

1 NATALIA A. SIDIAKINA  
746 Adobe Drive  
2 Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Telephone: (415) 302-9702  
3 Fax: (707) 538-3729

4 SHERRYL BAECKEL  
10520 Village Road  
5 Moreno Valley, CA 92557  
Telephone: (951) 286-0637  
6

7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9 OAKLAND DIVISION

C10-03157

10 NATALIA A. SIDIAKINA and

11 SHERRYL BAECKEL,

12  
13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 JAMES G. BERTOLI, JUDGE, in his official  
and personal capacity;  
16 ROBERT S. BOYD, JUDGE, in his official  
and personal capacity;  
SUPERIOR COURT OF SONOMA COUNTY;  
17 TARA REILLY, JUDGE, in her official and  
personal capacity;  
18 SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN BERNARDINO  
COUNTY;  
19 IGNAZIO J. RUVOLO, PRESIDING JUSTICE  
in his official and personal capacity;  
20 TIMOTHY A. REARDON, JUSTICE, in his  
official and personal capacity;  
21 CALIFORNIA COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST  
APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION FOUR;  
22 RONALD M. GEORGE, CHIEF JUSTICE,  
in his official and personal capacity;  
23 JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA,  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, and  
24 JUDICIAL BRANCH OF CALIFORNIA  
GOVERNMENT

25  
26 Defendants.

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
COMPLAINT – CLASS ACTION  
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

E-filing  
ORIGINAL  
FILED  
JUL 19 2010  
RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND

ADR

UL

1 NATALIA A. SIDIAKINA  
746 Adobe Drive  
2 Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Telephone: (415) 302-9702  
3 Fax: (707) 538-3729

4 SHERRYL BAECKEL  
10520 Village Road  
5 Moreno Valley, CA 92557  
Telephone: (951) 286-0637  
6

7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 OAKLAND DIVISION

11 NATALIA A. SIDIAKINA and  
12 SHERRYL BAECKEL,  
13 Plaintiffs,

) Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
) COMPLAINT – CLASS ACTION  
) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

14 vs.

15 JAMES G. BERTOLI, JUDGE, in his official  
and personal capacity;  
16 ROBERT S. BOYD, JUDGE, in his official  
and personal capacity;  
17 SUPERIOR COURT OF SONOMA COUNTY;  
TARA REILLY, JUDGE, in her official and  
personal capacity;  
18 SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN BERNARDINO  
COUNTY;  
19 IGNAZIO J. RUVOLO, PRESIDING JUSTICE  
in his official and personal capacity;  
20 TIMOTHY A. REARDON, JUSTICE, in his  
official and personal capacity;  
21 CALIFORNIA COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST  
APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION FOUR;  
22 RONALD M. GEORGE, CHIEF JUSTICE,  
in his official and personal capacity;  
23 JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA,  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, and  
24 JUDICIAL BRANCH OF CALIFORNIA  
GOVERNMENT

25 Defendants.  
26

27  
28

1 **I. JURISDICTION**

2 This court has jurisdiction over the matters contained in this complaint pursuant to  
3 the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title II, 42 U.S.C. 12131 et.  
4 seq., 29 U.S.C. 794a, 28 C.F.R. 35.101 et. seq., and Torture Victims Protection Act, 28  
5 U.S.C. 1350 et. seq..

6 **II. VENUE**

7 Venue is appropriate in this court because Plaintiff Natalia A. Sidiakina and 8 of 12  
8 Defendants reside in this district, and a substantial amount of the acts and omissions  
9 giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in this district.

10 **III. INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

11 This lawsuit should be assigned to the Oakland Division of this Court because 3 of  
12 12 Defendants work in the same building in which San Francisco Division is located and  
13 likely go to lunches and socialize together with Judges of San Francisco Division. These  
14 close social and friendship ties will make it difficult for the Judges of San Francisco  
15 Division to make orders against Defendants.

16 **IV. PARTIES**

17 (a) The Plaintiff Natalia A. Sidiakina:

18 1. The plaintiff Sidiakina is a resident since 1994, a permanent resident since May  
19 of 2001, application for citizenship in progress, a resident of Sonoma County, California  
20 and resides at 746 Adobe Drive, Santa Rosa, California. She is a qualified individual with  
21 cognitive disabilities as is defined by 42 U.S.C. 12131 et. seq., and has been in need of  
22 the services of the judicial division of the State of California for the purpose of dissolution  
23 of marriage litigation. Ms. Sidiakina's cognitive disabilities such as Post-Traumatic Stress  
24 Disorder, Panic Disorder, Major Depressive Disorder, Dissociative Disorder, and migraine  
25 pain disorder were diagnosed by three independent experts in the fields of Post-Traumatic  
26 Stress Disorder, Anxiety Disorders, and Dissociative Disorders: Dr. Andrew Leeds, PhD,  
27 MFT, Karin Huffer, MS, MFT, and Jo Lauer, MFT. Three family medicine practitioners Dr.  
28 Jann Hanscome, MD, Dr. Bonnie Kneibler, MD and Judy Walenta, CFNP have been

1 treating Ms. Sidiakina and have been prescribing medications for her cognitive disabilities  
2 since 2005.

3 2. From 1994 to May of 2006, Ms. Sidiakina was employed as a business  
4 development consultant in the pharmaceutical and biotech industry. Since May of 2006,  
5 Ms. Sidiakina has been unemployed due to the sale of her last employer, a  
6 pharmaceutical subsidiary of Merck KGaA, to another pharmaceutical company, and her  
7 only income was unemployment insurance, all extensions of benefits of which were  
8 exhausted in March of 2010. Since 2007, Ms. Sidiakina has been indigent and has been  
9 borrowing money from friends to pay for the necessities of life. It is hereby requested that  
10 Ms. Sidiakina be allowed to serve as a class representative for all indigent qualified  
11 individuals with a cognitive disability needing the services of the judicial division of the  
12 State of California.

13 (b) The Plaintiff Sherryl Baeckel:

14 1. The plaintiff Baeckel is a citizen and resident of Riverside County, California and  
15 resides at 10520 Village Road, Moreno Valley, California. She is a qualified individual with  
16 cognitive disabilities as is defined by 42 U.S.C. 12131 et. seq., and has been in need of  
17 the services of the judicial division of the State of California for the purpose of dissolution  
18 of marriage, child custody and support litigation. Ms. Baeckel's cognitive and physical  
19 disabilities such as severe migraine headaches, scleroderma with significant cognitive  
20 fatigue, a neck injury with persistent arthritis pain, emphysema, constant pain due to  
21 fibromyalgia, and Complex Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder were diagnosed by Dr.  
22 Andrew Rhodes, MD, Dr. Carl Wolnisty, MD, Dr. Zamiri, MD. and Dr. Karin Huffer, PhD,  
23 MFT.

