

No. 21-8071

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

Brala Beverly,

Petitioner

vs .

Riverside County Public Administrator,

Respondent.

FILED
MAY 31 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to
California Court of Appeals, Fourth Appellate District
Division Two

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Brala Beverly

9663 Santa Monica Blvd. #1115

Beverly Hills, Ca. 90210

(949)-560-2560

Pro Se, Plaintiff,Appellant

I. a) Questions Presented

Did the California Riverside County Superior Court and Fourth Appellate District Division Two in California violate the seventh amendment of the U.S. Constitution, including a right to a jury for Brala Beverly, Plaintiff, in a civil case, when it dismissed the Brala Beverly v. Riverside County Public Administrator case upon demurrer, where case facts were significantly in dispute?

Did the Riverside County Public Administrator violate the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment of the U.S. Constitution in seizing real property inhabited by an individual named Brala Beverly without notice?

Where lower courts and the Riverside County Public Administrator misstate facts of a case to construct a basis for seizure of real property, did those falsehoods create a validation for their violation of the constitutional rights of the Brala Beverly, whose real property was seized, including those of the fourth amendment right to be secure in one's person and right to probable cause?

Where the Riverside County Public Administrator has made a sworn declaration in court that Brala Beverly possesses and lawfully owns real property, may they subsequently seize that same real property without further evidence as to the estate without violating the Constitutional rights of that individual?

Did the Riverside County Public Administrator violate the first amendment, fourth amendment and fourteenth amendment rights of Brala Beverly to declare a Will outside probate court, when they interfered in the uncontested small estate?

Is the preclusion of a right to a jury in a civil lawsuit, by virtue of the sustaining of a demurrer amid disputed case facts, as occurred in the case of Brala Beverly v. Riverside County Public Administrator, a violation of the due process and equal protection clauses of the fourteenth amendment of the United States Constitution? Does this preclusion also preempt the fourth amendment right to probable cause?

Are Probate Courts functioning on constitutional grounds when acting outside a state law already enforced outside Probate court on disposition of a Will under California Probate Code 13100, a law that causes disposition of the Will by declaration in a small and abandoned estate outside probate court and administration of the estate?

Are Probate Courts functioning on constitutional grounds when they refuse electronic transmission evidence regarding a Will, or is this a violation of the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment of the United States Constitution?

Are Probate Courts entitled to demand a standard of evidence beyond that of probable cause in determination of the intent of a Will of a decedent, or is a higher evidential requirement a violation of equal protection under the law under the fourteenth amendment of the United States Constitution for a beneficiary?

Is a refusal of a Superior Court of California to allow creditor's claims to an estate to be made in a civil court, in violation of state law in California under the common counts cause of action and under probate Code 9353, also a violation of the due process and equal protection constitutional rights of that creditor under the fourteenth amendment of the United States Constitution?

Are Probate Courts respecting constitutionality in disallowing juries to decide the intent of a Will, a Will or creditor's claims? Probate courts don't permit juries by design. Is this Constitutional in light of the seventh amendment?

II. List of Parties and Related Cases

(a) The only defendant party whose actions are requested for review by this court are those of the Riverside County Public Administrator. All does parties which may be held responsible for the actions of that agency under laws of municipality liability and employees of that government agency would also be impacted by this review. This petition does not seek review of previously named other defendants in the case Kathleen Bertulli, Rebekah Aitken or Kristi Hartsock, for whom constitutional rights violations under federal law were never alleged in this case.

(b) Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, Case number RIC2000782

Brala Beverly v. Riverside County Public Administrator, Kathleen Bertulli Does 1-100

Appeal from minute order sustaining demurrer entered on 3/9/21

Appeal from order of Judgment after sustaining demurrer as to Riverside County Public Administrator as entered on 4/1/21

California Court of Appeals, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two
Case number E077038

Brala Beverly v. Riverside County Public Administrator, Kathleen Bertulli Does 1-100

Appeal from Opinion entered on 3/13/22

Appeal from denial of rehearing entered on 3/28/12

California Supreme Court Case number S274036

Brala Beverly v. Riverside County Public Administrator, Kathleen Bertulli Does 1-100
Appeal from denial of Petition for Review

