrar of an unsatisfied final judgment in accordance with this section is cause for disciplinary action. *(Amended by Stats. 2018, Ch. 925, Sec. 3. (AB 3126) Effective January 1, 2019.*

APPENDIX F- §3294 CIVIL CODE

CIVIL CODE - CIV

DIVISION 4. GENERAL PROVISIONS [3274 - 9566] (Heading of Division 4 amended by Stats. 1988, Ch. 160, Sec. 16.)

PART 1. RELIEF [3274 - 3428] (Part 1 enacted 1872.)

TITLE 2. COMPENSATORY RELIEF [3281 - 3360] (Title 2 enacted 1872.)

CHAPTER 1. Damages in General [3281 - 3296] (Chapter 1 enacted 1872.)

ARTICLE 3. Exemplary Damages [3294 - 3296]
(Article 3 enacted 1872.)

3294.

(a) In an action for the breach of an obligation not arising from contract, where it is proven by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant has been guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice, the plaintiff, in addition to the actual damages, may recover damages for the sake of example and by way of punishing the defendant.

(b) An employer shall not be liable for damages pursuant to subdivision (a), based upon acts of an employee of the employer, unless the employer had advance knowledge of the unfitness of the employee and employed him or her with a conscious disregard of the rights or safety of others or authorized or ratified the wrongful conduct for which the damages

are awarded or was personally guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice. With respect to a corporate employer, the advance knowledge and conscious disregard, authorization, ratification or act of oppression, fraud, or malice must be on the part of an officer, director, or managing agent of the corporation.

(c) As used in this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) "Malice" means conduct which is intended by the defendant to cause injury to the plaintiff or despicable conduct which is carried on by the defendant with a willful and conscious disregard of the rights or safety of others.

(2) "Oppression" means despicable conduct that subjects a person to cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of that person's rights.

(3) "Fraud" means an intentional misrepresentation, deceit, or concealment of a material fact known to the defendant with the intention on the part of the defendant of thereby depriving a person of property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury.

(d) Damages may be recovered pursuant to this section in an action pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 377.10) of Title 3 of Part 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure based upon a death which resulted from a homicide for which the defendant has been convicted of a felony, whether or not the decedent died instantly or survived the fatal injury for some period of time. The procedures for joinder and consolidation contained in Section 377.62 of the Code of Civil Procedure shall apply to prevent

multiple recoveries of punitive or exemplary damages based upon the same wrongful act.

(e) The amendments to this section made by Chapter 1498 of the Statutes of 1987 apply to all actions in which the initial trial has not commenced prior to January 1, 1988.

(Amended by Stats. 1992, Ch. 178, Sec. 5. Effective January 1, 1993.)

**APPENDIX G– CALIFORNIA SUPREME
COURT DENIAL OF PETITION FOR REVIEW**

Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division
Three– No. G055075

S252954

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

GARY HUMPHREYS et al., Cross-Complainants
and Respondents

v.

ADAM BEREKI, Cross-defendant and Appellant

The petition for review is denied.

CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice