

21

22

23

27

28

Robin Mashal (California State Bar No. 205003)

MAY 22 2009

ØARCIA, DEPUTY

HONG & MASHAL, LLP 1875 Century Park East, Suite 600 Los Angeles, CA 90067-2507 Telephone: (310) 286-2000

Attorneys for Plaintiff,

YU CHUNG KOO

Facsimile: (310) 286-2525

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT

BC414375

YU CHUNG KOO, an individual,

Plaintiff,

VS.

HUANG CHO HONG, an individual a/k/a Joe Hong; XI FAN HONG, an individual a/k/a Fred Hong; SIU LING LI, an individual; YAN NAN HONG, an individual; HONGYE STONE, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. FRAUD IN INDUCEMENT;
- 2. BREACH OF CONTRACT;
- 3. BREACH OF DIRECTORS' FIDUCIARY DUTIES AND **REMOVAL OF DIRECTORS;**
- 4. ACCOUNTING;
- 5. INVOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION OF CORPORATION AND APPOINTMENT OF RECEIVER
- 6. DECLARATORY RELIEF;
- 7. EMBEZZLEMENT BY FIDUCIARY;
- 8. RESTITUTION AND **CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST:**
- 9. FALSE IMPRISONMENT;
- 10. ASSAULT:
- 11. BATTERY;
- 12. INTENTIONAL INFI EMOTIONAL DISTRI

9

8

11 12

10

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

22

21

26

27 28

1. Plaintiff YU CHUNG KOO, an individual ("Plaintiff") is, and was at all relevant times a resident of Los Angeles County, California.

General Allegations:

- Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant, 2. HUANG CHO HONG, an individual, also known as Joe Hong ("JOE"), is and was at all relevant times a resident of and/or doing business in Los Angeles County, California.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant, XI FAN HONG, an individual, also known as Fred Hong ("FRED"), is and was at all relevant times a resident of and/or doing business in Los Angeles County, California. On information and belief, FRED is JOE's son.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant, 4. SIU LING LI, an individual ("SIU"), is and was at all relevant times a resident of and/or doing business in Los Angeles County, California.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant, YAN NAN HONG, an individual ("YAN"), is and was at all relevant times a resident of and/or doing business in Los Angeles County, California.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant, HONGYE STONE, INC. ("HONGYE"), has at all relevant times been a Corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in Los Angeles County, California.
- 7. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff believes that each fictitiously sued defendant was in some way responsible for the acts alleged in the complaint. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at all times mentioned herein, JOE, FRED, SIU, YAN, HONGYE and DOES 1 through 50 at all relevant times were, each the agent, servant, employee, joint venturer, partner and/or co-conspirators of

2

3

4

9

14

15

16

18

17

20

21

19

23.

25 26

27

28

one another, and to the extent of doing the acts alleged herein, each acted within the course and scope of said agency, service, employment, joint venture, partnership and/or conspiracy.

- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the "corporate" form of HONGYE and other corporate defendants should be disregarded, and the remaining defendants, and each of them, should be held liable for all obligations of the corporate defendants hereunder alleged, due to fraud, defalcation, undercapitalization, lack of observance of corporate formalities, unity of interest and ownership, abuse of corporate privilege, undercapitalization, transfer of corporate assets without adequate consideration, domination, intermingling of assets, use of corporation as mere shell and instrumentality, and/or improper distribution of corporate assets.
- 10. This action is not subject to Sections 1812.10 or 2984.4 of the California Civil Code. This action is subject to Section 395 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. The obligations were entered into in, and/or when the obligations were entered into the defendant(s) resided in, and/or when this action was commenced the defendant(s) resided in, and/or the obligations herein alleged were to be performed were to be performed in this judicial district and/or Defendants' tortious conduct caused injuries within this judicial district.

FACTUAL OVERVIEW

- 11. Plaintiff incorporated HYSTONE DEPOT, INC. ("HYSTONE") under California law in February 2007. Since HYSTONE's incorporation, Plaintiff was the sole shareholder, officer and director of HYSTONE. Conformed copies of HYSTONE's Articles of Incorporation and the initial Statement of Information are collectively attached hereto as "Exhibit 1" and incorporated herein by reference. HYSTONE was in the business of stone and marble supply and installation. Plaintiff opened HYSTONE's business account with Bank of America, where Plaintiff was the sole signatory.
- 12. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Plaintiff has been the lawful tenant of the real property located at 3268 Rosemead Boulevard, El Monte, California (the "Warehouse"). Since its incorporation, HYSTONE has occupied the Warehouse and conducted business therein.
- On or about June 2007, SIU, JOE and YAN approached Plaintiff with a 13. proposition to "invest" in HYSTONE and become co-shareholders of HYSTONE. SIU proposed that SIU will invest \$75,000 in cash as consideration for receiving HYSTONE's shares. JOE and YAN indicated that they are the owners of HONGYE, a competitor of HYSTONE. JOE and

YAN proposed to merge HONGYE into HYSTONE as consideration for receiving HYSTONE's shares. Defendants proposed that after these contributions, Plaintiff would hold one-quarter (25%) of the shares of HYSTONE, and each of SIU, JOE and YAN would hold one-quarter (25%) of the shares of HYSTONE. JOE prepared a "shareholder agreement" to this effect which the parties signed on or about June 29, 2007. A true copy of this shareholder agreement is attached hereto as "Exhibit 2" and incorporated herein by reference. At the time Plaintiff signed this document, Plaintiff believed Defendants would perform on their promises.

- 14. On or about the June 19, 2007, Plaintiff, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN were present at the offices of HYSTONE's accountant, Kit Leung, CPA. That day, JOE started a verbal argument with Plaintiff, and while this argument was taking place, defendants removed from the accountant's office HYSTONE's corporate minute book, containing HYSTONE's Articles of Incorporation, the bylaws, the minutes of corporate meetings, the stock certificates and the corporate seal. Kit Leung, CPA later stated that FRED had taken the corporate minute book. Plaintiff inquired FRED about this and FRED stated that FRED had turned the corporate minute book over to JOE. Plaintiff demanded JOE to return the minute book, to no avail. Plaintiff believes the verbal argument caused by JOE was a pretext to allow defendants to convert the corporate minute book.
- 15. Soon after removing the corporate minute book, defendants filed a with the California Secretary of State, a Statement of Information dated June 19, 2007, purporting to strip Plaintiff's of ownership, officership and directorship in HYSTONE. A conformed copy of this Statement of Information is attached as "Exhibit 3" and incorporated herein by this reference.
- 16. On or about June 19, 2007, prior to signing of the "shareholder agreement" on June 29, 2007, without Plaintiff's knowledge and consent, defendants opened a bank account for HYSTONE with Washington Mutual Bank. Plaintiff was not given signatory power on this Washington Mutual bank account, nor was Plaintiff aware of the existence of this bank account. Defendants have taken control of HYSTONE's sales, and take all proceeds of sale for themselves or deposit them into the Washington Mutual bank account.
- 17. HYSTONE's account with Bank of America became depleted as defendants forced Plaintiff to pay all HYSTONE expenses from this Bank of America account, but refused to deposit any of HYSTONE's income into that bank account.