II . Table of Contents

I.	Questions Presented.....	ii.
II.	List of Parties (a).....	iv.
	List of Related Cases (b).....	iv.
III.	Table of Contents.....	v.
IV.	Table of Authorities.....	vi.
V.	Jurisdiction.....	1
VI.	Opinions Below.....	1
VII.	Petition for Writ of Certiorari.....	1
VIII.	Constitutional Provisions Involved.....	2
IX.	Statement of the Case.....	6
	A. This is Both a Right to a Jury and Property Seizure Case	
X.	REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	10
XI .	CONCLUSION.....	12
XII.	APPENDIX.....	13
a)	Appendix A-California Fourth Appellate Court Division Two Opinion	
b)	Appendix B -California County of Riverside Superior Court Opinion	
c)	Appendix C- California Fourth Appellate District, Denial of Petition for Rehearing	
d)	Appendix D- California Supreme Court Denial of Petition for Review	
e)	Appendix E- California County of Riverside Superior Court Judgment	
f)	Appendix F-Appellant Petition for Rehearing in California Appellate District	

III . Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments Inc.</i> 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	2
<i>Minneapolis & St. Louis R. Co. v. Bombolis</i> , 241 U.S. 211 (1916)	3
<i>Schroeder v. City of New York</i> , 371 U.S. 208 (1962)	5
<i>Mullane v. Central Honover Bank & Trust Co.</i> 339 U.S. 306 (1950)	5
<i>Matthews v. Eldridge</i> 424 U.S. 319 (1976)	5

Statutes

28 US Code 2101 section C.....	1
California Probate Code 21700	2
California Constitution Chapter 1 Section 16	3
California Probate Code 7603	3
California Penal Code 1538.5	3
California Probate Code 13100.....	3
California Probate Code 9353.....	8
CACI 371.....	8
Probate Code 13115	9
California Code of Civil Procedure 430.30 (a).....	11

Constitutional Provisions

Seventh Amendment U.S. Constitution.....	2
First Amendment U.S. Constitution.....	2
Fourth Amendment U.S. Constitution.....	4
Fourteenth Amendment U.S. Constitution.....	5

V . Jurisdiction

i .) The date on which the highest state court decided this case was on 3/13/22. This was the opinion of the California Court of Appeals, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two. A copy of this decision is attached at Appendix A.

ii.) A timely petition of rehearing was thereafter denied on 3/28/22. A copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

iii. A Petition for Review was denied by the California Supreme Court on 5/18/22. A copy of the order denying review appears at Appendix D.

iv .) 28 US Code 2101 Section C confers jurisdiction to this court to review these lower court rulings.

VI . Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Petitioner Brala Beverly respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari, to review the judgment of the California Court of Appeals Fourth Appellate District Division Two pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2101 Section C.

VII . Opinions Below

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is unpublished.

The opinion of the state trial court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is unpublished.

The denial of the Petition for Rehearing in the Court of Appeals appears at Appendix C.

The decision of the California Supreme Court to deny the Petition for Review appears at Appendix D.

The judgment of the state trial court appears at Appendix E to the petition and is unpublished.

Due to misstatements of facts in the appeals decision, it is essential to read the Petition for Rehearing document to understand this case. This petition appears at Appendix F.

VIII. Constitutional Provisions Involved

The seventh amendment right to a jury was never supposed to be in dispute when Brala filed her civil rights case against the Riverside County Public Administrator, but this right has now become integral to this appeal to the US Supreme Court, after the California Court of Appeals sustained a demurrer as to constitutional rights violations of the Riverside County Public Administrator without leave to amend based on disputed facts of the case by the appeals court from the face of the Complaint. In *Markman v. Westview Instruments Inc.* 517 U.S. 370 (1996), the Supreme Court ruled on a case where interpretation of patent claims was a matter of law or fact. In that case, the court ruled that the law was at issue, so a right to a jury was not relevant. Here, the appeals court takes judicial notice of a prior proceeding in its opinion, claiming a legal threshold had been met to seize real property from Brala once belonging to Al Rinaldo when a probate court ruled against the Will of Al Rinaldo to Brala Beverly, but this assertion disputed the facts of the Complaint, which alleged many issues, so this legal analysis of a prior only partly related case was a preemption of the facts of the direct civil rights lawsuit in question and was thus improper and preempted Brala's right to a jury trial.

