

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

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY SAN DIEGO – CENTRAL DIVISION**

AMY SHERLOCK, an individual and on
behalf of her minor children, T.S. and S.S.,
ANDREW FLORES, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GINA M. AUSTIN, an individual; AUSTIN
LEGAL GROUP, a professional
corporation, LARRY GERACI, an
individual, REBECCA BERRY, an
individual; JESSICA MCELFRISH, an
individual; SALAM RAZUKI, an
individual; NINUS MALAN, an individual;
FINCH, THORTON, AND BARID, a
limited liability partnership; ABHAY
SCHWEITZER, an individual and dba
TECHNE; JAMES (AKA JIM) BARTELL,
an individual; NATALIE TRANG-MY
NGUYEN, an individual, AARON
MAGAGNA, an individual; BRADFORD
HARCOURT, an individual; SHAWN
MILLER, an individual; LOGAN
STELLMACHER, an individual;
EULENTHIAS DUANE ALEXANDER, an
individual; STEPHEN LAKE, an
individual, ALLIED SPECTRUM, INC. a
California corporation, PRODIGIOUS
COLLECTIVES, LLC, a limited liability
company, and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 37-2021-00050889-CU-AT-CTL

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

[IMAGED FILE]

Dept.: C-75

Judge: Hon. James A. Mangione

Filed: December 3, 2021

Trial: Not Set

1 On August 12, 2022, having considered all the evidence and arguments submitted by the
2 parties, the Court in the above-entitled matter granted Defendants GINA M. AUSTIN and
3 AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP's Special Motion to Strike under Code of Civil Procedure section
4 425.16 as to the Complaint for damages filed by Plaintiffs AMY SHERLOCK, an individual and
5 on behalf of her minor children, T.S. and S.S. and ANDREW FLORES, and all causes of action
6 alleged therein. The August 12, 2022 order adjudicated and disposed of all claims asserted by
7 Plaintiffs against Defendants. Accordingly,

8 IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that judgment is entered in favor of
9 Defendants GINA M. AUSTIN and AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP and against Plaintiffs AMY
10 SHERLOCK, an individual and on behalf of her minor children, T.S. and S.S. and ANDREW
11 FLORES. Plaintiffs AMY SHERLOCK, an individual and on behalf of her minor children, T.S.
12 and S.S. and ANDREW FLORES shall take nothing by way of their Complaint against
13 Defendants GINA M. AUSTIN and AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP.

14 Defendants GINA M. AUSTIN and AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP shall recover from
15 Plaintiffs AMY SHERLOCK, an individual and on behalf of her minor children, T.S. and S.S.
16 and ANDREW FLORES, jointly and severally, **costs according to proof.**
~~attorneys' fees and costs in the amount of~~
17 ~~\$ _____ and interest on that amount at the rate of ten percent (10%) per year~~
18 ~~from the date of entry of this judgment until paid in full.~~

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20
21 Dated: 09/09/2022

22 *James A. Mangione*
23 By: _____
24 Hon. James A. Mangione,
25 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE
Amy Sherlock, et al. v. Gina M. Austin, et al.
San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2011-00051643-CU-PO-NC

I, the undersigned, declare that:

I am and was at the time of service of the papers herein, over the age of eighteen (18) years and am not a party to the action. I am employed in the County of San Diego, California, and my business address is 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 300, San Diego, California 92130.

On **August 19, 2022**, I caused to be served the following documents:


- **[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT**
- [X] BY ELECTRONIC DELIVERY (Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6 and Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.251):** Based on an agreement between the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused such document(s) to be electronically served to those parties listed below from e-mail address kdiep@pettitkohn.com. The file transmission was reported as complete and a copy of the Service Receipt will be maintained with the original document(s) in our office.

<p>Andrew Flores, Esq. Law Office of Andrew Flores 427 C Street, Suite 220 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 356-1556 Fax: (619) 274-8053 Email: Andrew@FloresLegal.Pro Plaintiff in <i>Propria Persona</i> and Attorney for Plaintiffs Amy Sherlock, Minors T.S. and S.S.</p>	<p>James D. Crosby, Esq. Attorney at Law 550 West C Street, Suite 620 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 450-4149 Email: crosby@crosbyattorney.com Attorney for Defendants LARRY GERACI and REBECCA BERRY</p>
<p>Scott H. Toothacre, Esq. Michael R. Weinstein, Esq. FERRIS & BRITTON 501 West Broadway, Suite 1450 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 233-3131 Email: stoothacre@ferrisbritton.com mweinstein@ferrisbritton.com dbarker@ferrisbritton.com Attorney for Defendants LARRY GERACI and REBECCA BERRY</p>	<p>Steven W. Blake, Esq. Andrew E. Hall, Esq. BLAKE LAW FIRM 533 2nd Street, Suite 250 Encinitas, CA 92024 Tel: (858) 232-1290 Email: steve@blakelawca.com andrew@blakelawca.com eservice@blakelawca.com Attorney for Defendant STEPHEN LAKE</p>
<p>Natalie T. Nguyen, Esq. NGUYEN LAW CORPORATION 2260 Avenida de la Playa La Jolla, CA 92037 Tel: (858) 757-8577 Email: natalie@nguyenlawcorp.com Defendant NATALIE TRANG-MY NGUYEN <i>PRO SE</i></p>	

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 am readily familiar with the firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at San Diego, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on **August 19, 2022**, at San Diego, California.


_____ Kenny Diep