PlainSite

Legal Document

Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco Case No. CGC 12 522983

Brian Cartmell Et Al v. Bitcoinica Lp, Also Known As Bitcoinica Et Al

Document 1



View Document



View Docket



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Document Scanning Lead Sheet

Aug-06-2012 3:42 pm

Case Number: CGC-12-522983

Filing Date: Aug-06-2012 3:30

Filed by: ELIAS BUTT

Juke Box: 001 Image: 03714221

COMPLAINT

BRIAN CARTMELL et al VS. BITCOINICA LP, ALSO KNOWN AS BITCOINICA et al

001C03714221

Instructions:

Please place this sheet on top of the document to be scanned.

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

SEE SUMMONS ATTACHMENT

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

BRIAN CARTMELL, JED MCCALEB, JESSE POWELL and

ROGER VER

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entrequen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá guitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

400 McAllister St., 4th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94102

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

HENRY Y. CHIU 222927

5260 N. Palm Ave., Suite 205

559-472-9922

Fresno, CA 93704

CLERK OF THE COURT

DATE:

Deputy

(Fecha) AUG - 6 2012 (Secretario) — (For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons. (POS-010)).



NOTICE TO	THE PERSON SERVED: You are served					
4 December 1 december 1						

as an individual defendant.

as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):

3.	on behalf of	

under: CCP 416.10 (corporation)

CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)

CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) other (specify):

4. by personal delivery on (date):

CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.70 (conservatee)

CCP 416.90 (authorized person)

Page 1 of 1

Moss, Tucker, Chiu, Hebesha & Ward PC

		SUM-200(A)
	SHORT TITLE: CARTMELL v. BITCOINICA	SE NUMBER:	
_	INSTRUCTIONS FOR		
	This form may be used as an attachment to any summons if space of	does not permit the listing of all parties on the summor	ıs.
	If this attachment is used, insert the following statement in the plaintif	ff or defendant box on the summons: "Additional Partie	S
	Attachment form is attached."		

Attachment form is attached."

List additional parties (Check only one box. Use a separate page for each type of party.):

Plaintiff Defendant Cross-Complainant Cross-Defendant

BITCOINICA LP, also known as BITCOINICA CONSULTANCY LTD; INTERSANGO LTD; DONALD NORMAN; PATRICK STRATEMAN; AMIR TAAKI; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive

Page _____ of ____

Page 1 of 1

		CIVI-UT		
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State HENRY Y. CHIU 222927 Moss, Tucker, Chiu, He 5260 N. Palm Ave., Sui Fresno, CA 93704 TELEPHONE NO: 559-472-9922 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: 400 McAlliste MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Francisco BRANCH NAME: Civil Divisio CASE NAME: CARTMELL v. BI	te 205 FAXNO: 559-472-9892 San Francisco r St., 4th Floor , CA 94102 n TCOINICA	FOR COURT USE ONLY FOR COURT USE ONLY Superior Court of California County of San Francisco AUG - 6 2012 CLERK OF THE COURT BY: Deputy Clerk		
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET Unlimited Limited	Complex Case Designation	CASE CGC - 1 2-522983		
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder			
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defendant	JUDGE:		
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT.:		
1. Check one box below for the case type Auto Tort Auto (22) Uninsured motorist (46) Other Pl/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort Asbestos (04) Product liability (24) Medical malpractice (45) Other Pl/PD/WD (23) Non-Pl/PD/WD (Other) Tort Business tort/unfair business practice (1 Civil rights (08) Defamation (13) Fraud (16) Intellectual property (19) Professional negligence (25) Other non-Pl/PD/WD tort (35) Employment Wrongful termination (36) Other employment (15)	Contract Breach of contract/warranty (06) Rule 3.740 collections (09) Other collections (09) Insurance coverage (18) Other contract (37) Real Property Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14) Wrongful eviction (33) Other real property (26)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403) Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) Construction defect (10) Mass tort (40) Securities litigation (28) Environmental/Toxic tort (30) Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41) Enforcement of Judgment Enforcement of judgment (20) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint RICO (27) Other complaint (not specified above) (42) Miscellaneous Civil Petition Partnership and corporate governance (21) Other petition (not specified above) (43)		
This case is is is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management: a. Large number of separately represented parties b. Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve c. Substantial amount of documentary evidence f. Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. Monometary b. nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive Number of causes of action (specify): 5 This case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management: d. Large number of witnesses Coordination with related actions pending in one or more continuous in other countries, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court in other counties, states, or countries, states, or countries				
Date: AUGUST 2, 2012		e		
HENRY Y. CHIU (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	P GIGNA	ATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)		
(TIPE ON FINAL MANNE)	ROUNA	TOTAL OF FACTOR OF TOTAL OF THE		
under the Probate Code, Family Code, in sanctions. File this cover sheet in addition to any of the same is complex under rule 3.400 other parties to the action or proceeding.	et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you m	of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result nust serve a copy of this cover sheet on all		

SUMMONS ISSUED **DOUGLAS TUCKER 172550** HENRY Y. CHIU 222927 Superior Court of California County of San Francisco MOSS, TUCKER, CHIU, HEBESHA & WARD A Professional Corporation AUG - 6 2012 5260 North Palm Avenue, Suite 205 Fresno, California 93704 CLERK OF THE COURT Telephone: (559) 472-9922 Attorneys for Plaintiffs BRIAN CARTMELL, JED McCALEB, JESSE POWELL and ROGER VER 6 SUPERIOUR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 **COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO** 9 Case No.CGC - 1 2-522983 BRIAN CARTMELL, JED McCALEB, JESSE POWELL and ROGER VER, 11 Plaintiffs, **COMPLAINT FOR:** 12 (1) BREACH OF CONTRACT: V. (2) OPEN BOOK ACCOUNT; 13 BITCOINICA LP, also known as (3) ACCOUNT STATED; BITCOINICA; BITCOINICA (4) **NEGLIGENCE**; and 14 CONSULTANCY LTD; INTERSANGO LTD; (5) CONVERSION DONALD NORMAN; PATRICK STRATEMAN; AMIR TAAKI; and DOES 1 through 100. inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 Plaintiffs Brian Cartmell, Jed McCaleb, Jesse Powell and Roger Ver (collectively, 19 "Plaintiffs") allege the following against defendants Bitcoinica LP ("Bitcoinica"), Bitcoinica 20 Consultancy Ltd. ("Bitcoinica Consultancy"), Intersango Ltd. ("Intersango"), Donald Norman 21 ("Norman"), Patrick Strateman ("Strateman"), Amir Taaki ("Taaki") and DOES 1 through 60, 22 inclusive (altogether, "Defendants"): 23 24 **Parties** Plaintiffs are individuals who deposited certain monies with defendant Bitcoinica, 25 or its predecessor(s) in interest, which Defendants have failed and refused to return to Plaintiffs, 26 27 despite Plaintiffs' demands for the same.

LAW OFFICES 28

Moss, Tucker, Chiu,
Hebesha & Ward
A Professional Corporation
5260 North Palm Avenue
Suite 205
Fresno, California 93704

///

COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT, ETC.

- 2. Bitcoinica is an entity of unknown form and origin. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that: Bitcoinica is also known as Bitcoinica (without the "LP" suffix); and Bitcoinica, or its predecessor(s) in interest, is the operator of the Bitcoinica exchange described below, and the holder of the monies at issue herein.
- 3. Bitcoinica Consultancy is an entity of unknown form and origin. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Bitcoinica Consultancy is: an entity responsible for directing, managing and performing the day-to-day operations of Bitcoinica; and directly responsible for the decisions and actions alleged herein with respect to the monies at issue.
- 4. Intersango is an entity of unknown form and origin. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Intersango is: an entity responsible for directing, managing and performing the day-to-day operations of Bitcoinica; and directly responsible for the decisions and actions alleged herein with respect to the monies at issue.
- 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Norman is: an officer of Bitcoinica, Bitcoinica Consultancy or Intersango, or otherwise exercised direct authority and control with respect to the monies alleged herein.
- 6. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Strateman is: an officer of Bitcoinica, Bitcoinica Consultancy or Intersango, or otherwise exercised direct authority and control with respect to the monies alleged herein; and domiciled within the County of San Francisco.
- 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Taaki is an officer of Bitcoinica, Bitcoinica Consultancy or Intersango, or otherwise exercised direct authority and control with respect to the release of the Bitcoinica exchange source code and password, as alleged herein.
- 8. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants named in this complaint as DOES 1 through 60, and therefore sue said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of said defendants once their identities are ascertained. In the meantime, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each of these fictitiously named defendants is responsible in