24 27 27

18. Defendants did not provide their promised investments into HYSTONE. Yet, Defendants usurped control of HYSTONE, ousted Plaintiff from HYSTONE, and subsequently merged the assets of HYSTONE into HONGYE. This is the exact opposite of the transaction defendants had promised to Plaintiff.

- 19. On information and belief, soon after defendants approached Plaintiff about investing into HYSTONE, they also approached another business owner with a similar proposal. To wit, on or about January 2008, SIU, JOE and YAN approached Jason Tsao, the owner of Rock Castle Enterprises ("R.C.E."), and offered to merge HONGYE into R.C.E. as consideration for receiving R.C.E.'s shares. Defendants prepared and signed another "shareholder agreement" with the owner of R.C.E., which shareholder agreement is nearly identical to the shareholder agreement defendants signed with Plaintiff. A copy of the shareholder agreement with Jason Tsao is attached hereto as "Exhibit 4".²
- On or about August 7, 2007 at approximately 8:00 O'clock in the evening, at the Warehouse, while Plaintiff was present at the Warehouse, JOE closed and locked the doors of office and the Warehouse, so Plaintiff could not exit. As a result JOE seized Plaintiff and forcibly, against Plaintiff's will, and without his consent and over his protest, and caused Plaintiff by force and threats of physical violence to remain in the office within the Warehouse for a period approximately an hour (60 minutes). During this time JOE refused to reconcile cash receipts and attempted to deny Plaintiff's participation in operation and access to books, records and accounts by the use of threats and coercion. JOE threatened to attack Plaintiff by force. JOE violently took away all cash and checks received and taking away all books and receipts. Starting from this date, all revenues, whether cash, checks or credit cards are taken away by JOE, and any checks made payable to the business were likely deposited into the Washington Mutual

¹ Plaintiff is informed and believes there is pending litigation in that matter, in the case of <u>Hongye Stone</u>, Inc., et al. vs. Jason Tsao, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court, Central District, Case number BC 404245.

² Pursuant to the June 29, 2007 shareholder agreement (**Exhibit 2**), HONGYE should have been merged into HYSTONE and all the assets of HONGYE should have become part of HYSTONE. Defendants' promise to use the same underlying assets of HONGYE as contribution of capital into the merger with R.C.E. is a testament to defendants' fraudulent intent.

account under JOE's control.

21. On or about October 8, 2007, at approximately 11:30 O'clock in the morning, at the office and the Warehouse, JOE approached Plaintiff in a menacing manner, with closed fists, and stated JOE's intention of striking plaintiff with his hands, fist and elbow. Joe struck plaintiff in the face with his fists and elbow, directing the blows to plaintiff's head and body, causing injuries inter alia to Plaintiff's left eye and lips. Thereafter, JOE violently assaulted Plaintiff causing injuries to Plaintiff's left eye and lips. There are witnesses to this assault.

First Cause of Action:

FRAUD IN INDUCEMENT

- 22. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 18 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 23. On or about June 2007, SIU, JOE and YAN approached Plaintiff with a proposition to "invest" in HYSTONE and become co-shareholders of HYSTONE. SIU proposed that SIU will invest \$75,000 in cash as consideration for receiving HYSTONE's shares. JOE and YAN indicated that they are the owners of HONGYE, a competitor of HYSTONE. JOE and YAN proposed to merge HONGYE into HYSTONE as consideration for receiving HYSTONE's shares. Defendants proposed that after these contributions, Plaintiff would hold one-quarter (25%) of the shares of HYSTONE, and each of SIU, JOE and YAN would hold one-quarter (25%) of the shares of HYSTONE. JOE prepared a "shareholder agreement" to this effect which the parties signed on or about June 29, 2007. A true copy of this shareholder agreement is attached hereto as "Exhibit 2" and incorporated herein by reference.
- 24. At the time SIU, JOE and YAN made the above promises to Plaintiff, they had no intention of performing on them. When, SIU, JOE and YAN made these representations, each of them knew these representations to be false and made these representations with the intention to deceive and defraud Plaintiff and to induce Plaintiff to act in reliance on these representations in the manner hereafter alleged, or with the expectation that Plaintiff would so act.
- 25. Plaintiff, at the time these representations were made by the defendants and at the time the plaintiff took the actions herein alleged, was ignorant of the falsity of the defendant's representations and believed them to be true. In reliance on these representations, and without the

knowledge of other facts concealed, Plaintiff was induced to and did sign the Shareholder Agreement. Had Plaintiff known the actual facts, Plaintiff would not have taken such action. Plaintiff's reliance on the defendant's representations was justified because SIU is a relative of Plaintiff whom Plaintiff trusted at that time. SIU introduced JOE and YAN to Plaintiff, and endorsed JOE and YAN as respectable business people.

- On information and belief, soon after defendants approached Plaintiff about investing into HYSTONE, they also approached another business owner with a similar proposal. To wit, on or about January 2008, SIU, JOE and YAN approached Jason Tsao, the owner of Rock Castle Enterprises ("R.C.E."), and offered to merge HONGYE into R.C.E. as consideration for receiving R.C.E.'s shares. Defendants prepared and signed another "shareholder agreement" with the owner of R.C.E., which shareholder agreement is nearly identical to the shareholder agreement defendants signed with Plaintiff.¹ A copy of the shareholder agreement with Jason Tsao is attached hereto as "Exhibit 4".
- 27. Plaintiff is entitled to pre-judgment interest at the rate of 10% per annum pursuant to Section 3289(b) of the California Civil Code, from and after June 2007.
- 28. As a proximate result of the fraudulent conduct of the defendant(s) as herein alleged, the plaintiff was induced to sign the Shareholder Agreement based on which Defendants took control of HYSTONE, but has Plaintiff has not received any profit or other compensation for the shares of HYSTONE, by reason of which the plaintiff has been damaged in the sums according to proof at trial, in no event less than \$700,000.
- 29. The aforementioned conduct of the defendant was an intentional misrepresentation, deceit, or concealment of a material fact known to the defendant(s) with the intention on the part of the defendant of thereby depriving the plaintiff of property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and was despicable conduct that subjected the plaintiff to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of the plaintiff's rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages.