24 2. Ms. Baeckel was attacked on duty as Deputy Sheriff and, as a result of attack,  
25 sustained severe neck injury and severe psychological trauma, which resulted in her  
26 medical retirement. The only income she receives is disability-related medical retirement  
27 of \$2,200.00 per month; one half of which is under the control of Trustees in a Special  
28 Needs Trust for medical and related to disability expenses. It is hereby requested that Ms.

1 Baeckel be allowed to serve as a class representative for all indigent qualified individuals  
2 with a cognitive disability needing the services of the judicial divisions of the State of  
3 California.

4 (c) The Defendants:

5 1. The State of California is a political subdivision of the United States of America  
6 and as such it and its political subdivisions are subject to the laws of the United States of  
7 America. They are specifically charged under the terms of the United States Constitution  
8 and the California Constitution with providing the service of courts and judicial  
9 proceedings. All counties of the State of California are political subdivisions of the State of  
10 California and are required under the Constitution of the State of California to provide  
11 courthouses that provide services to all persons including residents of this State and  
12 indigent qualified individuals with cognitive disabilities as defined by 42 U.S.C. 12131.

13 2. Superior Court of Sonoma County and Superior Court of San Bernardino County  
14 are the trial courts in Sonoma County and San Bernardino County, respectively. The  
15 Court of Appeal of California, First Appellate District, Division Four is a political subdivision  
16 of the State of California charged with the appeals of the decisions of the Superior Courts  
17 of several Counties, including Sonoma County. Judicial Council of California is a political  
18 subdivision of the State of California charged with establishing The Rules of Court for all  
19 courts in this State.

20 3. James G. Bertoli, Judge and Robert S. Boyd, Judge are the judges of the  
21 Superior Court of Sonoma County. Tara Reilly, Judge is the judge of the Superior Court of  
22 San Bernardino County.

23 4. Ignazio J. Ruvolo, Presiding Justice and Timothy A. Reardon, Justice are the  
24 Justices of The Court of Appeal of California, First Appellate District, Division Four.

25 5. Ronald M. George, Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court is a Chairman  
26 of the Judicial Council of California.

27  
28

1 **V. PLAINTIFF SIDIAKINA'S PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

2 (a) That as noted above, the plaintiff, Natalia A. Sidiakina, hereinafter referred to as  
3 Sidiakina, is indigent and cognitively disabled and as such is a qualified individual with a  
4 cognitive disability as defined by 42 U.S.C. 12131(2).

5 (b) On or about July 3, 2005, Sidiakina and her former husband Siamak Navid  
6 entered into a written and recorded separation agreement. Per separation agreement, in  
7 July of 2005, Sidiakina filed for dissolution of marriage. Since the very beginning of the  
8 divorce litigation, Navid was represented by 2 experienced legal counsels and family law  
9 specialists.

10 (c) On or about August 26, 2005, Sidiakina filed an Order to Show Cause for  
11 spousal support and attorney's fees. In that order to show cause, Sidiakina submitted an  
12 affidavit, in which she informed the family court and the Judge that she had diagnosed  
13 psychological disabilities, such as panic disorder, depression, and anxiety disorder and  
14 submitted to the trial court the copies of the notes from Walgreen's pharmacy, which  
15 contained explanations of conditions for which I have been taking prescription  
16 medications.

17 (d) In 2007, Sidiakina filed several affidavits that informed James G. Bertoli, Judge  
18 of Superior Court of Sonoma County, that Sidiakina had been unemployed since May of  
19 2006 and that since January of 2007, after she used all her savings to pay for attorney's  
20 fees in her divorce litigation, she had been indigent and, thus, had to represent herself  
21 while having severe cognitive disabilities. Sidiakina requested an appointed legal counsel  
22 to represent her or, alternatively, to order her ex-husband to pay for Sidiakina's attorney's  
23 fees from community property, which had been under her husband's control since the  
24 beginning of the divorce litigation.

25 (e) At the hearing on September 14, 2007, Sidiakina personally informed Judge  
26 James G. Bertoli that she suffered from psychological disabilities that rendered her  
27 incapable to represent herself and asked Judge Bertoli to stop the hearing and to appoint  
28 a counsel to represent her. Judge Bertoli ignored Sidiakina's requests and continued to

1 exploit her fears and disabilities in questioning her why she concluded that Judge Bertoli  
2 was personally prejudiced against her. Sidiakina pleaded to stop the inquisition because  
3 she was terrified, was having a panic attack, and was feeling horrible physical pain and  
4 emotional suffering. Judge Bertoli DID NOT stop. Sidiakina felt that she was dying and  
5 lost consciousness.

6 (f) On September 14, 2007, at the request of Navid's attorney James Benoit, Judge  
7 Bertoli denied Sidiakina's request for legal representation or attorney's fees as "moot"  
8 without considering the merits of the attorney's fees request, Sidiakina's cognitive  
9 disabilities and needs, and Navid's abilities to pay.

10 (g) At the hearing on September 14, 2007, Judge Bertoli intentionally inflicted such  
11 pain and sufferings upon Sidiakina as punishment for her efforts to disqualify him that  
12 caused Sidiakina to experience a panic attack, depersonalization, and derealization,  
13 culminating in the loss of consciousness at the hearing. Sidiakina's brain was severely  
14 traumatized, which resulted in the disabling conditions of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder  
15 and related Dissociative Disorder, Depersonalization Disorder, Phobia, and Avoidance  
16 Disorder. Detailed discussions of these conditions are presented in experts' reports:  
17 Report of Karin Huffer, MS, MFT, p. 3-7; Report of Andrew M. Leeds, PhD, MFT, p. 7-10;  
18 Report of Jo Lauer, MFT, p. 4-8; Report of Judy Walenta, CFNP, p. 4-5.

19 (h) Since September of 2007, every time Sidiakina thinks of a possibility of being  
20 evicted from her home or a possibility to having to go again to Sonoma Superior Court or  
21 even thinking of Sonoma Superior Court, she starts having panic attacks with severe  
22 migraine pains, stomach cramps, chest pains similar to those in a heart attack,  
23 suffocation, dissociation, depersonalization, and, subsequently, major depression  
24 episodes. According to Request for Reasonable ADA Accommodation, Assessment and  
25 Report in Support of Request, prepared by Judy Walenta, CRNP, Sidiakina is currently  
26 taking 6 anti-anxiety and anti-depression medications just to keep her out of bed and  
27 somewhat functioning.

28 (i) The hearing on September 14, 2007 caused the trauma to Sidiakina's brain that

1 resulted in the dissociation of neurotransmission between her brain areas and her inability  
2 to recall memories related to her divorce, inability to concentrate during legal processes,  
3 inability to understand, process, and analyze information related to her divorce.