The civil rights suit herein asserts rights including a first amendment right to make a declaration under a state statute to declare the Will outside probate court and also under probate code 13100, a first amendment right of private parties to make oral agreements between one another, in this case between Brala and her best friend Al, including agreements to possess Al's home (later seized by the Riverside County Public Administrator who claimed Al died intestate), agreements regarding personal loans from Brala to Al, valuable items stored between the parties, and an intent to have a Will under probate Code 21700, all irrelevant of

the final determination of the Will at a later date in probate court in contrast with the opinion of the appeals court.

As a result, constitutional violations based on seizure of a home property where Brala was effectively a paying tenant without notice under California probate code 7603 occurred. The lack of notice is another fact the appeals court used random judicial notice of proceedings at irrelevant later dates to dispute the fact of. No matter how much judicial notice the appeals court wanted to take of probate court rulings and proceedings, Brala had a constitutional right to make oral agreements with her best friend Al Rinaldo in private before he passed away, to possess his home property above and beyond the agreement of the Will and to separately also make a declaration of that Will citing the deed of the home property in question at the Riverside County Recorder's office, before the seizure under probate code 13100. The appeals court also omitted all facts relating to the probate code 13100 declaration by Brala which determined the disposition of the Will outside probate court before probate court prejudicial ruling involvement in the estate, because the appeals court didn't like those facts. California Penal Code 1538.5 discusses requirements for probable cause (none which are met in this case) and the requirement to thereby return seized property in lack thereof.

In *Minneapolis & St. Louis R. Co. v. Bombolis*, 241 U.S. 211 (1916), the US Supreme Court ruled that there is no seventh amendment violation if state trial courts don't hold jury trials in civil cases, only if there is no jury in federal cases. However, this case, although filed in state court, asserts federal constitutional violations by the Riverside County Public Administrator and should thereby be entitled to a jury trial. The *Bombolis* case also states that, where the lack of a jury does not violate state rights, it does not violate federal rights. However, this case being filed in California, a right to a jury is guaranteed to all citizens under the California Constitution Chapter 1 Section 16. It is also true that the *Bombolis* case regarded the Employer's Liability Act and lack of a unanimous jury. Causes of action for constitutional rights violations by Plaintiff in that case were not made to my knowledge.

Going back to the direct constitutional claims made in the underlying case against the Riverside County Public Administrator, Brala asserts that her right to make oral agreements to lend Al money, to store her property in Al's home, to possess Al's home when needed, were first amendment rights, as well as her right to agree to mutual Wills with Al and otherwise intend to do so as codified outside the authority of the probate court where no other parties than Brala ever appeared regarding this estate. These rights were breached by the Riverside County Public Administrator when they seized the home property previously belonging to Al Rinaldo. Brala asserts thereby that the seizure was also a fourth amendment rights violation for lack of probable cause and lack of secureness in her person and belongings, and a due process violation under the fourteenth amendment. The wanton dismissal of her lawsuit by the courts was a coarse disregard for all of these rights, so the government could seize the solvent home and charge it off as an "administration cost," for the county government purposes. No amount of changing the facts from the face of the Complaint to the appeals court's liking justifies dismissal of this case from a jury trial. If courts are permitted to make up case facts as they like, they can dismiss any case and preempt any jury, thereby falsely claiming no constitutional rights are at issue.

The US Supreme Court of course has ruled on many cases involving property seizure by government agencies against individuals. Many of those cases regard the validity of a warrant or probable cause, particularly when discussing fourth amendment violations. This case had no warrant by the standard definition. It definitely had no probable cause, which doesn't even seem to be a standard in probate courts based on this case. It had a probate court assignment of a public administrator who did not provide California probate code 7603 notice to Brala before seizing the home property in this case. Even if it had done this, probate courts are not permitted to cause unconstitutional actions by virtue of their prior rulings. The act of assigning a public administrator is not the same act as that administrator seizing a property however, acts the appeals court refused to distinguish between in its ruling in this case when it used judicial