Plaintiff is informed and believes there is pending litigation in that matter, in the case of <u>Hongye Stone</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, <u>et al.</u> vs. <u>Jason Tsao</u>, <u>et al.</u>, Los Angeles Superior Court, Central District, Case number BC 404245.

3

4

5

7 8

10

9

12 13

11

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

2526

2728

Second Cause of Action:

BREACH OF CONTRACT

(Against all Defendants)

- 30. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 29 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that all relevant times mentioned herein, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN held themselves out as the officers and directors of HYSTONE, and had control and management of HYSTONE.
- 32. Plaintiff has performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required by it on its part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.
- 33. Within the past four years, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN breached the contract by failing to contribute money and/or inventory into HYSTONE.
- 34. Plaintiff is entitled to pre-judgment interest on past due accounts, inter alia, pursuant to Section 3289(b) of the <u>California Civil Code</u> at the rate of 10% per annum, from and after June 2007.
- 35. As a result of Defendants' breach of the contracts, Plaintiff has been damaged in the sum according to proof at trial, but in no event less than Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000.00), together with interest, and general damages in form of loss of goodwill and loss of profits, and other consequential and incidental damages, and the attorney fees and costs incurred in recovering these damages.

Third Cause of Action:

BREACH OF DIRECTOR'S FIDUCIARY DUTIES AND REMOVAL OF DIRECTORS

- 36. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 35 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 37. At all times herein mentioned, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have had control of HYSTONE, and held themselves out as the directors and/or officers of HYSTONE.
- 38. JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN were never properly elected as officers or directors of HYSTONE. JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN never properly paid consideration to become

shareholders of HYSTONE, and therefore had no authority to elect directors. Even if JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN had become shareholders, they never called any shareholders meetings to elect directors for HYSTONE, in place of Plaintiff. JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN never called any directors' meetings to elect themselves as officers of HYSTONE, in place of Plaintiff.

- 39. On information and belief, the JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have committed a waste of the assets of HYSTONE and/or a diminution of the value of Plaintiff's shares in HYSTONE. During all relevant times, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have had control and management of HYSTONE, and Plaintiff has been excluded from the same.
- 40. In acting as described above defendants did not exercise the care required of directors in that, the JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN owe a duty of care to Plaintiff, the shareholder who is excluded from the operations of the company and does not have access to its books and records.
- 41. As a proximate result of the act(s) of JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN herein-above described, Plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of at least Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000.00), according to proof at trial.

Fourth Cause of Action:

ACCOUNTING

- 42. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 41 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 43. Plaintiff is the true shareholder of HYSTONE. JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have had control and management of HYSTONE, and hence, they are fiduciaries of Plaintiff. On information and belief, in the course of this relationship the JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have breached their fiduciary duties to Plaintiff, inter alia, by engaging in self dealing, by committing waste and/or by causing a diminution of the value of Plaintiff's shares of stock.
- 44. Plaintiff has requested JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN for documentation and accounting concerning HYSTONE, but JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have failed and refused to provide any documentation or accounting to Plaintiff.
 - 45. The amount of money due from JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN and Does to Plaintiff

is unknown to Plaintiff and cannot be ascertained without an accounting of the receipts and disbursements of the aforementioned operations and the transactions Defendants have conducted.

Fifth Cause of Action:

INVOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION OF CORPORATION AND APOINTMENT OF RECEIVER

- 46. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 45 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 47. HYSTONE is not subject to the Banking Law, Public Utilities Law, Savings and Loan Association Act, or Sections 1010-1062 of the <u>California Insurance Code</u>.
- 48. Plaintiff has paid for and is owner of one hundred percent (100%) of the shares of stock of HYSTONE.
- 49. SIU, JOE and YAN wrongfully claim to be shareholders of HYSTONE, and they are wrongfully interfering with Plaintiff's rights as a true shareholder. There is internal dissension and two or more factions of "shareholders" in HYSTONE are so deadlocked that its business can no longer be conducted with advantage to its shareholders.
- 50. On information and belief, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN who hold themselves out as the directors of HYSTONE and are apparently in control of HYSTONE have been guilty of mismanagement or abuse of authority or unfairness toward Plaintiff in the following respects: JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have apparently taken corporate actions alleged above, in favor of themselves and to the detriment of Plaintiff; JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN apparently caused a diminution of the value of Plaintiff's shares of HYSTONE stock; JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have embezzled money and properties belonging to HYSTONE.
- Unless a receiver is appointed to take over and manage the business and affairs of HYSTONE and to preserve its property during the pendency of this action, the interests of both HYSTONE and Plaintiff, its true shareholder, will suffer in that because HYSTONE's "shareholders" are deadlocked they cannot come to any resolution about management of the company, no election of directors or officers can take place, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN who are apparently in control of HYSTONE have not been duly elected by Plaintiff, they do not share with Plaintiff information about operations of HYSTONE, Plaintiff does not consent to the JOE,

FRED, SIU, and YAN operation of HYSTONE without Plaintiff's input, Plaintiff is concerned that JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have apparently taken corporate actions alleged above, in favor of themselves, and to the detriment of Plaintiff; JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN apparently caused a diminution of the value of Plaintiff's shares of HYSTONE stock. JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have apparently embezzled properties belonging to HYSTONE.

Sixth Cause of Action:

DECLARATORY RELIEF

(Against all Defendants)

- 52. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 51 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 53. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties herein in that Plaintiff contends that the Shareholder Agreement (**Exhibit 2**) is invalid and unenforceable because it was obtained by fraud and Plaintiff received no consideration for it.
- 54. Plaintiff seeks a declaration as to the validity of the Shareholder Agreement and the rights and responsibilities of Plaintiff and defendants under this instrument.

Seventh Cause of Action:

EMBEZZLEMENT BY FIDUCIARY

- 55. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 54 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 56. As alleged above, defendants wrongfully acquired title as shareholders, officers and directors of HYSONE. On information and belief, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN continue in such position of control and management of HYSTONE. During the course of this relationship, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN have solely and completely been in charge of keeping the inventory, cash, bank accounts, books and business records of HYSTONE.
- 57. During the period of this relationship, JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN, by means of false and fraudulent alteration and writing of checks drawn on HYSTONE business account, and by means of false, fraudulent, and deceptive entries in the check register, the journal, and other business records, misappropriated and converted to his personal use and possession, without plaintiff's knowledge or consent, the sum according to proof at trial, in no event less than One

Million Dollars (\$1,000,000), all of which sum belonged to Plaintiff.

58. As a result of Defendants' conduct, assets and properties belonging to HYSTONE have been misappropriated. Since Plaintiff is the only true shareholder of HYSTONE, Defendants' conduct has caused serious diminution to the value of shares of stock of HYSTONE held by Plaintiff.

