

1 MICHAEL C. GHIZZONI, COUNTY COUNSEL
2 BARBARA A. CARROLL, DEPUTY (Bar No. 195015)
3 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
4 105 E. Anapamu St., Suite 201
5 Santa Barbara, CA 93101
6 (805) 568-2950 / FAX: (805) 568-298
7 Email: bcarroll@countyofsb.org

8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
9 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
10 and THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
11 CALIFORNIA by and through the
12 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Santa Barbara
Darrel E. Parker, Executive Officer
5/21/2021 1:42 PM
By: Sasha Nasir, Deputy

*Exempt From Filing Fee
Pursuant To Gov. Code § 6103*

13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
14 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
15 ANACAPA DIVISION

16 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, and
17 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
18 CALIFORNIA by and through the
19 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 ISLAND VIEW RANCH, LLC, a California
23 limited liability company; ISLAND
24 BREEZE FARMS, LLC, a California
25 limited liability company; and DOES 1
26 through 50, inclusive,

27 Defendants.

CASE NO.: 21CV02021

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES,
PERMANENT INJUNCTION, AND
OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR:

1. PUBLIC NUISANCE BY THE COUNTY;
2. PUBLIC NUISANCE BY THE PEOPLE;
3. VIOLATIONS OF THE SANTA BARBARA COUNTY CODE; and
4. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 (UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW)

28 Plaintiffs COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA (hereinafter the “County”) and the
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, by and through the COUNTY OF SANTA
BARBARA (hereinafter the “People”) (collectively hereinafter “Plaintiffs”), complain against
Defendants ISLAND VIEW RANCH, LLC, a California limited liability company, and
ISLAND BREEZE FARMS, LLC, a California limited liability company (hereinafter
“Defendants”), and allege as follows:

PARTIES

1
2 1. Plaintiff the County of Santa Barbara is a political subdivision of the State of
3 California and is administered and directed through the Board of Supervisors. The County
4 has jurisdiction over the unincorporated areas of the County of the Santa Barbara.

5 2. Pursuant to the County of Santa Barbara Coastal Zoning Ordinance, Article II
6 of Chapter 35, the Planning and Development Director referred this matter to County Counsel
7 for civil enforcement litigation.

8 3. The County of Santa Barbara has been authorized by the District Attorney
9 of Santa Barbara County to bring the cause of action alleged herein for violation of
10 Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* (Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”).

11 4. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times
12 herein mentioned, defendant ISLAND VIEW RANCH, LLC (hereinafter “Island View
13 Ranch”), is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of California,
14 and at all times material to this action is the landowner of 3376 Foothill Road, Carpinteria,
15 California, assessor parcel number 005-280-026, a property zoned AG-1-10, located within
16 the Coastal Zone for regulatory purposes, and within an unincorporated area of the County of
17 Santa Barbara.

18 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times
19 herein mentioned, defendant ISLAND BREEZE FARMS, LLC, (hereinafter “Island Breeze
20 Farms”) is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of California, and
21 at all times material to this action is the operator of a business located at 3376 Foothill
22 Road, Carpinteria, California, assessor parcel number 005-280-026 (hereinafter the
23 “Property”), a property zoned AG-1-10, and that is located within an unincorporated area of
24 the County of Santa Barbara.

25 6. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times
26 herein mentioned that the business of defendant Island Breeze Farms is to cultivate cannabis
27 and that Island View Ranch has caused and/or allowed Island Breeze Farms to operate that
28 business on its Property.

1 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at the time and place
2 of the events herein mentioned and described, the Defendants, and each of them, were the
3 agents, servants, employees and joint venturers of each of the remaining Defendants and
4 were, at all times mentioned acting within the course, scope and purpose of said agency,
5 employment and joint venture.

6 8. The true names and capacities of Defendants sued as DOES 1 through 50 are
7 unknown to Plaintiffs, who therefore sue each defendant by such fictitious names, and will
8 amend this Complaint to show their true names and capacities at such time as they are
9 ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that each of the
10 Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the events
11 alleged in this Complaint.

12 9. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that all of the actions of
13 Defendants have occurred, been carried out or have furthered the violations of law at or in
14 connection with the Property, and/or the cannabis business impermissibly operated thereon
15 and/or are associated with Island View Ranch and/or Island Breeze Farms, and their business
16 operations, which include violations of law and have contributed to the nuisance presented by
17 the operation and maintenance of the cannabis business, which nuisance and violations of law
18 are sought to be restrained by the within action.

19 10. Defendants and each of them are directly responsible for the activities
20 occurring on the Property as set forth below, are responsible for continuing violations of the
21 laws and public policy of the State of California and/or local codes, regulations and/or
22 requirements applicable to Defendants' operations and activities at the Property, and/or have
23 permitted, allowed, caused, or indirectly furthered the activities at the Property alleged herein,
24 and Defendants' use of and activities at the Property, or allowance of such uses and activities,
25 are inimical to the rights and interests of the general public and constitute unlawful business
26 practices, nuisances and/or violations of law.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

2 11. Plaintiffs bring this action under Civil Code §§ 3494, 3496, 3479 and 3480;
3 Code of Civil Procedure § 731; Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.; and Santa
4 Barbara County Code §§ 35-185.4.1.a, 35-144U, 50-28, and 50-29. This is an unlimited case
5 over which this Court has jurisdiction.

6 12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because at all times
7 mentioned herein, Defendants resided, were organized, existed in, or conducted business in
8 the State of California and the County of Santa Barbara.