notice of the assignment of the administrator by the probate court as grounds to seize the property without notice. In *Schroeder v. City of New York*, 371 U.S. 208 (1962), the US Supreme court cited *Mullane v. Central Honover Bank & Trust Co.* 339 U.S. 306 (1950) when it held that the city was responsible for personally serving notice to Schroeder regarding condemnation proceedings regarding real property and doing anything less was a violation of due process rights under the fourteenth amendment. In this case, the appeals court disputes the facts of the complaint when it says Brala had notice of eviction, or seizure of real property merely by her probate case being dismissed without prejudice. The complaint makes clear that the public administrator seized the home within a day of being assigned to the estate and the case being reopened at that time, all occurrences not noticed to Brala after the dismissal of her case without prejudice, the same case later reopened by the court without her permission, with no new case facts witnesses or evidence to reopen it under. The administrator was in a rush to seize the home for fear Brala would sell the home to a party not concerned with title insurance, or otherwise get a court order injunction from a quiet title proceeding, even though no other party appeared in the probate case. The *Mullane* US Supreme Court case would require personal notice to Brala, not mere publication of something somewhere else. That did not occur in this case. In *Matthews v. Eldridge* 424 U.S. 319 (1976), the US Supreme Court provided guidance on due process violations providing three dictates to consider including, the private interest that will be affected by the official action, the risk of erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, including the use of substitute procedures, as well as the government's interest. In this case, not only was Brala the only party to ever appear in any probate action, the government had no further interest in the estate after making a court declaration where they stated they should not even be administering the estate of Al Rinaldo after Brala made the probate code 13100 declaration on disposition of the Will at the county Recorder's office. The government wanted the property for themselves, and that's all there is to it. The estate was later charged off to government "administration expenses," after the

seizure in a distribution order from the probate court. The appeals court claiming Brala had notice of the seizure based on her later made objections to the seizure in probate court is nonsensical on a pure timetable basis. At the time of the seizure, Brala was under the impression her probate case was still dismissed without prejudice as signed by the same judge who directly told her at a hearing she could make the small estate declaration under probate code 13100 to collect all the property of the estate. A case study of fourth amendment violations relating to this kind of scenario is difficult to come by given the fact that the public administrator had no probable cause to interfere with the uncontested estate, the benefit of the seizure would only be to pad the pockets of government at the expense of a private party, and the disposition of the Will was already made by Brala under probate code 13100 at the County Recorder's office, preempting the authority of the probate courts in abandoned small estates.

As to the first amendment violations in this case, the courts simply ruled they don't see any first amendment right of Brala Beverly to make private oral agreements with Al Rinaldo to possess his property or to make loans, hold items or agree to a Will. This analysis is so off the mark, a case study to prove it would be redundant.

VIII . Statement of the Case

A. This is Both a Right to a Jury Case and a Property Seizure Case

Brala Beverly's best friend of 20 years, Al Rinaldo, passed away in 2019 after a bout with brain cancer which caused his final months to be psychologically chaotic and unpredictable in behavior. Brala and Al had agreed to mutual Wills in 2017. Al had also made an oral agreement with Brala as to his intentions and wanted Brala to be in possession of his real property when any emergency need arose. At the time of his death, the only surviving relatives of Al, his sister and nieces, who were not close with Al, abandoned the estate unaware of his daily financial circumstances. Brala, having sent more money to Al in 2017 than the worth of his estate, knew that his estate was solvent. Brala thus saved his home from foreclosure after