Eighth Cause of Action:

RESTITUTION AND CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST

(Against all Defendants)

- 59. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 58 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 60. Defendants have profited from their wrongful and fraudulent acts as described above. To permit Defendants to retain any of the proceeds from their wrongful conduct would permit Defendants to profit from their own wrongdoing and to be unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff.
- 61. To avoid unjust enrichment, Defendants and each of them should be required to make restitution to Plaintiff of any and all of Plaintiff's monies, goods and/or wares, as well as all profits and proceeds received and/or derived by Defendants, from such monies goods and/or wares prior to the entry of judgment in this action.
- 62. Plaintiff further requests for a court order directing Defendants and each of them to hold Plaintiff's monies, goods and/or wares, and any profits or proceeds derived therefrom, as a constructive trustee for Plaintiff.

Ninth Cause of Action:

FLASE IMPRISONMENT

- 63. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 62 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- On or about August 7, 2007 at approximately 8:00 O'clock in the evening, at the Warehouse, while Plaintiff was present at the Warehouse, JOE closed and locked the doors of office and the Warehouse, so Plaintiff could not exit. As a result JOE seized Plaintiff and forcibly, against Plaintiff's will, and without his consent and over his protest, and caused Plaintiff

by force and threats of physical violence to remain in the office within the Warehouse for a period approximately an hour (60 minutes). During this time JOE refused to reconcile cash receipts and attempted to deny Plaintiff's participation in operation and access to books, records and accounts by the use of threats and coercion. JOE threatened to attack Plaintiff by force. Following this period of detention, JOE released plaintiff from the office and the Warehouse without charging him with any crime or taking him before a magistrate.

- 65. Immediately prior to the acts of JOE herein alleged, Plaintiff had been peacefully standing on the Warehouse, which Warehouse is leased to Plaintiff. Plaintiff did not steal, nor was he in the process of stealing, any property belonging to JOE or any of the Defendants or anyone else, nor had he committed any crime against JOE or anyone else, and defendant knew of plaintiff's innocence.
- 66. In making these threats of criminal prosecution and in imprisoning plaintiff, defendants acted with deliberate malice and for the purpose of extorting money from Plaintiff.
- As a proximate result of the acts of JOE, Doe defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was injured in his health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to his body and shock and injury to his nervous system and person, and among others, sustained the following physical injuries: injury to his eye and his face, all of which injuries have caused Plaintiff to suffer extreme and severe physical pain and mental anguish. These injuries will result in some permanent disability to Plaintiff, namely continuing mental anguish, all to his general damage.
- 68. At the time of the acts of defendants herein complained of, Plaintiff was a shareholder and an officer of HYSTONE, and of the lawful tenant of the Warehouse. As a further proximate result of the acts of defendant, and each of them, as herein alleged, Plaintiff has been, and will continue to be, prevented from attending to his occupation. The amount of earnings which will be lost to Plaintiff is unknown at this time.
- 69. The acts of defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged were willful, wanton, malicious, and oppressive, and justify the awarding of punitive damages.

Tenth Cause of Action:

ASSAULT

(Against all Defendants)

70. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 69 and incorporates them herein by

reference as though restated herein in full.

THE CASE STATE

71. On or about August 7, 2007 at approximately 8:00 O'clock in the evening, at the Warehouse, while Plaintiff was present at the Warehouse, JOE closed and locked the doors of office and the Warehouse, so Plaintiff could not exit. As a result JOE seized Plaintiff and forcibly, against Plaintiff's will, and without his consent and over his protest, and caused Plaintiff by force and threats of physical violence to remain in the office within the Warehouse for a period approximately an hour (60 minutes). During this time JOE refused to reconcile cash receipts and attempted to deny Plaintiff's participation in operation and access to books, records and accounts by the use of threats and coercion. JOE threatened to attack Plaintiff by force. JOE violently took away all cash and checks received and taking away all books and receipts. Starting from this date, all revenues, whether cash, checks or credit cards are taken away by JOE, and any checks made payable to the business were likely deposited into the Washington Mutual account under JOE's control.

- 72. On or about October 8, 2007, at approximately 11:30 O'clock in the morning, at the office and the Warehouse, JOE approached Plaintiff in a menacing manner, with closed fists, and stated JOE's intention of striking plaintiff with his hands, fist and elbow. Joe struck plaintiff in the face with his fists and elbow, directing the blows to plaintiff's head and body, causing injuries inter alia to Plaintiff's left eye and lips. Thereafter, JOE violently assaulted Plaintiff causing injuries to Plaintiff's left eye and lips. There are witnesses to this assault.
- 73. In doing the acts as alleged above, JOE intended to place Plaintiff in apprehension of great bodily harm.
- 74. As a result of defendant's acts as alleged above, plaintiff, in fact, was placed in great apprehension of great bodily harm.

Eleventh Cause of Action:

BATTERY

- 75. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 74 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 76. On or about October 8, 2007, at approximately 11:30 O'clock in the morning, at the office and the Warehouse, JOE approached Plaintiff in a menacing manner, with closed fists,

and stated JOE's intention of striking plaintiff with his hands, fist and elbow. Joe struck plaintiff in the face with his fists and elbow, directing the blows to plaintiff's head and body, causing injuries inter alia to Plaintiff's left eye and lips. Thereafter, JOE violently assaulted Plaintiff causing injuries to Plaintiff's left eye and lips.

77. In doing the acts as alleged above, defendants acted with the intent to make a contact with Plaintiff's person.

Twelfth Cause of Action:

INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

(Against all Defendants)

- 78. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 77 and incorporates them herein by reference as though restated herein in full.
- 79. JOE, FRED, SIU, and YAN held themselves out as officers and directors and HYSTONE, and as Plaintiff's co-shareholders of HYSTONE.
- 80. As alleged above, on August 7 and October 8, 2007, defendants caused assault, battery and false imprisonments on Plaintiff.
- 81. Defendants conduct was intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress. The remaining defendants' conduct in confirming and ratifying that conduct was done with knowledge that plaintiff's emotional and physical distress would thereby increase, and was done with a wanton and reckless disregard of the consequences to plaintiff.
- 82. As the proximate result of the acts alleged above, plaintiff suffered humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress, and has been injured in mind and body as follows: injury to Plaintiff's face and his general emotional state.
- 83. The acts of defendants alleged above were willful, wanton, malicious, and oppressive, and justify the awarding of exemplary and punitive damages.