7

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

///

some manner for the occurrences alleged herein, and that the damages alleged herein were proximately caused by such defendants.

Common Allegations

- Bitcoin is a form of virtual currency recognized by certain individuals and entities throughout the world. Said currency has a value, which may be exchanged by its owners for other forms of currency, including United States Dollars.
- 10. Bitcoinica is an exchange which permits its users to deposit United States Dollars and Bitcoins, and to engage in certain transactions, including, but not limited to, contract-fordifference transactions against a recognized and accepted Bitcoin-to-United States Dollar exchange rate. Said transactions are made pursuant to one or more written agreements concerning the deposit, retention, safekeeping and withdrawal of said monies.
- In 2012, Bitcoinica allegedly suffered several security breaches, in which 11. unknown persons allegedly compromised the Bitcoinica system to steal monies held by Bitcoinica. In a public announcement following said breaches, Bitcoinica assured its users, among other things, that: the overwhelming majority of its Bitcoin deposits were not stolen; monies were stolen from Bitcoinica, not from its users; and that all withdrawal requests would continue to be honored. Bitcoinica subsequently set up a claims system by which its users could withdraw their monies.
- 12. Bitcoinica subsequently stated that it would: (i) verify all claims submitted by its users; (ii) return fifty percent of the verified claims; and (iii) return the remainders on a pro rata basis, based upon the total amount of all verified claims and the remaining monies.
- Plaintiffs are users of the Bitcoinica exchange who deposited Bitcoins and United 13. States Dollars with Bitcoinica. Plaintiffs have submitted claims to Bitcoinica, and are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Bitcoinica has verified said claims.
- Bitcoinica and the other Defendants have returned a portion of the amounts of 14. Plaintiffs' claims. Plaintiffs have demanded that Bitcoinica and the Defendants return the remaining amounts of their claims, but they have failed and refused to do so.

LAW OFFICES

- 15. None of the Plaintiffs have consented to Bitcoinica and the other Defendants withholding the remaining amounts of their claims for any period of time, nor have they consented to Bitcoinica and the other Defendants' proposed pro rata reduction of their rightful monies.
- 16. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that the value of the remaining amounts of their claims total approximately four hundred sixty thousand four hundred fifty-seven United States Dollars and seventy cents (US\$460,457.70) in principal, as of the date of this complaint.

Conspiracy

- 17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each of Defendants knowingly and willfully conspired and agreed upon themselves to hinder, delay and deprive Plaintiffs of their rights with respect to the monies at issue.
- 18. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe, and thereon allege, that said Defendants did the acts and things alleged herein pursuant to, and in furtherance of, the conspiracy and their own agreements with one another, and/or furthered the conspiracy cooperating with, lending aid to, encouraging, ratifying or adopting those acts.
- 19. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that there is not yet any last overt act in furtherance of said conspiracy, in that Defendants are continuing to hinder, delay and deprive Plaintiffs of their rights with respect to said monies.
- 20. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants acted willfully and with the intent to cause injury to Plaintiffs, and that Defendants are therefore guilty of malice, oppression and/or fraud in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights, thereby warranting an assessment of punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish said Defendants and deter others from engaging in similar misconduct.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Contract) Against Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20

21. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 20 of this complaint.