4 (j) In May of 2009, Sidiakina was diagnosed with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder,  
5 Major Depression, Panic Disorder, and Dissociative Disorder by Karin Huffer, M.S., MFT,  
6 who is an expert in Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and an advocate for psychologically  
7 disabled litigants under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title II. Expert Huffer's  
8 assessment and report, that confirms that Sidiakina is a person with psychological  
9 disabilities as defined by the ADA Title II, specifically states at p. 10 and p. 11:

10 **“During court processes, Ms. Sidiakina is likely to become symptomatic and**  
11 **she will have problems concentrating, thinking, processing information, and**  
12 **responding and presenting her case in court.”**

13 **“Only if the Court ensures accommodations including legal representation**  
14 **for Ms. Sidiakina, she will have “equal access” to the Court.”** (bold added)

15 (k) In July of 2009, Sidiakina was independently diagnosed with Post Traumatic  
16 Stress Disorder, Major Depression Disorder, Panic Disorder, Avoidance Disorder,  
17 Dissociative Disorder, and Depersonalization Disorder by Andrew M. Leeds, Ph.D., MFT,  
18 who is an expert in Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and related Depressive Disorders,  
19 Dissociative Disorders, and Anxiety Disorders. His assessment and report that confirms  
20 that Sidiakina is a person with psychological disabilities as defined in the ADA Title II  
21 states at p. 10:

22 **“It is my professional opinion that due to the psychological disabilities**  
23 **described above Ms. Sidiakina has been and will continue to be unable to**  
24 **represent herself and to comply with the California Rules of Court.”**

25 (l) On December 4, 2008 and on February 18, 2010, Sidiakina filed requests for a  
26 Change of Venue and for disqualification of Judge James G. Bertoli as accommodations  
27 for Sidiakina's cognitive disabilities and developed phobia of Sonoma Superior Court and  
28 of Judge James G. Bertoli. In her affidavit, Sidiakina stated:

1 “Since September of 2007, every time I had a hearing in the Sonoma Court, I had a  
2 panic attack right at the Courthouse or a few hours later at night. During a panic  
3 attack, I experience unbearable stomach cramps, heart and chest pain, suffocation,  
4 and loss of my ability to think clearly and speak. My brain disabilities make it  
5 physically impossible for me to have another hearing at the Sonoma Court. Even a  
6 thought of having another hearing at the Sonoma Court and, thus, a possibility of  
7 having another panic attack right there causes my brain and autonomous nervous  
8 system to malfunction so much as to cause my stomach and chest to ache and my  
9 heart to beat so fast that I have trouble breathing and thinking. In summary, I am  
10 severely disabled in legal processes and need accommodations requested by my  
11 doctors- Dr. Andrew M. Leeds, PhD, MFT (see Attachment 3, p. 10-12), Karin  
12 Huffer, MS, MFT (see Attachment 2, p. 9-11), Jo Lauer, MFT (see Attachment 4, p.  
13 9-11) and Judy Walenta, CRNP (see Attachment 5, p. 6-8).”

14 (m) Both times Judge Bertoli denied Sidiakina’s requests and insisted on continuing  
15 to discriminate against Sidiakina, abuse and torture her, intentionally causing further severe  
16 pain and sufferings, damage to Sidiakina’s brain, her humiliation and embarrassment.

17 (n) Due to Dissociative Amnesia, Sidiakina is unable to properly recall memories  
18 related to my divorce when she is under stress in the legal settings. Due to severe  
19 Dissociative Disorder, Sidiakina is unable to concentrate and properly understand,  
20 process, and analyze information related to her divorce when she has to write legal  
21 papers or speak during hearings. Due to severe Avoidance Disorder, Phobia, and Panic  
22 Attacks, Sidiakina is unable to open an envelope from the court for many days and unable  
23 to comply with the due dates, procedural rules, and the Rules of Court.

24 (o) During her appeals, on several occasions, Sidiakina requested  
25 accommodations as a cognitively disabled litigant, including the appointment of legal  
26 counsel on appeal, and submitted experts’ reports and her affidavit in support of her  
27 request. Ignazio J. Ruvolo, Presiding Justice and Timothy A. Reardon, Justice of the  
28 Court of Appeal of California, First Appellate District, Division Four, summarily denied

1 Sidiakina's requests. Subsequently, on August 19, 2009, they denied Sidiakina's appeals  
2 on the ground that Sidiakina failed to comply with the Rules of Court because she "failed  
3 to provide a reasoned argument and discussion of legal authority with appropriate citation  
4 to the appellate record". It is a self-evident truth that a cognitively disabled person  
5 CANNOT provide "a reasoned argument and discussion of legal authority with appropriate  
6 citation to the appellate record".

7 (p) In her Request for Reasonable ADA Accommodations; Assessment and Report  
8 in Support of Request, the expert in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and related disorders  
9 Karin Huffer, M.S., M.F.T. stated:

10 "Ms. Sidiakina suffers from Depression, Panic Disorder, and Anxiety diagnosed  
11 by Bonnie Kneibler, M.D, and Jann M. Hanscome, M.D, at Windsor Primary Care  
12 Medical Group in Windsor, California, and has been under treatment since 2005.  
13 Opinions of Dr. Kneibler and Dr. Hanscome consistently indicate that Ms. Sidiakina  
14 suffered first from traumatic reaction to a type of domestic abuse related more to  
15 coercion than physical violence although there were incidents of battery in 2003  
16 resulting in her husband's arrest.

17 Both doctors report that Ms. Sidiakina's litigation has exacerbated her conditions.  
18 It appears that the jeopardy, helplessness, and terror, which Ms. Sidiakina  
19 experienced during litigation, have precipitated a Post Traumatic Stress Disorder,  
20 which Ms. Sidiakina was already predisposed to from her earlier trauma.

21 Ms. Sidiakina has been in need of ADA Accommodations since August of 2005.  
22 The fact that she was not protected by the ADA created an inaccurate perception  
23 of her to the Court. Judges react to what is before them and often punitively and  
24 unfairly act with inadvertent bias toward litigants with invisible disabilities. English is  
25 Ms. Sidiakina's third language. Although she is fluent in English, the language in a  
26 court of law requires a literacy that most people do not possess let alone those  
27 dealing with English as a third language. Ms. Sidiakina reports that:

28 *"At one time during my answer to Judge Bertoli's interrogations, my voice broke,*

1 *and I felt suffocating. Another time during the dialog between my husband's*  
2 *attorney James Benoit and Judge Bertoli, I could not breathe at all, and my heart*  
3 *hurt so bad that I felt I was dying. Then my brain went blank. I don't know how long*  
4 *it lasted, maybe few minutes. I lost the track of time and the dialog. Because of fear*  
5 *and distress, I was unable to remember words in English and properly say what I*  
6 *wanted to say. I felt like a rat that is getting repeated electric shocks in the cage*  
7 *that it cannot escape."*

8 **This clearly demonstrates that Ms. Sidiakina did not have access to the**  
9 **proceedings or due process of law.** It also appears that Ms. Sidiakiana's  
10 expectations of the fairness in the court process, her thorough research as to rules  
11 and laws, and outspoken nature complicated by her inability to obtain  
12 accommodations for her functional impairments, and created a situation that was  
13 detrimental to her in the court. **The Americans with Disabilities Act should have**  
14 **protected Ms. Sidiakina when she was first diagnosed in 2005. With**  
15 **accommodations, she may have had equal access and avoided the severe**  
16 **trauma she suffers today."** (bold and italics in the original text)

17 (q) Three mental health experts and a family physician concurred that the following  
18 accommodations are medically necessary and reasonable given Sidiakina's cognitive  
19 disabilities:

20 "A. It is my professional opinion that it is absolutely medically required that Ms.  
21 Sidiakina's request for reasonable and necessary accommodations to change  
22 venue and transfer Ms. Sidiakina's case from Sonoma County Court to either San  
23 Mateo County Court or San Francisco County Court and to continue the hearing  
24 from February 26, 2010 to July of 2010 be granted.

