3

5

6

7

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

Cross-Complainant Bloom Hergott Diemer Rosenthal LaViolette Feldman Schenkman & Goodman, LLP, alleges this Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants John C. Depp, II, Scaramanga Bros., Inc., L.R.D. Productions, Inc., and Infinitum Nihil ("Cross-Defendants") as follows:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Cross-Complainant Bloom Hergott Diemer Rosenthal LaViolette Feldman Schenkman & Goodman, LLP ("Bloom Hergott") is a California limited liability partnership with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles, California.
- 2. Cross-Defendant John C. Depp, II ("Depp") is a natural person and a resident of the County of Los Angeles, California.
- 3. Cross-Defendant Scaramanga Bros., Inc. ("Scaramanga") is a California Corporation with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles, California.
- 4. Cross-Defendant L.R.D. Productions, Inc. ("LRD") is a California Corporation with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles, California.
- 5. Cross-Defendant Infinitum Nihil is a California Corporation with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles, California.
- 6. Cross-Complainant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the fictitiously named Cross-Defendants sued herein as DOES 1-30 ("Doe Defendants"), and each of them, are in some manner responsible or legally liable for the actions, events, transactions, and circumstances alleged herein. The true names can capacities of such fictitiously-named Doe Defendants, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, are presently unknown to Cross-Cross-Complainant, and Cross-Complainant will assert the true names and capacities of such fictitiously-named Doe Defendants when the same have been ascertained.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein pursuant to the Constitution of the State of California, Article VI, Section 10.

- 8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Cross-Defendants who engaged in conduct giving rise to the claims stated herein at locations in the State of California and the County of Los Angeles.
- 9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 395(a).

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 10. Beginning in 1999, Bloom Hergott or its predecessors provided entertainment-related legal services to Cross-Defendants.
- 11. Cross-Defendants orally agreed they would pay Bloom Hergott a fixed percent of their gross entertainment income, whenever received.
- 12. Bloom Hergott represented Cross-Defendants on dozens of matters and spent thousands of hours working on their behalf, and Cross-Defendants paid the fixed percent of their gross entertainment income for many years.
- 13. Cross-Defendants continued to request and receive entertainment-related legal services from Bloom Hergott and continued to direct fee payments to Bloom Hergott under the agreement between Cross-Defendants and Bloom Hergott through July 2017.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Breach of Contract Against All Cross-Defendants)

- 14. Bloom Hergott re-alleges by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 13 of this Cross-Complaint as if set forth fully herein.
- 15. An oral agreement existed between Bloom Hergott and Cross-Defendants under which Cross-Defendants agreed to pay a fixed percent of their gross entertainment income to Bloom Hergott whenever the income was received, in exchange for Bloom Hergott's entertainment-related legal services.
- 16. Cross-Defendants continued to request and accept legal services on matters from Bloom Hergott through July 2017.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

27

28

- 17. Bloom Hergott performed all obligations to Cross-Defendants except those obligations Bloom Hergott was prevented or excused from performing.
- 18. Cross-Defendants ratified their agreement with Bloom Hergott by continuing to accept legal services and by continuing to pay Bloom Hergott through July 2017.
- 19. Cross-Defendants have breached the agreement by failing and refusing to pay Bloom Hergott.
- 20. Bloom Hergott has been damaged by Cross-Defendants' breaches in an amount to be proved at trial, plus interest.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Common Count For Quantum Meruit Against All Cross-Defendants)

- 21. Bloom Hergott re-alleges by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 20 of this Cross-Complaint as if set forth fully herein.
- 22. In the event the fee agreement between Bloom Hergott and Cross-Defendants is deemed unenforceable by the Court, Bloom Hergott alternatively seeks the reasonable value of its legal services provided to Cross-Defendants.
- 23. Bloom Hergott has been damaged, and continues to be damaged, to the extent the parties' fee agreement is not enforced and Cross-Defendants have not paid the reasonable value of the legal services that Bloom Hergott provided to Cross-Defendants, in an amount to be proven at trial, plus interest.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Declaratory Relief Against All Cross-Defendants)

- 24. Bloom Hergott re-alleges by reference each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 23 of this Cross-Complaint as if set forth fully herein.
- 25. A controversy exits between Bloom Hergott and Cross-Defendants relating to the legal rights and duties of the parties. As alleged at Paragraph 104 of the seventh cause of action of their Complaint, Cross-Defendants seek a declaration regarding the voidability of the fee agreement between Bloom Hergott and Cross-Defendants and Cross-Defendants' entitlement to disgorgement

of fees paid.

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 26. Bloom Hergott agrees that a controversy exists between it and Cross-Defendants regarding these issues. Bloom Hergott seeks the mirror image of Cross-Defendants' seventh cause of action for a declaratory judgment pursuant to *Ludgate Ins. Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 82 Cal. App. 4th 592, 609 (2000).
- 27. Specifically, Bloom Hergott seeks a declaration that the fee agreement between Cross-Defendants and Bloom Hergott be declared valid and enforceable and a declaration that Bloom Hergott is not required to disgorge any fees paid by Cross-Defendants for legal services that Bloom Hergott provided.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE. Cross-Complainant Bloom Hergott Diemer Rosenthal LaViolette Feldman Schenkman & Goodman, LLP prays for judgment on the Cross-Complaint as follows:

- 1. For compensatory damages according to proof;
- 2. For declaratory relief;
- 3. For interest as allowed by law;
- 4. For the costs of suit incurred;
- 5. For any further relief that the Court deems proper.

DATED: December 11, 2017

REED SMITH LLP

By:

Kurt C/Peterson Peter J. Kennedy

Mathew M. Wrenshall

Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant Bloom Hergott Diemer Rosenthal LaViolette Feldman Schenkman & Goodman, LLP, and

Defendant Jacob A. Bloom

27

28

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PROOF OF SERVICE

John C. Depp, II, et al v. Bloom, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC680066

I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is REED SMITH LLP, 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2900 Los Angeles, CA 90071. On December 11, 2017, I served the following document(s) by the method indicated below:

DEFENDANT AND CROSS-COMPLAINANT BLOOM HERGOTT DIEMER ROSENTHAL LAVIOLETTE FELDMAN SCHENKMAN & GOODMAN, LLP'S CROSS - COMPLAINT

by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope(s) and consigning it to an express mail service for guaranteed delivery on the next business day following the date of consignment to the address(es) set forth below.

Fredrick S. Levin Ali M. Abugheida Buckley Sandler LLP 100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1000 Santa Monica, California 90401

Pat A. Cipollone, P.C. Robert B. Gilmore Stein Mitchell Cipollone Beato & Missner 1100 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20036

Adam R. Waldman The Endeavor Law Firm, P.C. 5163 Tilden St NW Washington, DC, 20016 **Attorneys for Plaintiffs**

Telephone: (310) 424-3984 Facsimile: (310) 424-3960

Email: flevin@buckleysandler.com Email: aabugheida@buckleysandler.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Telephone: (202) 737-7777 Facsimile: (202) 296-8312

Email: pcipollone@steimnitcheJl.com Email: rgihnore@steimnitchell.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Telephone: (202) 550-4507

Email: awaldman@theendeavorgroup.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on December 11, 2017, at Los Angeles, California.

Mary Hong