28

///

24

25

26

- 22. Plaintiffs entered into one or more written agreements with Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20, whereby Bitcoinica agreed, among other things, to do each of the following with respect to any monies deposited by Plaintiffs with Bitcoinica:
 - a. to accept monies from Plaintiffs, in the form of Bitcoins or United States

 Dollars, which Plaintiffs may deposit from time to time;
 - to keep said monies in a safe and secure manner, consistent with fiduciary
 obligations commonly imposed upon financial services providers;
 - c. to comply with instructions that Plaintiffs may provide from time to time concerning the transfer, investment and disposition of said monies; and
 - d. to permit Plaintiffs to withdraw their monies at any time, without any restrictions or limitations upon the manner or amount of said withdrawals.

Plaintiffs currently do not have any copies of said agreements in their possession, custody or control. However, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that copies of said agreements are in the possession, custody or control of Defendants. Plaintiffs also allege that the legal effect of said agreements was to create legally binding obligations on the part of Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20 in the manner alleged above.

- 23. Plaintiffs have performed all conditions, covenants and promises required of them by said agreements, and in accordance with the terms and conditions thereof, except for those acts that have been prevented, delayed or executed by the consent, acts or omissions of Defendants.
- 24. Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20 breached the agreements by, among other things: refusing to comply with Plaintiffs' instructions for withdrawing the entirety of their monies; permitting the withdrawal of only fifty percent of their monies, notwithstanding the alleged verification of Plaintiffs' entire claims; and seeking to distribute the remainder in an alleged pro rata manner, notwithstanding Plaintiffs' refusal to consent to such distribution.
- 25. Plaintiffs have suffered certain general, special, incidental and consequential damages as a direct and proximate result of said breaches, including, among other things: the loss of the monies themselves; the loss of use of said monies while the present action is pending;

changes in the value of said monies due to fluctuating exchange rates; etc., all in amounts to be proven at trial.

26. Furthermore, to the extent the applicable written agreements permit the prevailing party (-ies) to recover its/their reasonable costs and attorneys' fees from any non-prevailing party, Plaintiffs also hereby seek the recovery of said costs and fees from Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20, which Plaintiffs had been forced to incur as a further direct and proximate result of said breaches.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Open Book Account) Against Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20

- 27. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 20 of this complaint.
- 28. Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20 have become indebted to Plaintiffs on an open book account for the monies deposited by Plaintiffs with Bitcoinica. Said monies were deposited by Plaintiffs based upon representations and promises by Bitcoinica and said DOES that, among other things: the monies would be maintained and handled in a manner consistent with Plaintiffs' instructions; and the monies could be withdrawn at any time pursuant to Plaintiffs' instructions.
- 29. Although demand has been made, Bitcoinica and said DOES have failed to return all of the monies to Plaintiffs, notwithstanding Plaintiffs' instructions to do so. Plaintiffs hereby seek to recover the remainder of the monies deposited by them, along with the costs and attorneys' fees permitted under Civil Code section 1717.5, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum legal rate.
- 30. Furthermore, or in the alternative, to the extent the applicable written agreements permit the prevailing party (-ies) to recover its/their reasonable costs and attorneys' fees from any non-prevailing party, Plaintiffs also hereby seek the recovery of said costs and fees from Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20, which Plaintiffs had been forced to incur as a further direct and proximate result of said breaches.

///

28 | | /

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

26 27

LAW OFFICES

28 Moss Tucker Chiu Hebesha & Ward FESSIONAL CORPORATION 260 NORTH PALM AVENUE SUITE 205 sno. California 93704

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Account Stated) Against Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 20 of this complaint. 31.

- 32. Within the past four years, accounts were stated in writing between each Plaintiff, on the one hand, and Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20, on the other hand. Although Bitcoinica has acknowledged and verified the total amounts of the accounts, it has only returned portions of said accounts to Plaintiffs. The remaining, unreturned portions of said accounts, according to the records of Bitcoinica and Plaintiffs, total approximately four hundred sixty thousand four hundred fifty-seven United States Dollars and seventy cents (US\$460,457.70) in principal, as of the date of this complaint, which is now due and owing, and which Bitcoinica and said DOES have previously agreed to pay.
- 33. Bitcoinica and said DOES have failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to return the remainder of the monies, despite Plaintiffs' demands that they do so. Thus, there now remains due, owing and unpaid, the above principal sum, and prejudgment and postjudgment interest thereon at the maximum legal rate.
- 34. Furthermore, to the extent the applicable written agreements permit the prevailing party (-ies) to recover its/their reasonable costs and attorneys' fees from any non-prevailing party, Plaintiffs also hereby seek the recovery of said costs and fees from Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20, which they had been forced to incur as a further direct and proximate result of said breaches.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Negligence) Against All Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 40