//

2h

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against the Defendants, and against each of them, jointly and severally, as follows:

As to First Cause of Action for Fraud in Inducement:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

150

24

25

26

27

28

- 1. For general damages according to proof at trial, in no event less than \$1,000,000;
- 2. For special damages for loss of value of Plaintiff's shares of stock, according to proof at trial, in no event less than \$700,000;
- 3. For punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish the defendant(s) and deter others from engaging in similar misconduct;

As to Second Cause of Action for Breach of Contract:

4. For damages according to proof at trial, but in no event less than 700,000;

As to Third Cause of Action for Breach of Fiduciary Duties / Removal of Directors:

- 5. For damages according to proof at trial, but in no event less than \$700,000;
- 6. For exemplary and punitive damages;
- 7. For removal of the JOE, FRED, SIU and YAN as the officers and directors of the corporation;
- 8. That provisional directors be appointed by the Court, or other appropriate relief be given, pursuant to Section 308 of the <u>California Corporation Code</u> to break the deadlock between the shareholders;

As to Fourth Cause of Action for Accounting:

- 9. For an accounting between Plaintiff and Defendants;
- 10. For payment over to Plaintiff of the amount due from Defendants as a result of the account, and interest on that amount at the highest legal rate;

As to Fifth Cause of Action for Involuntary Dissolution of Corporation and Appointment of Receiver:

- 11. That the court decree a winding up and dissolution of HYSTONE;
- 12. That the court entertain such proceedings as may be necessary or proper for the involuntary winding up or dissolution of HYSTONE and, in that regard, make such orders for winding up and dissolution of HYSTONE as justice and equity

requireThat a receiver be appointed to take over and manage the business and affairs of HYSTONE and to preserve its property pending the hearing and determination of this complaint for dissolution of HYSTONE

As to Sixth Cause of Action for Declaratory Relief:

- 13. To declare the Shareholder Agreement (Exhibit 2) invalid;
- 14. To declare Plaintiff as the sole shareholder, officer and director of HYSTONE;
- 15. For such other and further declaratory relief the Court may deem just;

As to Seventh Cause of Action for Embezzlement:

- 16. For the value of the property converted according to proof at trial, but not less than \$1,000,000;
- 17. For interest at the legal rate on the foregoing sum pursuant to Section 3336 of the California Civil Code;
- 18. For damages for the proximate and foreseeable loss resulting from cross-defendants' conversion according to proof at trial, but not less than \$1,000,000;
- 19. For interest at the legal rate on the foregoing sum pursuant to Section 3287(a) of the California Civil Code;
- 20. For punitive and exemplary damages;
- 21. For reasonable attorney's fees;

As to Eighth Cause of Action for Restitution and Constructive Trust:

- 22. For restitution to Plaintiff of all monies, goods and/or wares Defendants received from Plaintiff, and the profits and proceeds therefrom;
- 23. For a court order court order directing Defendants and each of them to hold Plaintiff's monies, goods and/or wares, and any profits or proceeds derived therefrom, as a constructive trustee for Plaintiff;

As to Ninth Cause of Action for False Imprisonment:

- 24. For general damages according to proof;
- 25. For all medical and incidental expenses according to proof;
- 26. For all loss of earnings, past and future, according to proof;
- 27. For punitive damages;

allowable by law;

28

48. For costs of suit; and For such other and further remedy as the court may deem just and proper. 49. HONG & MASHAL, LLP Dated: May 21, 2009 By: Robin Mashal, Attorney for Plaintiff
YU CHUNG KOO

ARTICLE OF INCORPORATION

FILED
In the office of the Secretary of State
of the State of California

OF

FEB 0 6 2007

HYSTONE DEPOT, INC.

I. The name of this corporation is:

HYSTONE DEPOT, INC.

- II. The purpose of the corporation is to engage in any lawful act or activity for which a corporation may be organized under the General Corporation Law of California other than the banking business, the trust company business or the practice of a profession permitted to be incorporated by the California Corporations Code.
- III. The name and address in the State of California of this corporation's initial agent for service of process is:

YU CHUNG KOO 1101 MONTEREY PASS ROAD UNIT A MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754

IV. This corporation is authorized to issue only one class of share of stock; and the total number of shares which this corporation is authorized to issue is:

ONE MILLION SHARES (1,000,000 SHARES)

DATE: FEBURARY 1:2007

Signature of Incorporator

YU CHUNG KOO

Typed name of Incorporator





State of California Secretary of State

STATEMENT OF INFORMATION (Domestic Stock Corporation)

FEES (Filing and Disclosure): \$25.00. If amendment, see Instructions.

IMPORTANT — READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM CORPORATE NAME (Please do not after if name in pressured.)

HYSTONE DEPOT INC 1101 MONTEREY PASS RD UNIT A MONTEREY PARK CA 91754 2980329 <u>s</u>

FILED in the office of the Secretary of State of the State of California

FEB 2 8 2007

This Space For Filing Use Only

CUE DATE:			ANTERIOR DE LA CONTRACTION DEL CONTRACTION DE LA CONTRACTION DE LA CONTRACTION DE LA CONTRACTION DE LA CONTRACTION DEL CONTRACTION DE LA C
AL FORMA CORPORATE DISC	CLOSURE ACT (Corporations C	ode section 1502.1)	
author tended composition miss	t 5te with the Secretary of State	e a Corporate Disclosure Statement (information regarding publicly traded	Form SI-PT) annually, within 150 days corporations.
COMPLETE ADDRESSES FOR	THE FOLLOWING (Do not abb	reviate the name of the city. Items 2 and 3	cannoi be P.O. Ecres)
STREET ACCRESS OF PRINCIPALS 1101 MONTEREY PASS RD UNI	EXECUTIVE OFFICE	CITY AND STATE MONTEREY PARK, CA	ZIP CODE
STREET ACCRESS OF PRINCIPALS	Business office in California. II IT A	MONTEREY PARK	STATE ZIP CODE CA 91754
NAMES AND COMPLETE ADDITION THE SPECIES OF THE SPECIES OF THE PROOF THE SECOND	RESSES OF THE FOLLOWIN	G OFFICERS (The corporation must he form must not be altered.)	sve these three officers. A comparable title
1. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERY	ADORESS	CITY AND STATE	ZIP CODE
YUCHUNG KOO	2015 S BUSHNELL AVE	ALHAMBRA,	CA . 91803
E SECRETARY	ADORESS	LITY AND STATE	ZIP CODE
YUCHUNG KOO	2015 S EUSHNELL AVE	ALHAMERA.	CA 91803
* CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER/	ACCRESS	CITY AND STATE	ZIP CODE
YUCHUNG KOO	2015 S BUSHNELL AVE	ALHAMBRA,	CA
NAMES AND COMPLETE ADDITIONS FROM A RESILECT AND COMPLETE ADDITIONS	RESSES OF ALL DIRECTORS	S, INCLUDING DIRECTORS WHO AI	RE ALSO OFFICERS (The corporation
T. NAVE	ADDRESS	CITY AND STATE	ZIP CODE
MUCHUNG KOO	2015 S BUSHINELL AVE	ALHAMBRA,	CA 91803
3 NAME	ADDRESS	CITY AND STATE	ZIP CODE
> NAVE	ADDRESS	CITY AND STATE	ZIP CODE
1: NUMBER OF VACANCIES ON THE			
AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PRO address. If the agent is another of section 1505 and Item 12 must be b	rporation, the agent must have or	ual, the agent must reside in California and in file with the California Secretary of State	Hem 12 must be completed with a California a certificate pursuant to Corporations Code
** NAME OF AGENT FOR SERVICE S YUCHUNG KOO			
12. ADDRESS OF AGENT FOR SERVI 2015 S BUSHRELL AVE	OE OF PROCESS 14 CALIFORNIA, IF	AN INDIVIDUAL CITY ALHAMBRA	STATE ZIP CODE CA 91803
TYPE OF BUSINESS 13 DESCRIBE THE TYPE OF BUSINES GRANET AND MABLE	ISS OF THE CORPORATION		
GRANE! AND MADE 44 BY SUBVITING THIS STATEMEN INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS	NT OF INFORMATION TO THE SECRI IS TRUE AND CORRECT		HEIES THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN.
			· 4/4//01
YUCHUNG KOO TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSO	<u> </u>	SIGNATURE (TITLE DATE

