1	Steven L. Hayes A Law Corporation	RECEIVED JAN 1 3 1993 Ans'd			
2 3	1013 Oneonta Drive Los Angeles, California 90065 (213) 235-8578	ORIGINAL' <i>FILED</i>			
4 5 6	Attorney for Plaintiffs BOB L. NEILSON, SANDRA WOODARD, BOB SCHUCH, CHARLES A. VAN BREEMAN, GARY GUM, VICKI J. DRIES, PATRICIA ROSS, JENNIFER BEAUBIEN				
7 8 9	FOR THE COUNTY OF	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT			
10 11	BOB L. NEILSON,	CASE NO. EC 010163			
12 13	Plaintiff,) va.)	[XXXX] ORDER GRANTING JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL AND AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES			
14 15 16 17	CULT AWARENESS NETWORK, a California Non-profit Corporation;) CYNTHIA KISSER, an individual; and) PRISCILLA COATES, an individual; COREY SLAVIN, an individual; RACHEL ANDRES, an individual; and DOES 1-100, inclusive,				
18 19	Defendants.	CASE NO. EC UIUI04			
20 21 22	SANDRA WOODARD, Plaintiff, vs. CULT AWARENESS NEIWORK, a				
23 24 25 26	California Non-Profit Corporation; CYNIHIA KTSSER, an individual; and PRISCILLA COATES, an individual; COREY SLAVIN, an individual; RACHEL ANDRES, an individual; and DOES 1-100, included,				
27 27 28	Dafandants.	CASE NO. EC 010165			

. . !

1	BOB SCOTCH,	+			
2	Plaintiff,	1			
3	vs.	•			
4	CULT AWARENESS NETWORK, a				
5	California Non-Profit Corporation;; CYNTHIA KISSER, an individual; and;				
6	PRISCILLA COATES, an individual;) COREY SLAVIN, an individual;) RACHEL ANDRES, an individual; and ;	}			
7	RACHEL ANDRES, an individual; and ; DOES 1-100, inclusive,) }			
8) Defendants.)	CASE	NO.	EC	010166
9	}	1			
10	CHARLES A. VAN BREEMEN	1			
1	Plaintiff,				
11	vs.) }			
12) CULT AWARENESS NETWORK, a)			
13	California Non-Profit Corporation;; CYNTHIA KISSER, an individual; and;				
14	PRISCILLA COATES, an individual;)				
15)			
16	DOES 1-100, inclusive,	CASE	NO.	EC	010167
17	Defendants.)			2
18	·				
19	GARY GUM,				
20	Plaintiff,				•
Ì	VS.)			
21	CULT AwareneSS NETWORK, a California Non-Profit Corporation;				
22	CYNTHIA KISSER, an individual; and PRISCILLA COATES, an individual;				
23	COREY SLAVIN, an individual; RACHEL ANDRES, an individual; and				
24	DOES 1-100, inclusive,	Ś			
25	Defendants.) .)			
26)			
27) CASE)	NO.	EC	010168
28)			

l

1	VICKY J. DRIES,		
2	Plaintiff,		
3	vs.		
4	CULT AWARENESS NETWORK, a]		
5	California Non-Profit Corporation;] CYNTHIA KISSER, an individual; and]		
6	PRISCILLA COATES, an individual;] COREY SLAVIN, an individual;]	I	
7	RACHEL ANDRES, an individual; and] DOES 1-100, inclusive,]	CASE NO.	010169
8		1	
9	Defendants.		
10	PATRICIA ROSS,		
11	Plaintiff,	I	
12	vs.		
13	CULT AWARENESS NETWORK, a]		
	CYNTHIA KISSER, an individual; and]		
14	COREY SLAVIN, an individual;		-
15	RACHEL ANDRES, an individual; and DOES 1-100, inclusive,	CASE NO.	EC 010188
16	Defendants.		
17			
18	JENNIFER BEAUBIEN,		
19	Plaintiff,		
20	vs.		•
21	CULT AWARENESS NETWORK, a California Non-Profit Corporation;		•
22	CYNTHIA KISSER, an individual; and PRISCILLA COATES, an individual;		
23	COREY SLAVIN, an individual; RACHEL ANDRES, an individual; and		
24			
25	Defendants.		
26)	
27	111		
28	111		

I

i

3

١.

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OP RECORD:

On December 4, 1992 at 9:00 a.a. in Department B of the
above-entitled Court, plaintiffs' Motion for Judgment of
Dismissal and for Recovery of Attorneys' Faas came on regularly
for hearing before Honorable Thomas R. Murphy. Steven L.
Hayes appeared on behalf of plaintiffs and Daniel A. Leipold
appeared on behalf of defendants.

Plaintiffs filed these actions against defendants becausa of 8 91 defendants' conduct in discriminating against plaintiffs based 10 upon their religious beliefs, by denying then the right, as CAN 11 members, to attend defendant CAN'S 1992 annual convention. 12 Plaintiffs sought an order allowing them tha right to attend the 13 convention by way of a preliminary injunction. Tha ordar was 14 granted by this Court on tha condition that plaintiffs conduct 15 themselves in an appropriate and non-disruptive manner. Plaintiffs thereafter attended the convention. There has been no 16 17 evidence put before this Court that plaintiffs conducted 18 themsalves otherwise than in an orderly and appropriata manner as 19 they represented to this Court they would.

Based upon tha foregoing, this Court finds that defendants engaged in raligious discrimination prohibitad by California Civil Code Section 51 in denying plaintiffs equal access to defendants' annual convention, contrary to defendants' representations that the convention would be opan to all parsons without regard to thair raligious beliefs.

Plaintiffs, in obtaining an injunction allowing them to attend the convention and than attending the convention in a manner as ordered by this Court, prevailed on their claim and

4

•	ſ		×
	s unlawful conduct of		
	2	defendants.	
	3	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, that	plaintiffs' Motion for
	4	Judgment of Dismissal and Recovery	
•	5	the amount of \$6,009.00 against def	endant, is granted.
	6		
	7	DEC 15 1992	Thomas C.Murphy
	8 9	Dated:	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
	10		
	11	h:\can\neilson\neilson.ord	
	12		
t	13		
•	14		
	15		
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		•
	21		
	22		
	23		
	24		
	25 26		
	27		
	28		
	•	S S	