25 **B. It is my professional opinion that due to the psychological disabilities**  
26 **described above Ms. Sidiakina has been and will continue to be unable to**  
27 **represent herself and to comply with the California Rules of Court.**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**I fully agree with all eight of the major specific accommodations identified by Karin Huffer, MS, MFT in her ADA report and re-stated by Andrew Leeds, Ph.D. in his ADA report.**

These accommodations are well thought out and are reasonable ways to accommodate the disabilities and impairments from which Ms. Sidiakina suffers. **Most critical is that Ms. Sidiakina did require and continues to require the assistance of an attorney to assure her due process. Without such accommodations, her mental and emotional disabilities clearly make it impossible for her to participate in the legal process and receive equal access to the courts.**

The accommodations listed in Karin Huffer's report and re-stated in Andrew Leeds, Ph.D. report, would substantially accommodate Ms. Sidiakina's disabilities. For the record, I quote from Karin Huffer's and Andrew Leeds' reports below:

*"Specifically, Ms. Sidiakina requires the following accommodations to ensure she obtains equal access and fair treatment free from discrimination as mandated by the ADA:*

*1) Ms. Sidiakina needs to avoid places and people that may remind her of the traumatic events and are likely to trigger anxiety attack and dissociation, specifically Sonoma Superior Court, her husband Mr. Navid, her husband's attorney Mr. Benoit, and Sonoma Court Judge J. Bertoli. Ms. Sidiakina needs her case be transferred to Superior Court in another county.*

.....  
***Only if the Court ensures accommodations including legal representation for Ms. Sidiakina, will she have "equal access" to the Court.*** (bold and italics in the original text) ("Request for Reasonable ADA Accommodations; Assessment and Report in Support of Request" by Jo Lauer, MFT, p. 9, 11; "Request for Reasonable ADA Accommodations; Assessment and Report in Support of Request" by Judy Walenta, CFNP, p. 6, 8)

1 (r) Because Sidiakina was forced to represent herself despite her requests for  
2 accommodations as indigent and qualified litigant with cognitive disabilities, she suffered  
3 the loss of her home as her only shelter, the loss of all of her material assets, a ruined  
4 credit, enormous pain and sufferings and brain trauma that resulted in severe cognitive  
5 disabilities that prevent her from working in her profession and earning a living for the rest  
6 of her life, huge medical and disability related expenses for the rest of her life, and  
7 attorneys fees and costs incurred during the protracted litigation and appeals in the  
8 amount of over \$50,000. If Sidiakina was represented by an appointed legal counsel, the  
9 above would not have happened.

## 10 **VI. PLAINTIFF BAECKEL'S PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

11 (a) That as noted above, the plaintiff, Sherryl Baeckel, hereinafter referred to as  
12 Baeckel, is indigent and cognitively disabled and as such is a qualified individual with a  
13 cognitive disability as defined by 42 U.S.C. 12131(2).

14 (b) Baeckel's former husband Scott Baeckel filed for dissolution of marriage in April  
15 of 2000. Since the very beginning of the divorce and custody litigation, Scott Baeckel was  
16 represented by an experienced legal counsel and a family law specialist.

17 (c) On January 27, 2009, Baeckel, per several recommendations of child custody  
18 evaluators, was granted joint legal custody and primary physical custody of her daughter,  
19 Sarah Baeckel, with sole legal custody regarding the child's ice skating activities so she  
20 could continue to compete at a National level. Baeckel has had primary physical custody  
21 of her daughter for 14 years.

22 (d) On January 27, 2009, when Baeckel was self-represented because she did not  
23 have money to retain a legal counsel, a confusing order was made by Judge Tara Reilly  
24 pertaining to former husband Scott Baeckel's summer visitation time periods. Scott was to  
25 have eight weeks visitation in the summer in two-week increments. Due to Baeckel's  
26 cognitive disabilities, she did not understand and, therefore, did not bring to Judge's  
27 attention the fact that the visitation order was confusing because it contained several parts  
28 that were mutually exclusive, in which the particular dates assigned by the Judge for

1 father's visitation DID NOT add up to 8 weeks. After Baeckel received the transcript, she  
2 noted that the Judge specifically stated, " So for this year dad will have from June 12<sup>th</sup>,  
3 2009, through Sunday June 28<sup>th</sup> in its entirety. She [daughter] will then go back to mom  
4 for two weeks and then back to dad." Baeckel complied with this order and kept her  
5 daughter beginning June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2009. If Baeckel was represented by a legal counsel, then  
6 the legal counsel would have brought to the Judge's attention the mutually exclusive parts  
7 of the court order and Baeckel would not have been accused of "violating" the court order  
8 when, de facto, she followed the court order precisely.

9 (e) On or about June 23, 2009, Scott Baeckel through his legal counsel, a certified  
10 family law specialist, filed a declaration accusing Baeckel of intentionally violating the  
11 court visitation order and requesting the change of custody to Scott. The hearings on the  
12 change of custody took place on or about August 31, 2009 and December 2, 2009. For  
13 August 31, 2009, Baeckel was able to borrow money from friends and family to hire an  
14 attorney on a temporary basis for a couple of hours for the hearing only, and on  
15 December 2, 2009, Baeckel had to represent herself because she did not find money to  
16 hire an attorney.

17 (f) During the August 31, 2009 hearing, the trial Judge Tara Reilly did not give an  
18 opportunity to Baeckel's temporary attorney to explain that Baeckel DID NOT intentionally  
19 violate the court visitation order and that the order itself was not giving the father the full 8  
20 weeks of visitation. Judge Tara Reilly issued an order giving the sole physical custody of  
21 Baeckel's daughter to Scott Baeckel.

22 (g) During the December 2, 2009 hearing, Baeckel had to represent herself when  
23 she had the extreme migraine headache and an anxiety attack. Judge Tara Reilly issued  
24 an order giving the sole legal custody of Baeckel's daughter to Scott Baeckel.

