#### ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

06/02/2020 at 08:00:00 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court By Carla Brennan Deputy Clerk

Brian P. Worthington, Esq. (Bar No. 179590) WORTHINGTON LAW 402 W. Broadway, Suite 400 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone (619) 630-0096; Fax (619) 630-0096 Email: brian@worthington-law.com

4

Attorneys for Plaintiff DANELI SHOE COMPANY DBA FÓOTWEAR ETC

6

5

1

2

3

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

27

28

///

# SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA **COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

DANELI SHOE COMPANY DBA FOOTWEAR ETC, a California corporation,

Plaintiff,

VS.

VALLEY FORGE INSURANCE COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation; and DOES 1-10, inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO. 37-2020-00018134-CU-IC-CTL

#### **COMPLAINT FOR:**

- 1. BREACH OF CONTRACT;
- 2. BREACH OF THE COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING;
- 3. DECLARATORY RELIEF

COMES NOW, Plaintiff DANELI SHOE COMPANY DBA FOOTWEAR ETC (hereinafter "Footwear etc" or "Plaintiff"), by and through its counsel of record, and complains as follows:

#### THE PARTIES

- 1. Footwear etc is a California corporation doing business in California with offices in San Diego County and Santa Clara County.
  - Defendant VALLEY FORGE INSURANCE COMPANY (hereinafter "Valley 2.
- 25 Forge" or as part of the collective "Defendants") is incorporated under the laws of the
- 26 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and is authorized to do business as an insurance company and is
- regularly doing business as an insurance company in the State of California.

- 1 -

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 3. Plaintiff does not know the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of these DOE Defendants was intentionally, negligently, or in some other manner the cause of, or a contributing cause of, or was otherwise responsible for the events and happenings alleged in this Complaint and for Plaintiff's injuries and damages. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of each such DOE Defendant, together with such additional allegations as may be appropriate, when its name, capacity, and nature of involvement have been ascertained.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the agent and employee of each of the remaining Defendants and acted within the purpose and scope of said agency and employment, and each Defendant ratified and approved the acts of his agent and employee.
- 5. Venue is proper in this Court because the contract that is the subject of part of this action was to be performed, in whole or in part, in the County of San Diego, State of California, and/or because the damage that is the subject of this action occurred, in whole or in part, in the County of San Diego, State of California.

# **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 6. Footwear etc is a family-run footwear business that started in 1986 as one store, and has now grown to 11 retail locations, as well as online sales operations. Footwear etc's success and growth over its 34 years of operations are attributable to its combination of an oldfashioned sense of great customer care and its line of high-quality, comfortable, and fashionable footwear from around the world for both men and women.
- 7. In addition to its online store, Footwear etc currently operates retail stores in the California Counties of Santa Clara, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and San Diego, California. Footwear etc's headquarters are located in San Diego, California.
- 8. Defendants issued a policy of insurance to Footwear etc, policy number 6025461469, effective from December 23, 2019 to December 23, 2020 (hereinafter "the Policy").