弘业石材大卖场股东协议书

- 一、经过多方协商,就成立弘业石材大卖场(HY Stone Depot INC)新、旧股东达成如下协议:
 - 1) 弘业石材大卖场(简称新公司)是由美国弘业石材公司(Hongye Stone INC-简称旧公司)招股扩充而成立的,HY Stone 是 Hongye Stone 的缩写。
 - 2) 弘业石材公司用:现拥有的库存商品、卡车、工具及在 12200 E Washington Blvd #I Whittier, CA90606 的店铺装修和租用权计价伍万美元;公司商号、市场资源等无形资产估价伍万美元;投入 LAS Vegas HY Stone Depot INC 伍万美元并拥有该公司 50%的股份,折价伍万美元;以上三项共计壹拾伍万美元投入弘业石材大卖场。其中:中国公民厦门弘业石材公司洪延南先生(身份证 350204196303172031)持有新公司柒万伍仟美元股份;美国公民洪煌照,持有新公司柒万伍仟美元的股份。
 - 3) 美国公民古瑜春先生因从事石材经营有一些经验,除自愿将 其已建立的个人商业信用在必要时给新公司使用,及部分设备、 工具(2020 软件)无偿献给新公司使用之外;另投入现金美元 肆万伍仟柒佰玖拾肆元伍角整投入新公司,即持有新公司柒万伍 仟美元的股份。
 - 4)美国公民李少玲女士用现金美元柒万伍仟元整投入新公司,即拥有新公司柒万伍仟元的股份。
 - 5) 弘业石材大卖场以 100%的股份计算,具体明确如下:

洪延南: 占 25%

洪煌照: 占 25%

古瑜春: 占 25%

李少玲: 占 25%

- 二、HY Stone Depot INC 公司经营地址是: 3268 Rose Mead Blud E1 Monte. CA91731, 电话: (626) 573-8899、(626) 573-1899; 传真: (626) 571-8877; 所有新、旧公司商号、商标及电话、场地租约、市场资源均归新公司拥有,任何个人不得侵占或损害,公司的所有有形无形资产受美国公司法保护。
- 三、新公司自 2007 年 4 月 1 日起开始正式营业,自此之日起新、旧公司的所有债权债务均由新公司承担,之前除特别注明之外旧公司发生的债权债务与新公司无关。特别注明: 3 月份发生延续到 4-5 月份完成的客户货物订单,经协商 TMS 一半利益归旧公司以外,其他一切业务的责权均归新公司。
- 四)、公司上设董事会、下设经理部。董事会由全体股东(4人)组成,董事长由董事会选举产生、或由股份拥有最多者担任,董事长按公司法行使职权;经理部总经理,由业务较熟悉者担任并对董事会负责,执行董事会的决定,主管公司日常业务的营运事务。

五)、股东与公司员工权责:

- 1)公司全体员工是公司董事会聘请的、对其岗位负责的员工,股东可以是员工,员工也可以是非股东。
 - 2) 当股东成为公司的职员时,其行使的是职员的职责而非股东

权力。

3)股东的权利只有在董事会上行使才有效。

六、在协议由全体成员签定生效之后,再由全部股东根据具体情况制定:财务、银行、现金、仓储、工资、业务等管理制度供全体员工 执行。

七、公司股东实行自愿进出原则:

- 1)原始股东原则上三年内不能腿股,除特别情况下经董事会同意之外。
- 2)公司股东经董事会同意后,可以增资持股。
- 3)随着公司发展的需要,公司员工或其他人在愿意遵守公司的规章制度和缴足规定的资金后可以持股成为新股东。
- 4)股东所持股票在不造成公司利益受损的情况下可以自由转让,在公平原则下受让人的顺序是公司、公司股东、公司员工、其他人。
- 八、中国厦门弘业通商(HONGYE TONGSHANG)、弘业石材(HONGYE STONE)均为洪延南控股的公司;是美国弘业石材的商号法源、最重要的商业搭档;应尽全力向美国公司做好货源供货工作,向美国公司提供最合理的、好的包装产品;协助美国公司做好客户的服务工作;在未经许可之下不得与美国弘业石材公司的客户进行直接联系或干预他们之间的业务工作。
- 九、特别重要条款,为了确保公司正常运作和股东的良好信誉,财务必需确保公司经营场所的租金为第一支付款项。
- 十、本协议经全体股东签字后生效,如日后根据实际情况,经股东大

会修改并一致通过,视与本和约同等法律效应,本合约一式五份,公司及股东各持一份。

十一、2007年7月7日,为古司或主纪高日。

股东 1)

日期:

6/29/07

股东 3)

日期:

6/29/07

股东 2)

日期: 6/29/07

股东 4) 秒

日期: 6/29/200

Mary and the



State of California Secretary of State

STATEMENT OF INFORMATION

(Domestic Stock Corporation)

52

FEES (Filing and Disclosure): \$25.00. If amendment, see instructions.

IMPORTANT — READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM

CORPORATE NAME (Please do not alter if name is preprimed.)

HYSTONE DEPOT, INC 3268 ROSEMEAD BLVD EL MONTE, CA 91731 2980329

5-200 C (REV 07/2006)

in the office of the Secretary of the State of Californ.