25  
26 (h) The decisions on August 31, 2009 and December 2, 2009 to give physical and  
27 legal custody of Baeckel's daughter to Scott Baeckel were against the recommendations  
28 of the court evaluators. If Baeckel had legal counsel, she would not have lost the physical

1 and legal custody of her daughter.

2 (i) Due to her cognitive disabilities, confusion and pain from severe migraines  
3 exacerbated by the stress of litigation, Baeckel was unable to comply with requests for  
4 documents and filing deadlines. Baeckel informed the court about the confusion she was  
5 experiencing from her cognitive disabilities. Baeckel was forced to sit in the courtroom for  
6 hours waiting for her case to be called, causing her severe migraine headaches and neck  
7 pain and resulting in Baeckel's inability to think and speak clearly during the hearings. Due  
8 to the migraines and neck pain, Baeckel was unable to type at the computer and timely  
9 prepare court documents.

10 (j) On or about January 19, 2010, Baeckel filed a motion and requested the  
11 assistance of counsel due to her indigent status and inability to represent herself due to  
12 cognitive disabilities. On or about January 29, 2010, Judge Tara Reilly denied Baeckel's  
13 request.

14 (k) Since January of 2010, Scott Baeckel through his legal counsel, a certified  
15 family law specialist, has filed over ten Order to Show Causes, Motions or pleadings that  
16 need Baeckel's response to which Baeckel has been unable to properly respond.

17 (l) Due to her cognitive and physical disabilities, Baeckel was unable to prepare for  
18 and attend the hearing scheduled for May 4, 2010. Baeckel wrote down May 6<sup>th</sup> as the  
19 hearing date in error and confusion, and telephoned the court immediately to inform them  
20 of her error. The bailiff gave her no direction, but instead, Judge Tara Reilly declared  
21 Baeckel a vexatious litigant.

22 (m) Presently, Baeckel is so traumatized by the course of custody litigation that she  
23 experiences panic attacks with severe pains every time she gets an envelope from the  
24 trial court or the opposing counsel, causing her to instinctively avoid any contact with the  
25 court or court personnel. If Baeckel was represented by an appointed legal counsel, then  
26 all her severe sufferings from the distress of litigation and the significant deterioration of  
27 her cognitive abilities would not have occurred.

28 **VII. THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND OTHER DEFENDANTS' RECENT**

1                    **HISTORY CONCERNING THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITY ACT**  
2                    **AND APPOINTMENT OF LEGAL COUNSEL FOR INDIGENT**  
3                    **LITIGANTS IN CIVIL ACTIONS**

4                    (a) In October of 2006, the Conference of Delegates of California Bar Association  
5 passed a resolution in which it recommended California Legislation to add a new provision  
6 to the state constitution as Article 1, Section 32:

7                    **“All people shall have a right to the assistance of counsel in cases before**  
8 **forums in which lawyers are permitted. Those who cannot afford such**  
9 **representation shall be provided counsel when needed to protect their rights**  
10 **to basic human needs, including sustenance, shelter, safety, health, child**  
11 **custody, and other categories the Legislature may identify in subsequent**  
12 **legislation.” (bold added)**

13                    (b) In 2006, a task force of the California Commission on Access to Justice  
14 developed a model statute “State Equal Justice Act” that would implement a  
15 comprehensive right of access to equal justice, including, when appropriate, a right to  
16 appointed counsel:

17                    “100. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

18                    The Legislature finds and declares:

19                    **101. Access to justice is a fundamental right in a democratic society. It is**  
20 **essential to the enforcement of all other rights and responsibilities in any**  
21 **society governed by the rule of law. It also is essential to the public’s**  
22 **confidence in the legal system and its ability to reach just decisions.**

23                    Recognizing its responsibilities in a democratic society, **the State government**  
24 **assumes the duty to guarantee this right to all its citizens.” (bold added).**

25                    The full text of “State Equal Justice Act” is published at:

26                    [http://www.povertylaw.org/poverty-law-library/research-guides/civil-gideon/state-model-  
statute.pdf](http://www.povertylaw.org/poverty-law-library/research-guides/civil-gideon/state-model-<br/>27 statute.pdf)

28                    (c) On September 27, 2008, Chief Justice Ronald M. George made the following

1 statement in the State of the Judiciary address at the State Bar Convention:

2 **“The judicial system also has sought- thus far unsuccessfully- to fund three**  
3 **pilot projects to provide legal representation in civil cases in which**  
4 **fundamental rights are at issue, and we shall continue to pursue an**  
5 **appropriation for this purpose. Just as the U.S. Supreme Court’s landmark**  
6 **decision in *Gideon v. Wainwright* recognized the importance of counsel in**  
7 **criminal cases where individual liberty is at stake, counsel may be just as**  
8 **essential in those civil proceedings that affect the most fundamental aspects**  
9 **of individual lives.”** (bold added)

10 (d) Several years ago, the California Bar Association has established a special  
11 procedure and special accommodations for cognitively disabled applicants for testing:

12 **“Testing accommodations are available to individuals with mental or physical**  
13 **disabilities** as defined in Chapter 7 of the Admissions Rules. Depending on the  
14 nature of the disability, **accommodations may include such things as**  
15 **assistants (i.e., readers or personal healthcare assistants), wheelchair access,**  
16 **permission to dictate to a typist or tape recorder, customized timing,**  
17 **separate testing room, customized examination materials (i.e., Braille, large**  
18 **print, etc.), extended testing days and permission to bring and use specific**  
19 **items or medical aids. When completing the required forms, the applicant**  
20 **and his/her physician/specialist should request what they think is necessary**  
21 **to allow the applicant to compete on an equal basis with all other applicants**  
22 and must provide adequate documentation and rationale to support the diagnosis  
23 and their request for accommodations.

24 The Committee's policies, procedures and forms related to filing a petition for  
25 testing accommodations are available online at [www.calbar.ca.gov/admissions](http://www.calbar.ca.gov/admissions) or  
26 upon request.” (bold added)  
27  
28

1 The full text of special proceedings and special accommodations for cognitively disabled  
2 law students can be found at:

3 [http://calbar.xap.com/applications/CalBar/info/bar\\_exam.html](http://calbar.xap.com/applications/CalBar/info/bar_exam.html)

4 (e) On October 12, 2009, California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed AB  
5 590, Assembly member Mike Feuer's landmark measure that would make California the  
6 first state in the nation to establish a model program providing a right to counsel for low-  
7 income people in critical civil cases.

8 **"This law helps ensure essential legal rights are not sacrificed simply**  
9 **because someone cannot afford to hire a private lawyer,"** said Feuer. "The  
10 current economic crisis and state budget cuts make this measure more critical than  
11 ever. Just as health services can decrease the need for expensive ER treatment,  
12 **timely access to legal services can keep a family in their home or a child with**  
13 **her mother or father, which ultimately saves taxpayers money. This new**  
14 **statute will also make the justice system more efficient and**  
15 **economical."** (bold added)

16 **"Chief Justice Ronald M. George said** the signing of the legislation was welcome  
17 news for both the court system and unrepresented litigants in critical civil cases.