COMPLAINT

27

28

#### RISKS OF DIRECT PHYSICAL LOSS unless the loss is:

- Excluded in section B. EXCLUSIONS;
- b. Limited in paragraph A.4. Limitations; or
- Excluded or limited by other provisions of this policy. c.
- 15. The Policy's Declarations identify 14 locations covered by the Policy, including the locations of Footwear etc's 11 retail stores.
- 16. On March 4, 2020, California Governor Gavin Newsom proclaimed a State of Emergency to exist in California as a result of the threat of the Coronavirus and COVID-19.
- 17. On March 16, 2020, Santa Clara County, San Mateo County, and Contra Costa County issued "Shelter in Place" Orders requiring all non-essential businesses "to cease all activities at facilities located within the County...." Although Footwear etc is a successful business that provides important goods and services to the community in the form of footwear, Footwear etc's business does not qualify as one that these three Counties characterized as providing "essential" services in the Orders. Footwear etc was therefore required to close its seven retail stores in Santa Clara County, San Mateo County, and Contra Costa County effective March 17, 2020.
- 18. On March 19, 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-33-20. This Executive Order acknowledged that, "in a short period of time, COVID-19 has rapidly spread throughout California, necessitating updated and more stringent guidance from federal, state, and local public health officials." The Executive Order mandated that all individuals living in the State of California stay home or at their place of residence except as needed to maintain continuity of operations of the federal critical infrastructure sectors. As a consequence, all businesses except those providing essential services were ordered closed. Although Footwear etc is a successful business that provides important goods and services to the community in the form of footwear, Footwear etc's business does not qualify as one that the State of California characterized as providing "essential" services for purposes of this Executive Order. Footwear etc was therefore required to close the four retail stores in San Diego County, in addition to the seven retail stores it had already closed in Santa Clara County, San Mateo County, and Contra Costa County. All 11

27

28

of Footwear etc's retail stores remained closed until May 2020, when the State began modifying its various Orders.

- 19. Effective May 8, 2020, the State of California moved to what it calls "Stage 2" of its four-stage framework. This permitted some retail stores to re-open, including clothing and shoe stores, but only for delivery or curbside pickup. Under Stage 2, customers for such businesses are not permitted inside the stores.
- 20. Footwear etc thereafter began opening its stores to the limited extent permitted by the State of California. Its retail stores are currently open and operating to the full extent permitted by the State of California, but because of the State's limitations, Footwear etc's operations are limited, and Footwear etc continues to suffer a substantial loss of business income. Footwear etc's loss of business income is ongoing and continuing, and is certain to continue into the foreseeable future.
- 21. Prior to the closure of its 11 retail stores, Footwear etc operated a thriving retail business in its stores. As a direct consequence of the above, Footwear etc has lost and been deprived of substantial business income. Because the partial suspension of its operations in its 11 retail stores remains in effect, the amount of the lost business income continues to increase significantly on a daily basis. Although Footwear etc has been able to continue online sales, income from sales through the online store, alone, after the government-ordered closures did not rise anywhere near to the level of business income, before the government-ordered closures, from the combination of the 11 retail stores and online sales.
- 22. While some rogue media outlets have called the 2019-2020 Coronavirus an exaggerated mass hysteria that will unlikely create significant physical damage, the scientific community, and those personally affected by the virus, recognize the Coronavirus as a cause of real physical loss and damage.
- 23. A growing body of scientific evidence indicates that the Coronavirus physically infects and stays on surfaces normally considered inhospitable to viruses, such as doorknobs, faucets, and other hard surfaces in buildings, and other objects or materials knows as "fomites" (objects or materials which are likely to carry infection, such as furniture) for up to 28 days. The

presence of a contaminant, whether a chemical constituent or a contagion such as the Coronavirus, constitutes insured physical loss of or damage to property. China, Italy, France, and Spain have implemented the cleaning and fumigating of public areas prior to allowing them to re-open publicly due to the intrusion of microbials.

- 24. The government-ordered closures of non-essential businesses were based in part on the increasing likelihood of occurrence of COVID-19 throughout the State, and the physical damage to property caused by the Coronavirus. The United States Centers for Disease Control (CDC) has determined that a person may contract COVID-19 by touching a surface or object that has the virus on it, and then by touching his or her mouth, nose, or eyes.
- 25. On March 17, 2020, Footwear etc submitted a claim to Defendants for lost business income under the Policy's Businessowners Special Property Coverage Form, and specifically the Business Income and Extra Expense and Civil Authority Endorsements.
- 26. On April 21, 2020, Defendants wrote to Footwear etc and denied the claim. Defendants stated that their denial was based on an "investigation" it contends to have conducted, and that as part of this supposed "investigation," Defendants "relied upon information provided by [Footwear etc], including oral discussions of the circumstances of the claimed loss as well as email correspondence in which you provided additional documentation related to your claim."