JUN 2 2 2007

This Space For Filing Use Only **DUE DATE:** CALIFORNIA CORPORATE DISCLOSURE ACT (Corporations Code section 1502.1) A publicly traded corporation must file with the Secretary of State a Corporate Disclosure Statement (Form SI-PT) annually, within 150 days after the end of its fiscal year. Please see reverse for additional information regarding publicly traded corporations. COMPLETE ADDRESSES FOR THE FOLLOWING (Do not abbreviate the name of the city. Items 2 and 3 cannot be P.O. Boxes.) STREET ACCRESS OF PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICE CITY AND STATE 71P C^00E 3268 ROSEMEAD BLVD EL MONTE, CA 91731 STREET ADDRESS OF PRINCIPAL BUSINESS OFFICE IN CALIFORNIA, IF ANY STATE ZIP CODE CA NAMES AND COMPLETE ADDRESSES OF THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS (The corporation must have these three officers. A comparable title for the specific officer may be added; however, the preprinted titles on this form must not be altered.) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERA ADDRESS CITY AND STATE ZIP CODE SUILING LI 4061 JENNINGS DR LOS ANGELES, CA 90032 ZIP CODE SECRETARY ADORESS CITY AND STATE XIFAN HONG 306 N MOORE AVE #A MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754 CHEF FINANCIAL OFFICER ZIP CODE CITY AND STATE YANNAN HONG 306 N MOORE AVE #A MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754 MAMES AND COMPLETE ADDRESSES OF ALL DIRECTORS, INCLUDING DIRECTORS WHO ARE ALSO OFFICERS (The corporation sest have at least one director. Attach additional pages, if necessary.) ADDRESS CITY AND STATE ZIP CODE 4061 JENNINGS DR LOS ANGELES, CA 90032 SUILING U ADDRESS CITY AND STATE ZIP CODE NAME 91754 **FAN HONG** 306 N MOORE AVE #A MONTEREY PARK, CA ZIP CODE NAVE ACCRESS CITY AND STATE 306 N MOORE AVE #A MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754 YANNAN HONG 13. MUVEER OF VACANCIES ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, IF ANY: AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS (If the agent is an individual, the agent must reside in California and Item 12 must be completed with a California address. If the agent is another corporation, the agent must have on file with the California Secretary of State a certificate pursuant to Corporations Code section 1505 and item 12 must be left blank.) NAME OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS SUBJNG H ZIP CODE 1. ADDRESS OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS IN CALIFORNIA IF AN INDIVIDUAL CITY **美国 iu** 90032 4061 JENNINGS DR LOS ANGELES TYPE OF BUSINESS -3. DESCRIBERRE TYPE OF BUSINESS OF THE CORPORATION WHOLESALES OF BUILDING MATERIALS EY SUBMITTING THIS STATEMENT OF INFORMATION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THE CORPORATION CERTIFIES THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS, IS TRUE AND CORRECT. (au l SECRETARY TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING THE FORM SIGNATURE TITLE APPROVED BY SECRETARY OF STATE



Granite Countertops, Tiles, & Cabinets Import, Wholesale, Factory Outlet

3268 Rosemead Blvd El Monte CA 91731

Tel: (626) 573-8899

Fax: (626) 571-8877

弘业石头城股东协议书

- 一. 经多方协商,现成立弘业石头城,英文名为: HY STONE CITY INC.
- 1. 弘业石头城 HY STONE CITY INC 是由美国弘业石材公司 HONG YE STONE INC 招股扩充而成立, HY STONE 是由 HONGYE STONE 缩写而成。
- 2. HY STONE CITY INC. 将投入 10 万现金及 10 万货物作为初始股拥有公司 66.6%的股份。
- 3. Jason Tsao (地址在 1655 E Mission Blvd Pomona, CA 91766) 以
- 1) 原有公司所有库存货物及设备展品(以2008年2月4日登记的为准),
- 2) 原有客户,
- 3) 建筑执照

作为入股资本,占公司 33.3% 的股份。

- 4. HY STONE CITY INC 是一间独立公司,不会承担由其他公司带来的债权债务。
 - 二. HY STONE CITY INC. 的地址是 1655 E Mission Blvd Pomona CA 91766, 公司商标, 电话号码, 租约市场, 货源均归公司所有, 任何人不得侵



Granite Countertops, Tiles, & Cabinets Import, Wholesale, Factory Outlet

3268 Rosemead Blvd El Monte CA 91731

Tel: (626) 573-8899

Fax: (626) 571-8877

占及损害公司利益,有形及无形资产均受法律保障。

- 三. 公司设董事会及经理部。
- 1. 董事会由董事长,秘书长,财务长,常务董事组成。董事长由董事会选举产生,或由拥有股份最多者担任。
- 2. 经理部是执行公司经营的部门。总经理由董事长任命,总经理有雇佣和 解雇,订货及售货之决定权。总经理必须向董事会负责。
- 四.股东分为记名股和不记名股。记名股原则上三年内不能退股,除非董事会多数人同意。不记名股则可视市场需求而扩增。

五. 初始股为:

Jason Tsao 占 33.3%

Hongye Stone Inc. 占 66.7%

董事会由:

Jason Tsao

Jok (Hui Yao) Hong

Yan Nan Hong

Cui Zhong Hai

共同组成。

ATTACHER OF THE



Granite Countertops, Tiles, & Cabinets Import, Wholesale, Factory Outlet

3268 Rosemead Blvd El Monte CA 91731

Tel: (626) 573-8899

Fax: (626) 571-8877

六.在协议由全体成员签订生效之后,再由全部股东根据具体情况制定:财务,银行,现金,仓储,工资,业务等管理制度供全体员工执行。股东的权利只有在董事会上行使才有效。

- 七. 公司股东实行自愿进出原则:
- 1) 原始股东原则上三年内不能退股,除特别情况下经董事会同意之外。
- 2) 公司股东经董事会同意后,可以增资持股。
- 3)随着公司发展的需要,公司员工或其他人在愿意遵守公司的规章制度和 缴足规定的资金后可以持股成为新股东。
- 4)股东所持股票在不造成公司利益受损的情况下可以自由转让,在公平原则下受让人的顺序是公司,公司股东,公司员工,其他人。
- 八.中国厦门弘业通商(HONG YE TONG SHANG),弘业石材(HONG YE STONE)均为洪延南控股的公司,是美国弘业石材的商号法源,最重要的商业搭档,应尽全力向美国公司做好货源供货工作,向美国公司提供最合理的,最好的包装产品,协助美国公司做好客户的服务工作,在未经许可之下不得与美国弘业石材公司的客户进行直接联系或干预他们之间的业务工作。
 - 九. 特别重要条款,为了确保公司正常运作和股东的良好信誉,财务必需确