18 "The growing number of unrepresented parties in lawsuits imposes significant costs  
19 on the courts and erodes the public's confidence in our system of justice," he said.

20 **"This legislation provides an important step in improving access to justice**  
21 **for those most in need."** (bold added)

22 Currently, attorneys are appointed for indigent parties only in criminal cases. **Legal**  
23 **officials agree, however, that some issues decided in civil cases can be just**  
24 **as significant as in criminal cases, such as cases involving the elderly and**  
25 **individuals with disabilities, the well-being and safety of parents and**  
26 **children, and the basic need for adequate shelter.** AB 590 would support the  
27 project without drawing on California's general fund: A previously-approved \$10  
28

1 increase on certain court fees when a party wins a case would be redirected to the  
2 program starting in 2011.

3 AB 590 reflects a growing national movement known as "civil Gideon" after the  
4 name of the Supreme Court case establishing the right to counsel in criminal  
5 cases. **The concept is endorsed by judges, legal leaders and scholars,**  
6 **including the American Bar Association, the California Commission on**  
7 **Access to Justice, and the Conference of California Bar Associations.**  
8 **Members of California's business community, including the California**  
9 **Chamber of Commerce, support the measure,** which also provides resources to  
10 courts to test more efficient ways to handle the enormous number of currently  
11 unrepresented parties in the legal system.

12 **AB 590 will go into effect as a pilot project from July 1, 2011 until July 1,**  
13 **2017."** (bold added)

14 The full text of the press release regarding AB 590 can be found at:

15 <http://democrats.assembly.ca.gov/members/a42/newsroom/20091012AD42PR01.htm>

16 (f) In February of 2009, a special study called "The Impact of Legal Aid Services on  
17 Economic Activity in Texas" was published. This study affirmatively showed that \$1.00  
18 spent on legal aid generates \$7.42 overall gain to the economy:

19 <http://www.texasatj.org/FINAL%20Econ%20Impact%20Study%2002-12-09.pdf>

## 20 **VIII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

21 (a) That James G. Bertoli, Judge of Superior Court of Sonoma County has  
22 discriminated against the plaintiff, Natalia A. Sidiakina, has excluded her from participation  
23 in, and/or denied her the access to and the benefits of, the services of the court system  
24 and due process in violation of 42 U.S.C. 12132, has intentionally subjected her to the  
25 unconscionable, immoral and inhumane treatment, abused and tortured her during the  
26 court processes causing her to experience pain and sufferings so severe that Sidiakina  
27 lost consciousness during the hearing on September 14, 2007 and that Sidiakina's brain  
28 was permanently traumatized resulting in permanent cognitive disabilities such as severe

1 Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, Dissociative Disorder and Avoidance Disorder.

2 (b) That James G. Bertoli, Judge of Superior Court of Sonoma County, has  
3 intended to continue to discriminate against the plaintiff, Natalia A. Sidiakina, intentionally  
4 subject her to the unconscionable, immoral and inhumane treatment, abuse, torture,  
5 humiliate, and embarrass her, exclude her from participation in, and/or deny her the  
6 access to and the benefits of, the services of the court system and due process in  
7 violation of 42 U.S.C. 12132.

8 (c) That Robert S. Boyd, Judge, Superior Court of Sonoma County, has  
9 discriminated against the plaintiff, Natalia A. Sidiakina, has covered up the abuse and  
10 torture of Sidiakina while serving as Presiding Judge of Superior Court of Sonoma County  
11 and has intended to discriminate against the plaintiff, Natalia A. Sidiakina, intentionally  
12 subject her to the unconscionable, immoral and inhumane treatment, abuse, humiliate,  
13 and embarrass her, exclude her from participation in, and/or deny her the access to and  
14 the benefits of, the services of the court system and due process in violation of 42 U.S.C.  
15 12132.

16 (d) That Ignazio J. Ruvolo, Presiding Justice and Timothy A. Reardon, Justice of  
17 the Court of Appeal of California, First Appellate District, Division Four, have discriminated  
18 against the plaintiff, Natalia A. Sidiakina, intentionally subjected her to the  
19 unconscionable, immoral and inhumane treatment, abused, humiliated, and embarrassed  
20 her, excluded her from participation in, and/or denied her the access to and the benefits  
21 of, the services of the court system and due process in violation of 42 U.S.C. 12132.

22 (e) That Tara Reilly, Judge of Superior Court of San Bernardino County, has  
23 discriminated against the plaintiff, Sherryl Baeckel, intentionally subjected her to the  
24 unconscionable, immoral and inhumane treatment, humiliated, and embarrassed her,  
25 excluded her from participation in, and/or denied her the access to and the benefits of, the  
26 services of the court system and due process in violation of 42 U.S.C. 12132.

27 (f) That Ronald M. George, Chief Justice and Judicial Council of California have  
28 discriminated against the plaintiffs, Natalia A. Sidiakina and Sherryl Baeckel, by knowingly

1 creating The Rules of Court that make it physically impossible for indigent plaintiffs with  
2 cognitive disabilities to meaningfully participate in, and/or have equal and meaningful  
3 access to and the benefits of, the services of the court system and due process in  
4 violation of 42 U.S.C. 12132.

5 (g) That the State of California, Superior Court of Sonoma County, Superior Court  
6 of San Bernardino County, The Court of Appeal of California, First Appellate District,  
7 Division Four, knowingly and intentionally continue to discriminate against the plaintiffs,  
8 Natalia A. Sidiakina and Sherryl Baeckel, all other indigent litigants with cognitive  
9 disabilities and all other individuals similarly situated who have a need or responsibility to  
10 participate in court processes as litigants in civil matters in which their rights to the  
11 fundamental human needs are at stake. Further, there are other Superior Courts in this  
12 State that have failed to fully comply with the requirements of the ADA and knowingly and  
13 intentionally continue to discriminate against indigent litigants with cognitive disabilities.

14 (h) That the actions of the State of California and other named defendants were  
15 conscious, deliberate, and intentional in their active discrimination against the plaintiffs,  
16 Natalia A. Sidiakina and Sherryl Baeckel, all other indigent litigants with cognitive  
17 disabilities and all other similarly situated disabled individuals in this State. That James G.  
18 Bertoli, Judge of Superior Court of Sonoma County consistently insisted on continuing to  
19 deny necessary and reasonable accommodations for Natalia A. Sidiakina with full  
20 knowledge of her cognitive disability and severe pain and sufferings, humiliation, and  
21 embarrassment that Sidiakina is subjected to during court hearings without  
22 accommodations and his knowledge of the requirement to conform to the ADA.