his death and repaired the home for sale. After reading about the home sale process, it became apparent that opening a probate case could assist with the matter. When Brala opened the probate case, the Judge did not want to conclude the written evidence of Al to Brala constituted a Will, but told Brala she could make a small estate affidavit as to the property at the County Recorder's office under California Probate Code 13100, which she then did. At that time, the probate case was signed as dismissed without prejudice by the probate court Judge. The Riverside County Public Administrator then sent a declaration to that court stating they had no business to interfere with the small estate, as it was already collected by Brala Beverly and the estate thus no longer had value. They stated therein that the sister of Al Rinaldo, Kathleen Bertulli, had declined to administer the estate, and would consider whether she had a private civil cause of action against Brala for collecting the estate on her own time. Nevertheless, not more than a month later, the Judge had asked the administrator to appear in court on the matter, at which time they both concluded Brala did not possess a Will that could pass through probate court, with no new evidence since the Judge last spoke on the matter and told Brala she could make the small estate declaration outside probate court as to the disposition of the will. This new conclusion was reached not at a hearing on the Will, but at an Order to Show Cause why the administrator should not be appointed hearing. By then, Brala had already collected the estate at the Riverside County Recorder's office, citing the deed of the real property therein, under Probate Code 13100, a code titled, "Disposition of the Estate Without Administration." Although the administrator had attempted to lie at the hearing Brala received no notice of, claiming the estate was over the small estate threshold of \$150,000 at the time, it was not, nor did they present any evidence on the matter. Because the case had been closed without prejudice and no notices of that hearing were sent to Brala, Brala did not appear. The administrator never opened a case of their own. Nevertheless, the administrator was appointed in Brala Beverly's closed without prejudice case, reopened by the court on its own motion. The next day, the public administrator barged into the estate home and seized it on the

spot, the home Brala had agreed with her friend Al before he had passed away that she had the right to possess, where she was paying mortgage, and later collected that same property at the Riverside County Recorder's office under probate code 13100, the same home the administrator only knew of because of Brala opening a probate case in good faith that the court would see the common sense of the issues, at the least. The administrator then went on to sell the property \$15,000 below market value and charged off their proceeds to "administration costs," in an action Al Rinaldo could not possibly approve of. The administrator then went on to reject creditor's claims to the estate made by Brala when the case was previously active, in the event the court wanted to approve those and didn't approve the Will. The administrator rejected the creditor's claims out of hand, which included a well documented transaction and a \$50,000 loan to Al Rinaldo from Brala, expensive painting's of Brala's lost in possession of Al, and a claim under probate code 21700, an intention of a Will. As a result of these actions, Brala filed an appeal to the probate court actions, and at the same time opened a civil lawsuit against the public administrator which also made creditor's claims on the estate under probate code 9353 and the California cause of action for common counts CACI 371. The suit also named Al's sister Kathleen Bertulli in the event she held or was given estate funds, but that defendant was not named in any constitutional rights claims in the case. All such claims were made against the Riverside County Public Administrator and Does parties, which would include the County of Riverside if the case were sent back to the trial court. The appeal of the probate court orders was denied, which was wrong, but Brala was not overly concerned with this as she continued her civil case against the public administrator, which unlike the probate case, is a civil rights violations case which includes constitutional rights violations by the Riverside County Public Administrator. What was unacceptably alarming however was when the superior court of Riverside demurred to all these claims in the civil case. When Brala appealed this ruling, the same presiding appeals Judge Fields who mishandled the first appeal, took judicial notice of his prior appeal ruling and dismissed this case wrongly on that basis alone

it appears, arguing equitable estoppel in his opinion. Of course, the civil rights lawsuit and the probate court rulings are not one of the same. The public administrator did not need to seize the home in question on the mere basis of being assigned as a public administrator in the probate case. Furthermore, a civil case being opened is required when that administrator rejects creditor's claims under probate code 9353. Nevertheless, the appeals court decided to conflate all the cases as one of the same and sustain the demurrer on that basis. Although the appeals court never discusses Probate Code 13100 which determined the disposition of the estate without administration as declared by Brala before the public administrator was even assigned to the estate, the Administrator has contended the code can't transfer real property. Regardless of the ambiguity of the code in that area based on Probate Code 13115, the fact remains that in order for the public administrator to seize the estate, they had to first disregard the disposition of the estate as declared by Brala under this code despite that the code preempts probate of the Will. This was a clear due process violation against Brala Beverly as well as a violation of her first amendment right to declare the Will. The appeals court ignored this discussion in their rulings, simply deciding Brala had no Will from Al Rinaldo, regardless that the Brala made this declaration under probate code 13100 before the administration of the estate, and regardless that the only reason the public administrator even knew about the estate at all was because of Brala Beverly opening then closing without prejudice a probate case on Al Rinaldo. Brala's civil rights case against the public administrator never relied on probate courts or their rulings. It relied only on her rights as a human being who made private and uncontested agreements with her best friend Al Rianldo, some regarding the Will and others regarding their friendship, before he passed away. These agreements were not to be interfered with verbatim by the government. The appeals opinion in this case was factually flawed in dozens of places as to the allegations of the civil complaint, so the petition for rehearing addressed these factually discrepancies ad nauseum. The discrepancies were so much so that Brala could not even take any of the case studies as relevant to her case which