TANK THE PERSON NAMED IN



Granite Countertops, Tiles, & Cabinets Import, Wholesale, Factory Outlet

3268 Rosemead Blvd El Monte CA 91731

Tel: (626) 573-8899

Fax: (626) 571-8877

保公司经营场所的租金为第一支付款项。

十.本协议经全体股东签字后生效,如日后根据实际情况,经股东大会修改并一致通过,视与本合约同等法律效应。本合约一式六份,公司及股东各持一份。

股东 1)

日期:

股东 2)

日期:

股东 3)

日期:

股东 4)

日期:

-19-08

		CM-010
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Barning Pohin Machal (California State Bar No. 205)		
Robin Mashal (California State Bar No. 205) HONG & MASHAL, LLP		LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
1875 Century Park East, Sixth Floor, Los Ar	ngeles, California 90067-2507	
TELEPHONE NO.: (310) 286-2000	FAX NO.: (310) 286-2525	MAY 2 2 2009
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): YU CHUNG KOO	A 1	IN C HARR
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street	Angeles	,
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street		JOHNA CLARKE, CLERK
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, California 90	0012	100 cpm
BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk Courthouse	<u> </u>	BY MARY CARCIA, DEPUTY
CASE NAME: Koo vs.	Hong	
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:
X Unlimited Limited		BC414375
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	IIIDGE:
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000 \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defend (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	ant DEPT:
	ow must be completed (see instructions of	·
1. Check one box below for the case type that		
Auto Tort	F 1	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)
Auto (22)	Dicach of contract watranty (00)	·
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) Construction defect (10)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09) Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14) Wrongful eviction (33)	above listed provisionally complex case types (41)
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	045	Enforcement of Judgment
Business tort/unfair business practice (07) Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)		Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Professional negligence (25)		Miscellaneous Civil Petition
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05) Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Employment Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	
2. This case is X is not com	·	ules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
factors requiring exceptional judicial mana	·	·
a. Large number of separately repre		r of witnesses
b Extensive motion practice raising		with related actions pending in one or more courts
issues that will be time-consuming c. Substantial amount of documenta		ties, states, or countries, or in a federal court ostjudgment judicial supervision
	<u>. </u>	
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.		declaratory or injunctive relief c. X punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): Two	erve ss action suit.	\circ
6 If there are any known related cases, file a		may use form CM-015.
# ## # ##	,	
Date: May 21, 2009 (1) Robin Mashal	> \	XXXX
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the	NOTICE first paper filed in the action or proceedir	no (except small claims cases or cases filed
		les of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
in sanctions. • File this cover sheet in addition to any cov		
		u must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
other parties to the action or proceeding.		
 Unless this is a collections case under rule 	e ਤ.740 or a complex case, this cover sh	eet will be used for statistical purposes only.

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER	BC414375
Koo vs. Hong		-

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

(CENTILICATE OF OROGINDO FOR ADDICINIENT TO CODICTIOCOE ECOATION)
This form is required pursuant to LASC Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.
Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:
JURY TRIAL? ✓ YES CLASS ACTION? ☐ YES LIMITED CASE? ☐ YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 5.0 ☐ HOURS/ ☑ DAYS
Item II. Select the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):
Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet Form, find the main civil case cover sheet heading for your case in
the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A , the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.
Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case.
Step 3: In Column C, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked.
For any exception to the court location, see Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0.

Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)

- Class Actions must be filed in the County Courthouse, Central District. May be filed in Central (Other county, or no Bodily Injury/Property Damage). Location where cause of action arose. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred. Location where performance required or defendant resides.

- Cocation of property or permanently garaged vehicle.
 Location where petitioner resides.
 Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
 Location where one or more of the parties reside.
 Location of Labor Commissioner Office.

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
	Asbestos (04)	☐ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage ☐ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2.
	Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	☐ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons ☐ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 2., 4. 1., 2., 4.
18 18 18	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	 ☐ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) ☐ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) ☐ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress ☐ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death 	1., 2., 4. 1., 2., 4. 1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 4.
	Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 2., 3.
(3	Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
ı	Defamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
	Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.

Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort

Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Tort

, Dama 1.}	SHORT TITLE:	Koo vs. Hong	
ıry/Property Fort (Cont'o	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons -See Step 3 Above
Non-Personal Injury/Property Dama Wrongful Death Tort (Cont'd.)	Professional Negligence (25)	☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice ☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
Non-F Wron	Other (35)	☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
ment	Wrongful Termination (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Employment	Other Employment (15)	☐ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3.
ct	Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	 □ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not Unlawful Detainer or wrongful eviction) □ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) □ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) □ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) 	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Contract	Collections (09)	☐ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
	Insurance Coverage (18)	☐ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
	Other Contract (37)	 ✓ A6009 Contractual Fraud ☐ A6031 Tortious Interference ☐ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) 	1 (2,3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
t,	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
Property	Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Real	Other Real Property (26)	☐ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure ☐ A6032 Quiet Title ☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
etainer	Unlawful Detainer- Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
wful D	Unlawful Detainer- Residential (32)	☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
v Unla	Unlawful Detainer- Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.
icial Review Unlawful Detainer সূত্ৰী ক্ষ্যা	Asset Forfeiture (05) Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case ☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 6. 2., 5.
.⊆			

SHORT TITLE:		CASE NUMBER		
	Koo vs. Hong			

Judicial Review (Cont'd.)	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
3		☐ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus	2., 8.
vie	Writ of Mandate	☐ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter	2.
~	(02)	☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2.
Judicia	Other Judicial Review (39)	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
plex	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction defect	1., 2., 3.
Comi	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
onally Co Litigation	Securities Litigation (28)	☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	☐ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
۵.	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	 □ A6141 Sister State Judgment □ A6160 Abstract of Judgment □ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) □ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) 	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8.
Enfo of J		 ☐ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax ☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case 	2., 8. 2., 8., 9.
i`vi	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	 □ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only □ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) □ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) □ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex) 	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance(21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions		☐ A6121 Civil Harassment ☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment ☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case ☐ A6190 Election Contest ☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name ☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law ☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8. 2., 9.

SHORT TITLE: Koo vs. Hong			CASE NUMBER
			accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.
	THE NUMBER UNDE APPLIES IN THIS CA	ASE	ADDRESS: 3268 Rosemead Boulevard
CITY: El Monte	STATE: CA	ZIP CODE: 91731	
	he above-entitled	matter is properly t	perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is filed for assignment to the <u>Stanley Mosk</u> courthouse in the r Court (Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and LASC Local Rule 2.0,
oubds. (b), (c) and (d)). Dated:05/21/2009	·		SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FINE PARTY)

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet form CM-010.
- 4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form LACIV 109 (Rev. 01/07), LASC Approved 03-04.
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- Signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, JC form FL-935, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age, or if required by Court.
- Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.