23 (i) That the actions of the State of California, Judicial Council of California, and  
24 Judicial Branch of the Government of California were conscious, deliberate, and  
25 intentional in their active discrimination against the plaintiffs, Natalia A. Sidiakina and  
26 Sherryl Baeckel, all other indigent litigants with cognitive disabilities and all other similarly  
27 situated disabled individuals in this State. That their persistent misrepresentation of the  
28 actions of the judicial process on the California Courts web site at

1 <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/> as “Committed to providing fair and equal access to justice  
2 for all Californians.” was with full knowledge of plaintiff’s disability and with their  
3 knowledge of the requirements to conform to the ADA.

4 (j) That the actions of the State of California and the other defendants were  
5 conscious, deliberate, and intentional in their active discrimination against all other  
6 similarly situated cognitively disabled individuals of this State. That their persistent  
7 presentation of the actions of the judicial process as “fair and equal access to justice”,  
8 knowing that cognitively disabled individuals were unable to gain meaningful access to  
9 court processes, was with full knowledge of their disabilities and their knowing failure to  
10 meet the requirements to conform to the ADA.

11 (k) That in alternative, the actions of the State of California and other defendants  
12 were knowing and resulted from the defendants’ negligence in complying with the law.

13 (l) That as a result of the defendants’ actions, the plaintiff Sidiakina has suffered  
14 damages in the form of extreme pain and suffering, resulting in her Post-Traumatic Stress  
15 Disorder and permanent cognitive disability, loss of earnings for the rest of her life, the  
16 need to take medications and have weakly therapy sessions for the rest of her life, and to  
17 incur significant medical expenses for the rest of her life, extreme embarrassment,  
18 humiliation, anxiety and panic attacks, dissociation and avoidance in her attempts to  
19 represent herself and to gain access to the services provided by the State of California  
20 and Superior Court of Sonoma County and not being able to be accommodated. In  
21 addition, plaintiff Sidiakina has suffered the loss of her home as her only shelter and  
22 incurred attorney fees and expenses including court costs in excess of \$50,000.

23 (m) That as a result of the defendants’ actions, the plaintiff Baeckel has suffered  
24 damages in the form of extreme pain and suffering, extreme embarrassment, and  
25 humiliation in attempting to represent herself and to gain access to the services provided  
26 by the State of California and Superior Court of San Bernardino County and not being  
27 able to be accommodated. In addition, plaintiff Baeckel has suffered the loss of physical  
28 and legal custody of her daughter and incurred attorney fees and expenses including

1 court costs in excess of \$15,000.

2 **IX. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS AND REQUEST FOR**  
3 **CERTIFICATION AS CLASS ACTION**

4 (a) Now come the plaintiffs, who in addition to bringing this action on behalf of  
5 themselves, would request this Court to certify them as class representatives pursuant to  
6 the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of all  
7 individuals residing in the State of California who are indigent litigants and are qualified  
8 individuals with a cognitive disability that prevents them from thinking clearly, staying  
9 focused, maintaining attention, speaking and understanding fully, and making logical  
10 decisions during the litigation and court processes. These individuals have been subjected  
11 to discrimination like the plaintiffs and continue to experience this discrimination, the  
12 denial of fair and equal access to justice, and the denial of due process. Each of these  
13 individuals has the right to fully and meaningfully participate in judicial proceedings in the  
14 courthouses of this State and specifically the named defendant courts and would currently  
15 not have access to the judicial processes in the named defendant courts without going  
16 through the humiliation and embarrassment that the plaintiffs Natalia A. Sidiakina and  
17 Sheryl Baeckel have been forced to endure.

18 (b) Plaintiffs would show that the certification of this class is proper in that (1) the  
19 class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable, (2) there are questions  
20 of fact and law that are common to the class, (3) the claims and defenses of the  
21 representative party is typical of the claims and defenses of the class, and (4) the  
22 representative party will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the class.

23 (c) Plaintiffs would further show that the defendants have acted, or refused to act,  
24 on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive  
25 relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole. Further, that  
26 the questions of fact and fact common to the members of the class predominate over any  
27 questions affecting only individual members. As class action is superior to other available  
28 methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

**X. REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs would hereby request this Honorable Court to:

1. Render a ruling that by not providing a legal counsel as accommodation to plaintiffs and other indigent litigants with cognitive disabilities in civil cases, in which such litigants' fundamental rights to basic human needs are at stake, the Judicial Branch of the California Government and its subdivisions violated the due process rights of plaintiffs and other indigent litigants with cognitive disabilities.

2. Render a ruling that during the court processes in Superior Court of Sonoma County and California Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Four, during which plaintiff Sidiakina was denied requested accommodations and had to represent herself, her due process rights were violated and that all rulings made as a result of such court processes are reversed.

3. Render a ruling that during the court processes in Superior Court of San Bernardino County during which plaintiff Baeckel was denied requested accommodations and had to represent herself, her due process rights were violated and that all rulings made as a result of such court processes are reversed.

4. Render judgment against James G. Bertoli, Judge for damages for plaintiff Sidiakina's pain and sufferings during the abuse, torture, humiliation, and embarrassment during the course of court proceedings before him in the amount of \$1,000,000 pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 12133 and 29 U.S.C. 794a and section 52 of the California Civil Code.

5. Render judgment against Robert S. Boyd, Judge for damages for covering up plaintiff Sidiakina's abuse and torture in his capacity of Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Sonoma County, and for damages for plaintiff Sidiakina's pain and sufferings during intentional abuse, humiliation, and embarrassment during the course of court proceedings before him in the amount of \$500,000 pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 12133 and 29 U.S.C. 794a and section 52 of the California Civil Code.

6. Render judgment against Ignazio J. Ruvolo, Presiding Justice and Timothy A.

1 Reardon, Justice for damages for plaintiff's Sidiakina's pain and sufferings during her  
2 preparation as self-represented cognitively disabled litigant of three statutory Petitions for  
3 Writ, which were summarily denied, two appeals, which were denied, and one Petition for  
4 Writ of Mandate by Person With Disabilities, which was also denied, in the amount of  
5 \$1,000,000 pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 12133 and 29 U.S.C. 794a and  
6 section 52 of the California Civil Code.

7 7. Render judgment against Ronald M. George, Chief Justice and the Judicial  
8 Council of California for damages for creating the Rules of Court that make it physically  
9 impossible for cognitively disabled litigants to have fair and equal access to justice in  
10 California and for damages for the plaintiff Sidiakina's pain and sufferings during abuse,  
11 humiliation, and embarrassment during the course of litigation and appellate proceedings  
12 in the amount of \$1,000,000 pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 12133 and 29 U.S.C.  
13 794a and section 52 of the California Civil Code.