were cited in the opinion of the appeals court, and thus discussed none of them in her petition for rehearing brief. The Appeals opinion claim Brala, who filed her civil lawsuit within a month of the public administrator rejecting her creditor's claims to the estate, filed the suit too late to make those creditor's claims was also corrected in the petition for rehearing.

This is a case about uncontested private party agreements between Brala Beverly and Al Rinaldo before the passing of Al, including oral agreements that don't even include a Will, but regard creditor's claims and a right to of Brala to possess Al's home property regardless of the Will. The government got wrongly involved in an abandoned small estate that Brala declared the disposition of the Will on without administration of the estate at the County Recorder's Office citing the deed number of the home of the estate therein, preempting probate of the Will under probate code 13100. The use of judicial notice to decide a Will from a later probate court ruling by the appeals court, flew in the face of the Complaint, which was that Brala made a disposition of the Will declaration outside probate court under probate code 13100 lawfully at the time it was made before any prejudicial probate court orders were made and confirmed as legal and binding by the court declaration of the Riverside County public administrator shortly thereafter. The civil rights case was never directly relevant to the probate court ruling on the Will, even though the ultimate claims in the case were caused in part from poor judgments from the probate court. An appeals court has no right to deny Brala her seventh amendment right to a jury trial on the facts of a case simply because they dispute the facts of the case.

X . REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

Despite the factual inaccuracies about the case and the misstatements about the timing of events and the filings in the appeal opinion, the focus of this appeal to the US Supreme Court is that area of law where the appeals court argued with Brala about the facts as stated on the face of her Complaint and thereby sustained a demurrer. This is a clear violation of the seventh amendment of the US Constitution. I believe courts are routinely engaging in this type of

behavior nationwide, and as a result, I believe the US Supreme Court can review this case to send a message in this regard. How many courts and government agencies across the US are engaging in similar behavior, wherein they believe they can preempt civil liberties of individuals based on their dispute of the facts in civil lawsuits, dismissing the cases on demurrer, using an end justifies the means methodology? Also, is judicial notice being misused to try a case in a demurrer regularly to the end of violating constitutional rights of citizens?

The exact elements of this case of property seizure without probable cause and without notice or due process is also at issue. The court used their dispute of the otherwise uncontested facts about the private relationship between Brala and Al Rinaldo to enable the violations of Brala's first, fourth and fourteenth amendment rights in the case upon demurrer. The appeals court did state however that if they agreed with Brala on the facts of the case they would agree her some of her constitutional rights were violated in some of the assertions. It is not the place of the courts to rewrite the Complaints submitted to them to their factual liking so that they may contrive the case result of their liking. The first amendment rights violations, due process violations and fourth amendment rights violations in this case are blatant. As a result of the courts preempting a jury on these issues in this case, I believe the top priority of this case should be reigning in the lower courts from throwing constitutional rights cases out of court on such a fact disputed basis via demurrer (California Code of Civil Procedure 430.30 (a)). In order for society to naturally progress in its understanding of constitutional rights, juries must be allowed their say. This case is an example of a case where surely well over 95% of juries would disagree with the courts siding with the government. No one believes the state should seize their property when they pass away and take it from their loved ones, to their own benefit, as occurred in this case. When courts preempt juries from hearing cases against the government, the same cases juries will surely side with the Plaintiff, something is amiss and probably a path to something even worse.

XI . CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Brala Beverly respectfully requests that this Court issue a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the California Court of Appeals, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two.

Dated this 31st day of May, 2022,

Respectfully Submitted,



Brala Beverly

Brala Beverly

9663 Santa Monica Blvd. #1115

Beverly Hills, Ca. 90210

(949)-560-2560