- 35. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 20 of this complaint.
- At all relevant times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 40 had monies belonging 36. to Plaintiffs in their possession, custody and/or control, and therefore owed Plaintiffs a duty of care with respect to safeguarding said monies. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants and said DOES served as fiduciaries with respect to said monies, and that said role imposed certain fiduciary obligations upon said defendants.

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

20

21

19

22

23

2425

2627

///

///

28

J. 20

Moss, Tucker, Chiu, Hebesha & Ward A Professional Corporation 5260 North Palm Avenue Suite 205

NO. California 93704

LAW OFFICES

37. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants and said DOES breached their duties to Plaintiffs by negligently performing their obligations, including, but not limited to: failing to utilize all reasonable and practical safeguards to protect the monies of Plaintiffs and other customers; releasing the source code and other information concerning the exchange that directly and proximately resulted in the aforementioned security breaches; and failing to promptly and completely secure the exchange upon said breaches, thereby allowing subsequent breaches of the exchange and additional loss of monies.

38. Plaintiffs have suffered certain general, special, incidental and consequential damages as a direct and proximate result of said negligence, including, among other things: the loss of the monies themselves; the loss of use of said monies while the present action is pending; changes in the value of said monies due to fluctuating exchange rates; etc., all in amounts to be proven at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Conversion) Against All Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 60

- 39. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 20 of this complaint.
- 40. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs were, and are, the lawful owners of certain monies deposited with Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20, as alleged herein. As between Plaintiffs, Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 20, Plaintiffs are entitled to possession of the monies once they provide instructions to Bitcoinica to return the same, which Plaintiffs have done.
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that: upon receiving Plaintiffs' instructions to return the monies, Defendants and DOES 1 through 60 converted, and took unlawful possession of, said monies for their own use and benefit by refusing to return all of the monies belonging to Plaintiffs, and instead retaining portions of said monies for the alleged pro rata distribution despite Plaintiffs' refusal to permit the same, or for some other unpermitted purpose. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants and said DOES did so intentionally, willfully and in flagrant disregard for Plaintiffs' rights.

- 42. Plaintiffs have suffered certain general, special, incidental and consequential damages as a direct and proximate result of said negligence, including, among other things: the loss of the monies themselves; the loss of use of said monies while the present action is pending; changes in the value of said monies due to fluctuating exchange rates; etc., all in amounts to be proven at trial.
- 43. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege: that the aforementioned actions by Defendants and DOES 1 through 60 were intentional; that said Defendants intended to deprive Plaintiffs of valuable property or legal rights, or otherwise cause injury to Plaintiffs; and that said Defendants' conduct was despicable, and subjected Plaintiffs to a cruel and unusual hardship in conscious disregard of their rights, all so as to justify an award for exemplary and punitive damages.
- 44. Furthermore, to the extent the applicable written agreements permit the prevailing party (-ies) to recover its/their reasonable costs and attorneys' fees from any non-prevailing party, Plaintiffs also hereby seek the recovery of said costs and fees from Bitcoinica and DOES 1 through 60, which they have incurred as a further direct and proximate result of said breaches.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as follows:

- 1. for the return of all monies in the accounts of Plaintiffs;
- 2. for all other general, special, incidental and consequential damages;
- 3. for attorneys' fees, as alleged in the causes of action above;
- 4. for exemplary and punitive damages, as alleged in the causes of action above;
- 5. for prejudgment and post-judgment interest, to the full extent permitted by law;
- 6. for costs of suit incurred by Plaintiffs herein; and
- 7. for such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: August 2, 2012.

MOSS, TUCKER, CHIU, HEBESHA & WARD

A Professional Corporation

Attorney for Plaintiffs