VERNON C. GOINS II (SBN 195461) ĺ YASMIN GILANI (SBN 240830) GOINS & ASSOCIATES A Professional Law Corporation 3 1330 Broadway, Suite 1530 Oakland, CA 94612 4 Telephone: (510) 893-9465 Facsimile: (510) 893-4228 5 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff GUYANA TRIBUTE FOUNDATION 7 and JYNONA NORWOOD 8 9 10 11 Goins & Associates PLC GUYANA TRIBUTE FOUNDATION, a California non-profit corporation; and JYNONA NORWOOD, an individual; Plaintiffs, VS. THE EVERGREEN CEMETERY 18 ASSOCIATION, a California corporation; BUCK KAMPHAUSEN, an individual; RON) 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

inclusive,

Defendants.

ALAMETYA CONTROPY

MAY 18 Zun

SY YASMIN SINGH, BEPUTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION SHOULD NOT ISSUE Date: May 12, 2011 11:00 a.m. HAULMAN, an individual; and DOES 1-50, Time: Dept: 31 Res. No.: R-1179749

Case No. RG11575036

INTRODUCTION I.

Plaintiffs GUYANA TRIBUTE FOUNDATION and JYNONA NORWOOD hereby apply ex parte for a temporary restraining order and an order to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue to enjoining Defendants, EVERGREEN CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, BUCK KAMPHAUSEN, Defendants and their principals, officers, agents,

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION SHOULD NOT ISSUE Guyana Tribute Foundation et al. vs. Evergreen Cemetery Association et al.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ĺ

2

3

servants, employees, attorneys, and those persons under their control, or in active concert or participation with them, from permitting the New People's Temple or any other person or entity from constructing any memorial upon the mass grave site of the victims of Jonestown until the instant action is adjudicated.

STATEMENT OF FACTS H.

The instant action arises from a long-term relationship and agreements between the parties with respect to the construction of a memorial wall that was proposed and sponsored by plaintiffs Jynona Norwood ("Norwood") and her non-profit organization Guyana Tribute Foundation (collectively, "Plaintiffs").

On or about November 18, 1978, 918 people lost their lives in Jonestown, Guyana in a massacre led by Jim Jones, who forced these victims into a mass murder-suicide pact. Declaration of Jynona Norwood in Support of Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause re: Preliminary Injunction ("Norwood Decl."), ¶ 2. This tragedy is historically referred to as the "Jonestown Massacre-Suicides".

Since the tragedy, Norwood has been holding memorial services to honor the victims of the Jonestown Massacre-Suicides, and since 1980, the memorial services have been held annually at Defendants' cemetery, located at 6450 Camden Street, Oakland, CA 94605, as 406 bodies are buried in a mass grave at the cemetery, most of whom are children. Norwood Decl., ¶ 2.

In November 1992, Defendants orally agreed that they would assist in the building of a memorial wall to honor the victims of the Jonestown Massacre-Suicides at the mass grave site ("Jonestown Memorial Wall"). Id., ¶ 6. Further this agreement, Defendants insisted that Plaintiffs utilize their monument vendor, Marin Monument Company and Amador Memorial Company, in order to ensure that the monument was constructed by a company that best knew the grounds of the cemetery and what size granite would fit at the mass grave site. Id. at \P 7-8; Complaint, ¶ 21. Plaintiffs complied with this request, and soon thereafter, Marin Monument Company circulated plans and specifications for the Jonestown Memorial Wall to Defendants. Norwood Decl., ¶ 12. The parties' agreements were formalized in multiple writings, including a

writing from Defendant Kamphausen in 2002 and a writing from Plaintiff Norwood to Defendants in 2007. Norwood Decl., ¶¶ 8, 10.

Plaintiffs raised tens of thousands of dollars for the Jonestown Memorial Wall, and paid to Marin Memorial Company more than \$30,000 for the memorial as well. All of the granite panels have been ordered, and two of the nine panels have been completed. *Id.*, ¶¶ 11, 13. Defendants have seen the granite panels, as well as the two completed granite panels, and at no point in time objected to the size or any of the other specifications of the Jonestown Memorial Wall. *Id.* ¶ 12.

In December, 2009, Defendants wrote a letter to Plaintiffs alleging that the Jonestown Memorial Wall had never been approved by Defendants and it was too large. *Id.*, ¶ 15. Prior to this, Defendants had never objected to the size or general specifications of the Jonestown Memorial Wall. Plaintiffs attempted to contact Defendants to confer about the content of the letter, to no avail.

On March 1, 2011, Plaintiffs discovered, to their horror, that Defendants reneged on the parties' agreement and, instead, decided to permit the new People's Temple Church, led by Fielding McGehee and Jim Jones, Jr. to erect their *own* memorial, which is set to include the name of *Jim Jones himself* as a victim of the Jonestown Massacre-Suicides. This travesty has, and will cause, the families of victims of the Jonestown Massacre-Suicides to be adversely affected by the tragedy which occurred in the loss of all of the individuals in the mass grave site at the hands of Jim Jones. Norwood Decl., ¶ 19. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that grading and foundation work has already been completed, and that the monument will be erected in time to be unveiled on Memorial Day.

III. <u>LEGAL ARGUMENT</u>

1. Legal Standard on Temporary Restraining Order

The Court will grant a temporary restraining order if it appears that the moving party is entitled to the relief granted, by weighing the following factors: (1) the likelihood that the plaintiff will prevail on the merits of its case at trial; and (2) the interim harm that the plaintiff is likely to sustain if the injunction is denied compared to the harm the defendant is likely to suffer

if the court grants the preliminary injunction. Right Site Coalition v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th 336, 341-342, see also O'Connell v. Superior Court (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 1452, 1467-1468.

