

1 ANDREW FLORES, ESQ (SBN:272958)
2 LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW FLORES
3 427 C Street, Suite 220
4 San Diego CA, 92101
5 P:619.356.1556
6 F:619.274.8053
7 Afloreslaw@gmail.com

8 Plaintiff in Propria Persona
9 and Attorney for Plaintiffs
10 Amy Sherlock, Minors T.S.
11 and S.S.

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
13 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CENTRAL DIVISION

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

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 GINA M. AUSTIN, an individual; AUSTIN
20 LEGALGROUP, a professional corporation,
21 LARRY GERACI, an individual, REBECCA
22 BERRY, an individual; JESSICA MCELFRISH,
23 an individual; SALAM RAZUKI, an individual;
24 NINUS MALAN, an individual; FINCH,
25 THORTON, AND BAIRD, a limited liability
26 partnership; ABHAY SCHWEITZER, an individual
27 and dba TECHNE; JAMES (AKA JIM) BARTELL,
28 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.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

05/17/2024 at 10:54:00 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By E- Filing, Deputy Clerk

Case No.: 37-2021-0050889-CU-AT-CTL

AFFIDAVIT OF PHILLIP ZAMORA IN
SUPPORT OF PLANTIFFS' MOTION TO
VACATE VOID JUDGMENT

Hearing Date: May 31, 2024

Hearing Time: 9:00 AM

Judge: Mangione

Courtroom: 75

Related Case: 37-2022-00000023-CU-MC-CTL

AFFIDAVIT OF PHILLIP ZAMORA

1
2 I, Phillip Zamora, do hereby attest as follows:

3 1. I am over the age of eighteen years and am a resident of the County of San Diego,
4 California.

5 2. The facts set forth herein are true and correct as of my own personal knowledge or belief.

6 3. This affidavit is limited to the facts set forth herein and should not be deemed an omission
7 or waiver of other known material facts that are closely related to those set forth herein.

8 4. I execute this affidavit in support of Darryl Cotton's ongoing litigation in federal and
9 state courts arising from or related to the ownership of cannabis permits and licenses acquired through
10 the legal services of attorney Gina M. Austin.

11 5. In 2016 I was operating a Medical Marijuana Consumer Collective (MMCC) that
12 delivered medical cannabis and met Salam Razuki and Ninus Malan.

13 6. From in or around January of 2017 through April of 2017, I worked for Razuki and Malan
14 at a storefront dispensary located at 8869 Balboa Avenue, San Diego, CA (the "Balboa Property").

15 7. Razuki and Malan convinced me to transfer the MMCC I operated to the Balboa Property
16 and to work for them as a Director of Operations for the cannabis conglomerate that they were building
17 in the cannabis market in the County of San Diego.

18 8. During this time, I worked almost every day at the Balboa Property overseeing the day
19 to day operations of the dispensary, the delivery service, and strategizing the development of the
20 contemplated cannabis conglomerate. At the time, the discussions and strategy centered around the
21 acquisition of cannabis code-compliant real properties in Lemon Grove, California where cannabis
22 storefronts had just been lawful.

23 9. During this time, I had numerous meetings with attorney Austin, Razuki and Malan, both
24 at the Balboa Property and at Razuki's office located at 7977 Broadway Lane, Lemon Grove, California.

25 10. In Razuki's office, there was a large map of the County of San Diego that attorney Austin
26 had marked with cannabis code-compliant real properties that had been acquired by Razuki and Malan,
27 that they were in the process of acquiring, were going to attempt to acquire, or were properties at which
28 other parties had submitted applications for cannabis permits that were deemed competition to their own

1 cannabis enterprise.

2 11. At least once a week there were meetings regarding the status of the acquisition and
3 development of cannabis businesses throughout the County of San Diego.

4 12. During these meetings it was expressly represented, discussed and/or formed the
5 underlying premise of all conversations, that Razuki and Malan were partners in all of the cannabis
6 businesses that they acquired and that Austin was both their business and legal strategist for the
7 acquisition and development of their cannabis business.

8 13. I cannot remember the names, but it was represented and clear that Razuki and Malan
9 were part of a small group of about four or five wealthy parties who formed an enterprise whose goal
10 was to collectively control the cannabis market in the County of San Diego and that Austin was counsel
11 for all of them.

12 14. During these meetings, Austin made clear that the goal of their enterprise was to create
13 a "monopoly" in the cannabis market in the County and City of San Diego.

14 15. Austin specifically used the word "monopoly."

15 16. Furthermore, Austin made clear that she was providing information to Razuki and Malan
16 about some of her other clients who had engaged Austin to help them acquire both the real property and
17 cannabis permits thereon.

18 17. In short, Austin was working against some of her own clients at every step of the way.
19 From the beginning by providing Razuki and Malan the contact information for the owners of targeted
20 properties so that Razuki and Malan could beat out Austin's own clients in acquiring the property. To
21 the back end, by delaying the approval of a cannabis permit of her own clients' applications to allow
22 time for another one of Austin's clients to acquire a nearby property and have their own application for
23 a cannabis permit approved.

24 18. One of Austin's clients that was discussed at these meetings was Chris Williams whom
25 Austin was representing for cannabis applications in Lemon Grove, California.

26 19. Austin, Razuki and Malan expressly and numerous times discussed Austin's use of
27 litigation against competitors in order to allow them the time to acquire valuable code cannabis
28 compliant properties and permits.

1 20. On March 3, 2023, Darryl Cotton reached out to me via social media.

2 21. On March 9, 2023, I met with Cotton at his real property and we discussed his litigation
3 with Lawrence Geraci, a client of Austin; my understanding of the relationships and actions between
4 Austin, Razuki, Malan, and the parties who are related to the various ongoing litigation matters that are
5 the subject of Cotton's litigation; and my interview with investigative news reporter Cara Anderson, in
6 late November of 2018, that took place after Razuki had been arrested by the Federal Bureau of
7 Investigation for attempting to have Malan kidnapped, tortured and murdered.

8 22. What Austin did to Cotton via litigation on behalf of Geraci - as I understand it economic
9 extortion - is exactly what I heard Austin said she would do and did do to numerous other parties on
10 behalf of Razuki and Malan during the exact same time frame that I was working with them and meeting
11 with them on a near daily basis.

12 I declare under penalty of perjury according to the laws of the State of California that the
13 foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 17, 2023.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


Phillip Zamora

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California

County of SAN DIEGO

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me this 17 day

of March, 2023, by Phillip Zamora

_____, prove to me on the basis
of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

Signature  (Seal)