14 8. Render judgment against the State of California, Superior Court of Sonoma  
15 County, Court of Appeal of California, First Appellate District, Division Four for damages  
16 for plaintiff Sidiakina's pain and sufferings during abuse and torture, the resulting  
17 permanent disability, lost earnings due to disability, past and ongoing medical and other  
18 expenses associated with disability evaluations and treatment, humiliation, and  
19 embarrassment during the course of proceedings in the Superior Court of Sonoma  
20 County, Court of Appeal of California, First Appellate District, Division Four, and the  
21 Supreme Court of California in the amount of \$20,000,000 as well as her attorney fees,  
22 costs and expenses pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 12133 and 29 U.S.C. 794a  
23 and section 52 of the California Civil Code for defending her in the grievance procedure,  
24 her vindication of her rights in the state court, and for bringing this action.

25 9. Render judgment against the State of California and Judicial Council of  
26 California for damages to plaintiff Sidiakina for intentionally dishonest advertising and  
27 intentional misrepresentation, on which plaintiff Sidiakina relied to her detriment, on the  
28 California Courts web site at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/> "Committed to providing fair and

1 equal access to justice for all Californians.” in the amount of \$5,000,000 pursuant to the  
2 provisions of 42 U.S.C. 12133 and 29 U.S.C. 794a and section 52 of the California Civil  
3 Code.

4 10. Render Judgment against the State of California, the Superior Court of San  
5 Bernardino County, and Tara Reilly, Judge for damages for the plaintiff Baeckel’s pain  
6 and sufferings during abuse, humiliation, and embarrassment associated with her  
7 attempting to represent herself before Judge Tara Reilly in the amount of \$3,000,000 as  
8 well as her attorney fees, costs and expenses pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C.  
9 12133 and 29 U.S.C. 794a and section 52 of the California Civil Code for bringing this  
10 action.

11 11. That this Court certify this as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal  
12 Rules of Civil Procedure and that proper notice be given to all individuals in the class in  
13 order that they may make the proper election.

14 12. That his Court take such actions necessary and proper through declaratory  
15 judgment and injunctive relief to compel the State of California and other defendants to  
16 comply with the provisions of the Americans with Disability Act, and further award such  
17 damages to the class representatives as are fair and proper. Further that this Court award  
18 damages to each member of the class for said abuse, humiliation, and embarrassment  
19 associated with the defendants’ failure to comply with the ADA. Further that this Court  
20 compel the State of California to do a survey of all courts of the State of California to  
21 determine if they in fact fully comply with the provisions of the ADA, and if they fail to do  
22 so join them as party defendants and compel them to comply with the ADA.

23 13. That this Court grant general relief to the plaintiffs and other persons that are  
24 members of the class.

25 **XI. BRIEF SUMMARY OF LEGAL BASIS FOR REQUESTED RELIEF**

26 (a) The denial of a indigent cognitively disabled litigant’s request for  
27 accommodation, such as representation by appointed legal counsel, under the *ADA Title*  
28 *II, 42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.* effectively denies that indigent cognitively disabled litigant

1 his/her constitutional right to due process of law.

2 (b) The US Supreme Court held in *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509 (2004) that  
3 the *ADA Title II* applies to state courts.

4 (c) The States can be sued for violations of and discrimination under *ADA Title II*,  
5 *42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.*

6 “As it applies to the class of cases implicating the fundamental right of access to  
7 the courts, Title II constitutes a valid exercise of Congress’ authority under §5 of  
8 the Fourteenth Amendment to enforce that Amendment’s substantive guarantees.”  
9 (*Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509 (2004), at p. 510).

10 (d) Under the *ADA Title II*, the defendants such as trial judges and ADA  
11 administrators can be sued in their official capacities, as an alternative method of suing  
12 the entity for which they are representative. (*Hafer v. Melo*, 502 U.S. 21, 112 S. Ct. 358,  
13 116 L. Ed.2d 301 (1991); *Gorman v. Bartch*, 152 F.3d 907, 916 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).)

14 (e) State judges do not enjoy absolute immunity for acts that are administrative  
15 rather than judicial in nature, such as providing accommodations for parties with  
16 disabilities under the *ADA Title II*. The US Supreme Court has held that judges can be  
17 held liable for damages in suits where actions which are administrative in nature are  
18 challenged. (*Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 224-225 (1988), *Cameron v. Seitz*, 38 F.3d  
19 264, 271 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994), *Morrison v. Lipscomb*, 877 F.2d 463 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989).)

20 (f) The California Supreme Court in *Kenneth Munson v. Del Taco, Inc.*, (2009) 46  
21 Cal.4th 661, stated:

22 “A plaintiff who establishes a violation of the ADA, therefore, need not prove an  
23 intentional discrimination in order to obtain damages under section 52 [of the  
24 California Civil Code]”.

25 In other words, the entities, including the California courts, should be PROACTIVE in  
26 eliminating the discrimination against people with disabilities.

27 (g) Under the *California Civil Code, Section 52*, the plaintiff who establishes the  
28 violation of the *ADA Title II*, obtains injunctive relief, damages, and attorneys’ fees.

1 (h) The right to representation by legal counsel sought by plaintiffs in this Complaint  
2 was established in the State of Washington on July 7, 2007, when the Washington  
3 Supreme Court adopted a New General Rule 33, which includes “representation by  
4 counsel” as “accommodation” for parties with disabilities. As stated in General Rule 33  
5 (a)(1)(C):

6 “(C) as to otherwise unrepresented parties to the proceedings, representation by  
7 counsel, as appropriate or necessary to making each service, program, or activity,  
8 when viewed in its entirety, readily accessible to and usable by a qualified person  
9 with a disability.”

10

11 Dated: July 15, 2010

12

Respectfully Submitted,

13

14

By \_\_\_\_\_ /S/ \_\_\_\_\_

15

NATALIA A. SIDIAKINA, Plaintiff

16

17

By \_\_\_\_\_ /S/ \_\_\_\_\_

18

SHERRYL BAECKEL, Plaintiff

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 In other words, the entities, including the California courts, should be PROACTIVE in  
2 eliminating the discrimination against people with disabilities.


3 (g) Under the *California Civil Code, Section 52*, the plaintiff who establishes the  
4 violation of the *ADA Title II*, obtains injunctive relief, damages, and attorneys' fees.


5 (h) The right to representation by legal counsel sought by plaintiffs in this  
6 Complaint was established in the State of Washington on July 7, 2007, when the  
7 Washington Supreme Court adopted a New General Rule 33, which includes  
8 "representation by counsel" as "accommodation" for parties with disabilities. As stated in  
9 General Rule 33 (a)(1)(C):

10 "(C) as to otherwise unrepresented parties to the proceedings, representation by  
11 counsel, as appropriate or necessary to making each service, program, or activity,  
12 when viewed in its entirety, readily accessible to and usable by a qualified person  
13 with a disability."  
14

15 Dated: July 15, 2010

16 Respectfully Submitted,

17  
18 By  \_\_\_\_\_  
19 NATALIA A. SIDIAKINA, Plaintiff

20 By  \_\_\_\_\_  
21 SHERRYL BAECKEL, Plaintiff  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28