

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE
CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

MAY 16 2012

ALAN CARLSON, Clerk of the Court

S. Garcia
BY S GARCIA

RECEIVED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER
APR 30 2012

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE, CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

PETER REILLY,

Plaintiff,

v.

INQUEST TECHNOLOGY, a
California Corporation, dba In-Quest
Technology; DAVE SINGHAL;
PRADEEP SETHIA; and ~~DOES-1~~
~~through 50~~, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE No. 30-2009-00333233

**JUDGMENT AGAINST INQUEST
TECHNOLOGY ON JURY
VERDICT**

Assigned for All Purposes:
Judge Frederick P. Horn
Department C-31

Action Filed: December 31, 2009
Trial Date: September 12, 2011

This cause came on regularly for trial commencing on September 26, 2011, in Department C-31 of the above-entitled court, Honorable Frederick P. Horn presiding. Plaintiff Peter Reilly appeared by his attorneys, Eric S. Engel and H. Kim Sim of Conkle, Kremer & Engel. Defendants Inquest Technology, a California Corporation, dba In-Quest Technology, Dave Singhal and Pradeep Sethia appeared by their attorney, Thomas S. Gruenbeck of Gruenbeck & Vogeler.

A jury of 12 persons was regularly impaneled and sworn to try the action. After hearing the evidence, arguments of counsel, and instructions of the Court, the cause was

1 submitted to the jury. The jurors deliberated and subsequently returned to Court and,
2 being called, on October 12, 2011 rendered their verdict in writing as follows:

- 3
- 4 1. We, the jury in the above-entitled action, find in favor of Plaintiff Peter
5 Reilly and against Defendant Inquest Technology.
- 6
- 7 2. We, the jury in the above-entitled action, find in favor of Plaintiff Peter
8 Reilly and against Defendant Dave Singhal.
- 9
- 10 3. We, the jury in the above-entitled action, find in favor of Plaintiff Peter
11 Reilly and against Defendant Pradeep Sethia.
- 12
- 13 4. We, the jury in the above-entitled action, award damages in the amount of
14 \$2,065,702.00 in favor of Plaintiff Peter Reilly.
- 15
- 16 5. We, the jury in the above-entitled action, find that Defendant Inquest
17 Technology willfully failed to provide Plaintiff Peter Reilly with a signed
18 written contract containing all of the terms required by California Civil
19 Code § 1738.10 *et seq.*, the Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives
20 Contractual Relations Act of 1990.

21

22 It appearing by reason of said verdict that Plaintiff Peter Reilly is entitled to
23 judgment against Defendants Inquest Technology, a California Corporation, dba In-
24 Quest Technology, Dave Singhal and Pradeep Sethia.

25

26 On October 13, 2011, the Court separately made a finding of alter ego liability
27 against Defendants Dave Singhal and Pradeep Sethia individually for the liabilities of
28 Defendant Inquest Technology, a California Corporation, dba In-Quest Technology to

1 Plaintiff Peter Reilly, including all damages from the violation by Defendant Inquest
2 Technology, a California Corporation, dba In-Quest Technology of California Civil
3 Code § 1738.10 *et seq.*, the Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual
4 Relations Act of 1990.

5
6 WHEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that:

- 7
- 8 A. The damages awarded by the jury against Defendant Inquest Technology,
9 a California Corporation, dba In-Quest Technology are trebled pursuant to
10 California Civil Code § 1738.15, and Plaintiff Peter Reilly shall recover
11 from Defendant Inquest Technology the sum of \$6,197,106.00 in
12 compensatory damages, after trebling, with interest thereon at the rate of
13 ten percent (10%) per annum from October 14, 2011 until paid;
- 14
- 15 B. Attorneys' fees pursuant to California Civil Code § 1738.16 shall be
16 awarded to Plaintiff Peter Reilly against Defendant Inquest Technology, a
17 California Corporation, dba In-Quest Technology by a separate Order; and
- 18
- 19 C. Costs shall be awarded to Plaintiff Peter Reilly against Defendant Inquest
20 Technology, a California Corporation, dba In-Quest Technology by a
21 separate Order.

22
23 DATED: 5/16/12

24
25 

26 Hon. Frederick P. Horn
27 Judge of the Superior Court

1 Dated: April 30, 2012

2 Respectfully Submitted:

3 Eric S. Engel

4 H. Kim Sim, members of
5 CONKLE, KREMER & ENGEL
6 Professional Law Corporation

7 

8 Eric S. Engel
9 CONKLE, KREMER & ENGEL
10 Professional Law Corporation
11 3130 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 500
12 Santa Monica, California 90403-2351
13 Phone: (310) 998-9100 • Fax: (310) 998-9109
14 Attorneys for Plaintiff Peter Reilly

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action**. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. My business address is 3130 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 500, Santa Monica, California 90403-2351.

On April 30, 2012, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as **JUDGMENT AGAINST INQUEST TECHNOLOGY ON JURY VERDICT** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: I enclosed said document(s) in an envelope or package provided by the overnight service carrier and addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in the Service List. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight service carrier or delivered such document(s) to a courier or driver authorized by the overnight service carrier to receive documents.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on April 30, 2012, at Santa Monica, California.


Prescilla Ingram

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SERVICE LIST
Peter Reilly v. Inquest Technology, et al.
30-2009-00333233

Thomas S. Gruenbeck, Esq.
GRUENBECK & VOGELER
9110 Irvine Center Drive
Irvine, CA 92618
Telephone No.: (949)453-1874
Fax No.: (949)453-1875
Email: tom@gruenbeckvogeler.com
Attorneys for Defendants Inquest
Technology, a California Corporation,
dba In-Quest Technology, Dave Singhal,
and Pradeep Sethia

Christopher P. Walker, Esq.
Law Office of Christopher Walker
505 S. Villa Real, Suite 116
Anaheim Hills, CA 92807

Andrew S. Bisom, Esq.
Law Office of Andrew S. Bisom
695 Town Center Drive, Suite 700
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Anthony Kornarens, Esq.
Law Office of Anthony Kornarens
2907 Stanford Avenue
Marina Del Rev. CA 90292

Iain A. Macdonald, Esq.
MacDonald /Fernandez LLP
221 Sansome Street, 3rd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104

Robert P. Goe, Esq.
Goe & Forsythe, LLP
18101 Von Karman Ave., Suite 510
Irvine, CA 92612

Bryan A. Arnold, Esq.
Gordee Norwicki & Augustini
8105 Irvine Center Dr., Suite 870
Irvine, CA 92618