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### **BREACH OF CONTRACT**

## (As to All Defendants)

- 27. Plaintiff hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 26, above, as though set forth in full herein.
  - 28. Footwear etc and Defendants entered into a valid contract in the form of the Policy.
- 29. Defendants have breached that contract in that they have wrongfully denied Footwear etc's claim for lost business income resulting from the need to suspend operations (in full or in part) in its 11 retail stores, and failed and refused to pay benefits under the Policy when it had a contractual obligation to do so. Defendants contend wrongly that the retail there is no indication that Footwear etc's operations were suspended as a result of direct physical loss or

28

damage due to a Covered Cause of Loss to property at any of the 14 locations listed on the Policy's declarations. Footwear etc's operations were suspended at its 11 retail stores in part because of the presence of the Coronavirus on property in the retail stores. The presence of Coronavirus on property impairs the property because of the direct and serious threat that employees and customers may touch the property and thereby transfer the Coronavirus to their hands, then touch their mouth, nose, and face and contract COVID-19. The presence of Coronavirus on property is a physical loss of or damage to property and is a Covered Cause of Loss, meaning the suspension of operations at the 11 retail stores is covered under the Policy.

30. Defendants also contend wrongly that the Orders of the various Counties and the Governor's Executive Orders were not issued due to direct physical loss of or damage to property and did not prohibit access to the premises. The various Orders of governmental authorities were issued in part because of the presence of the Coronavirus on property items in various public spaces such as retail stores. The governmental authorities issued their Orders so as to prevent people from touching such property, transferring the Coronavirus to their hands and then contracting COVID-19 by touching their mouth, nose and face. Coronavirus is a dangerous, lifethreatening, highly contagious virus for which there is presently no vaccine. For that reason, property items with the Coronavirus on them constitute a threat to the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and of society in general. Governmental authorities acknowledged this and issued orders closing all non-essential business in part out of this concern that people would touch Coronavirus-laced property items at business locations throughout the State of California and thereby infect themselves and then infect others, spreading COVID-19 uncontrollably. Property items with Coronavirus on them are therefore dangerous to human beings, are impaired, and the presence of Coronavirus on property items throughout the state are a physical loss of or damage to such property. The orders of the various governmental authorities were therefore indeed issued because of physical loss of or damage to property. Moreover, the orders of the governmental authorities did indeed prohibit access to the premises because the premises of all non-essential businesses were ordered closed to the public, and the owners and employees of all non-essential businesses were ordered to stay home and not go to the premises of non-essential businesses.

28

Footwear etc's claim for lost business income was covered under the Policy, and specifically the Civil Authority Endorsement, and Defendants breached the insurance-policy contract by denying the coverage owed.

- 31. Footwear etc has fully performed its obligations under the Policy, and Defendants' performance under the Policy was not excused.
- 32. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breach of the Policy, Footwear etc has been damaged in that, among other things, it has been deprived of insurance coverage for lost business income to which it is entitled under the Policy. Footwear etc currently estimates its damages from Defendants' conduct as \$1.6 million, but that number is increasing on a daily basis, and Footwear etc reserves the right to amend the damages figure according to proof, according to information revealed in discovery, and as those damages continue to increase.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

# BREACH OF THE IMPLIED COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING (As to All Defendants)

- 33. Plaintiff hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 32, above, as though set forth in full herein.
  - 34. Footwear etc and Defendants entered into a valid contract in the form of the Policy.
- 35. Footwear etc suffered a loss that, as explained in greater detail above, is covered under the Policy, and Defendants were notified of that loss.
- 36. Like all contracts, the Policy contains an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing providing that no party to the contract will do anything that would deprive another party of the benefits of the contract.
- 37. Defendants breached this covenant of good faith and fair dealing by, among other things:
- a. Defendants acted unreasonably in that they denied Footwear etc's claim for lost business income arbitrarily and without proper cause. Defendants unreasonably ignored the evidence of the presence of Coronavirus on property items throughout the State of California, the evidence that governmental authorities ordered closure of all non-essential business in part based

on the fact that the presence of Coronavirus on property items could lead to the uncontrolled spread of the dangerous and deadly COVID-19, and evidence that the presence of Coronavirus on property items does constitute physical loss of or damage to property.