A temporary restraining order will be granted when it appears by the verified complaint or affidavits that the commission or continuance of some act during the litigation would produce waste, or great or irreparable injury, to a party in the action. Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(2).

A court will issue a TRO only for a limited period of time, which is usually pending its consideration whether to order a preliminary injunction. San Diego Water Co. v. Pacific Coast S.S. Co. (1894) 101 Cal. 216, 218; see also Code Civ. Proc. § 527. A TRO terminates automatically when a preliminary injunction is issued or denied. Landmark Holding Group, Inc. v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal.App.3d 525, 529.

Temporary restraining orders may be granted *ex parte* if it appears from the facts set forth in affidavits, declarations or the verified complaint that great or irreparable injury would result to the applicants before the matter can be heard on noticed motion. Code Civ. Proc. § 527(c)(1).

1. Plaintiffs Are Likely To Prevail On the Merits

The underlying action is one for Breach of Oral Contract, Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing, Intentional Misrepresentation of Fact, Negligent Misrepresentation of Fact, Fraud, Injunctive Relief, and Declaratory Relief. Plaintiffs have, and will, provide evidence that Defendants agreed to permit Plaintiffs to construct the Jonestown Memorial Wall upon the mass grave site of the victims of the Jonestown Massacre-Suicides. Plaintiffs paid more than \$30,000 to commence the process, and two of the nine memorial plaques are completed. Instead of complying with their end of the bargain, Defendants repudiated their agreement and all promises that they made with Plaintiffs, despite the fact that two plaques had been finished, and have since allowed the surviving People's Church to erect the Jim Jones Memorial wall and honor Jim Jones, the individual who was himself responsible for the Jonestown Massacre-Suicides. As a result, Plaintiffs are likely to prevail on their claims of breach of contract and the fraudulent misrepresentations as stated in the Complaint, and the temporary restraining order should be granted.

Plaintiffs Will Suffer Immediate Irreparable Harm Absent an Order Enjoining Defendants; Thus, Issuance of a TRO Ex Parte is Appropriate

If it is shown that the threatened injury forming the basis for seeking a TRO cannot be compensated for by an ordinary damage award, the damage is considered irreparable thus forming the basis for the issuance of the TRO. *Brownfield v. Daniel Freeman Marina Hospital* (1989) 208 Cal.App.3d 405, 410; see also Helms Bakeries v. St. Bd. Equalization (1942) 53 Cal.App.2d 417, 425.

Plaintiffs can easily demonstrate that they will suffer immediate irreparable injury absent preliminary relief. Grading and foundation work, as well as extensive renovations have already been completed at the mass grave site to permit the construction of the rival monument, and it is set to be constructed in order to be unveiled by no later than Memorial Day weekend. Grading and foundation work is ongoing, and must be stopped to ensure that the Jim Jones Memorial is not installed while the lawsuit is pending. It would be far more costly to resolve this dispute once the Jim Jones Memorial has been installed, so not only is time of the essence, the issuance of a temporary restraining order would prevent the unnecessary and further incurring of costs while the dispute, upon which Plaintiffs are likely to prevail, is adjudicated. Given that the memorial is set to be unveiled on Memorial Day Weekend, time is of the essence in stopping the work that is ongoing at Evergreen Cemetery, thus creating a basis for the immediate issuance of a TRO before a noticed motion can be heard.

In repudiating their agreement to Plaintiffs that Plaintiffs were permitted to erect their own memorial on the mass grave site, one that did *not* include the name of Jim Jones,

Defendants have already caused excessive damage to Plaintiffs, who have ongoing relationships with donees who have provided thousands of dollars to Plaintiffs' cause, damaging Plaintiffs' reputation in a manner that cannot be compensated for by money damages. Defendants have made it apparent that they do not intend to comply with the parties' agreement, and thus a temporary restraining order against Defendants should be issued *ex parte*.

///

///

Goins & Associates PLC 1330 Broadway, Suite 1530, Oakland, California 94612 Tel. (510) 893-9465; Fax (510) 893-4228

3. The Balance of Hardships Tips Decidedly in Plaintiffs' Favor

As for the balance of hardships, Defendants have maliciously permitted a rival memorial to be erected on the mass grave site promised to Plaintiffs. Additionally, Plaintiffs have been put to a substantial burden and expense of hiring lawyers to enjoin Defendants' violation. Plaintiffs have repeatedly notified Defendants of their objections to the violations, yet Defendants have refused to voluntarily stop the violative conduct. Finally, the difficulty of calculating and quantifying Plaintiffs' loss, including but not limited to the unique mass grave site and reputation as a non-profit entity accepting donations for the Jonestown Memorial Wall has resulted, and will continue to result from Defendants' violative conduct, makes monetary damages alone insufficient, and causes the balance of hardships to tip decidedly in Plaintiffs' favor. The equities could hardly weigh more heavily toward issuance of a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction.

V. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

As demonstrated above, Defendants' conduct has caused Plaintiffs immediate irreparable harm, and all the factors tip decidedly in favor of awarding immediate injunctive relief in the form of a temporary restraining order *ex parte*. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiffs' application for a temporary restraining order should be granted to enjoin Defendants from construction, or permitting the construction of any memorial upon the mass grave site of the victims of Jonestown until the instant action is adjudicated.

Dated: May 9, 2011

GOINTS & ASSOCIATES //
Annofessional Law Corporation

VĒRNON Č. GOINS IÍ YASMIN GILANI

Attorneys for Defendants

GUYANA TRIBUTE FOUNDATION and

JYNONA NORWOOD

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION SHOULD NOT ISSUE Guyana Tribute Foundation et al. vs. Evergreen Cemetery Association et al.