- b. Defendants acted unreasonably and without proper cause in that, based on information and belief, Defendants accepted the payment of Policy premiums from Footwear etc with no intention of providing any coverage under the Business Income and Extra Expense and Civil Authority Endorsements due to a loss and shutdown from a virus pandemic.
- c. Defendants acted unreasonably, arbitrarily, and without proper cause in that, based on information and belief, as soon as governmental authorities starting issuing orders closing non-essential businesses, Defendants made the decision to deny any and all claims for lost business incomes under policy like the Policy here regardless of whether the facts showed that there was indeed coverage in order to avoid negative financial affects to the insurance company. Defendants knew that providing the coverage owed would be detrimental to their financial well-being and decided to deny all claims for lost business income so as to avoid that detriment, even if the facts demonstrated the coverage exists for the loss.
- d. Defendants acted unreasonably and without proper cause in that they provided reasons for denial of Footwear etc's claims that they knew or, through use of any reasonable care should have known, were factually inaccurate and contrary to law.
- Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing harm and damage to Defendants, in that Footwear etc. has been deprived of policy benefits to which it is entitled for its lost business income, and in that they have had to incur attorney's fees to seek and recover policy benefits that have been tortiously denied. Footwear etc's damages as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct is currently approximately \$1.6 million but are increasing on a daily basis. Footwear etc reserves the right to amend the damages figure according to proof, according to information revealed in discovery, and as those damages continue to increase.
- 39. As set forth above, Defendants acted with oppression, fraud, or malice. Defendants conduct was despicable and so vile, base, contemptible, miserable, wretched or loathsome that it would be looked down upon and despised by ordinary decent people. Defendants ignored facts

they knew or should have known supported the existence of coverage for Footwear etc's claim so that they could avoid loss of profits by paying the claim and the claims of other insureds have suffered similar losses. Defendants also accepted premium payments from Footwear etc knowing they would never honor a valid claim for lost business income resulting from physical loss of or damage to property because of a global pandemic virus. Defendants are therefore subject to punitive or exemplary damages.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION DECLARATORY RELIEF

# (As to All Defendants)

- 40. Plaintiff hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 39, above, as though set forth in full herein.
- 41. An actual, present controversy exists between the parties in that: 1) Footwear etc contends it is entitled to coverage under the Policy for its past, ongoing and continuing lost business income resulting from the suspension of its operations due to the damage from the Coronavirus and the orders of the governmental authorities relating to the Coronavirus and the damages stemming from the Coronavirus; and 2) Defendants contend that coverage is not owed under the Policy for Footwear etc's claim for lost business income.
- 42. Footwear etc seeks a judicial declaration of the rights and obligations of the parties, and specifically that there is coverage under the Policy for Footwear etc's claim for lost business income, and that Defendants have a duty to provide and pay Policy benefits to Footwear etc for this claim.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff DANELI SHOE COMPANY DBA FOOTWEAR ETC prays for judgment as follows:

- 1. For actual and compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in the current approximate amount of \$1.6 that is continuing to increase on a daily basis;
- 2. For a judicial declaration that Footwear etc is entitled to coverage under the Policy for loss of business income as a result of the Coronavirus and the orders of civil authorities suspending Footwear etc's operations;

1	3.	For punitive and/or e	exemplary damages;
2	4.	For costs of suit; and	
3	5.	For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.	
4	Dated: June	1, 2020	WORTHINGTON LAW
5			By: s/Brian P. Worthington
6			Brian P. Worthington, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff DANELI SHOE COMPANY DBA FOOTWEAR ETC
7			COMPANY DBA FOOTWEAR ETC
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			11
			- 11 - COMPLAINT