9 13. In addition, venue is proper in the County of Santa Barbara pursuant to
10 California Code of Civil Procedure Section 395(a) because the conduct giving rise to the
11 present action took place in the County of Santa Barbara and the real Property at issue is
12 located in this judicial district.

13 **LEGAL BACKGROUND**

14 14. The County has the authority to: (1) regulate land use pursuant to its police
15 powers under Article XI, Section 7 of the California Constitution; (2) adopt zoning ordinances
16 under the state zoning laws at Government Code Section 65800 et seq.; and (3) adopt and
17 enforce local zoning and land use requirements relating to the cultivation of cannabis under
18 Business and Professions Code Section 26200.

19 15. On January 19, 2016, the County adopted Ordinance 4954, which added
20 Article X, Medical Marijuana Regulations, to Chapter 35 (Zoning) of the County Code. It
21 prohibited cultivation of marijuana with an exception for medical marijuana cultivation
22 locations already existing on January 19, 2016, if they were legal under California state law,
23 which would “become” legal nonconforming uses. It also provided that “[n]o use permit,
24 variance, building permit, or any other entitlement, license, or permit, whether administrative
25 or discretionary, shall be approved or issued for medical marijuana cultivation in the
26 unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County.”

27 16. On April 11, 2017, the County adopted Ordinance 4993, which established a
28 limited term registry of non-personal cannabis cultivation operations within the

1 unincorporated areas of the County. Ordinance 4993 provided that: (1) persons who register
2 “may be eligible for priority license application review”; and (2) “registration through the
3 County’s Registry Program does not guarantee issuance of a local or State license and/or
4 permit.”

5 17. On November 14, 2017, the County adopted Ordinance 5019, which amended
6 Article X to provide for the termination of nonconforming uses after an amortization period
7 of: (1) 6 months after the operative date of the County’s cannabis ordinance; or (2) 18 months
8 from the effective date of Ordinance 5019, whichever was longer. If the operator submitted a
9 complete permit application, and complied with various requirements, the operator could
10 continue its medical cannabis cultivation while the application was pending. If the
11 application was denied, the operator had to cease cultivation.

12 18. On February 6, 2018, the County adopted Ordinance 5025, amending Article X
13 again. The amortization period was changed to: (1) 6 months after the Board’s action on
14 February 6, 2018, regarding a County cannabis cultivation ordinance; or (2) 18 months from
15 December 15, 2017, the effective date of Ordinance 5019, whichever was longer. It also
16 provided that Article X would be rescinded upon termination of all legal nonconforming uses.

17 19. On February 27, 2018, the County adopted Ordinances 5027 and 5028,
18 allowing commercial cannabis cultivation with the approval of the applicable permit, County
19 business license, and State cannabis license. Ordinance 5027 added Section 35.42.075,
20 Cannabis Regulations, to the Land Use & Development Code, Chapter 35, of the County
21 Code. Ordinance 5028 added Section 35-144U to Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance.
22 Ordinance 5028 was certified by California Coastal Commission on November 7, 2018.

23 20. On May 1, 2018, the County adopted Ordinance 5037, adding Chapter 50 to
24 the County Code, which provides the standards for obtaining a business license for
25 commercial cannabis operations.

26 21. In order to conduct commercial cannabis business in the County of Santa
27 Barbara, business entities must obtain the appropriate annual State license issued by one of
28 the State’s three licensing authorities (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 26012(a)(2), 26013.) Prior to

1 submitting an annual State license application to any of the three licensing authorities, new
2 cannabis business entities must first obtain local authorization from the County, which
3 consists of 1) an issued land use entitlement and 2) a cannabis business license. A separate
4 cannabis business license is required for each entity, each fixed location in which the
5 commercial cannabis activity is to occur, and each licensed activity. A cannabis business
6 license shall be obtained before the commencement of business or, if the business is in
7 operation and a license possessed, prior to the expiration of such license. (County Code, §§
8 50-3, 50-25(a)(9).)

9 22. It is unlawful for any person to conduct or engage in a commercial (referred to
10 by the State as “adult use”) cannabis activity in the County without the required land use
11 entitlements and a local business license. As a result, any grower who is cultivating cannabis
12 for commercial or adult-use (not medical) without a land use entitlement and the appropriate
13 County and State business licenses is in violation of Coastal Zoning Ordinance § 35-144U
14 and/or Land Use and Development Code § 35-42.075 and County Code, Chapter 50.

15 23. Under the County Code, any use of land in conflict with the zoning ordinances
16 is unlawful and a public nuisance. (County Code §§ 35-185.4.1.a, 35-108.050.) Any
17 condition caused or allowed to exist in violation of Chapter 50 of the County Code also is
18 declared a public nuisance. (County Code § 50-29(b).) Such nuisances are a nuisance *per se*
19 under public nuisance law. (*People v. ConAgra Grocery Products Co.* (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th
20 51, 79.) The County of Santa Barbara is a public body and as such is authorized to abate a
21 public nuisance. (Civ. Code, § 3494.)

22 24. In addition, Business and Professions Code section 17200 prohibits any
23 unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice, or any unfair, deceptive, untrue or
24 misleading advertising. “Unlawful practices” prohibited by the unfair competition statute are
25 any practices forbidden by law whether civil or criminal, federal, state, or municipal,
26 statutory, or court-made. (*Saunders v. Super. Ct.* (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 832.)

27 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

28 25. On March 22, 2019, the Overbach Family Trust through its agent Dylan Hyde,

1 submitted an application for Planning and Development Land Use Permit, Coastal
2 Development Permit, Building Permit, and Zoning Clearance to the Santa Barbara County
3 Planning & Development Department for Island Breeze Farms to conduct cannabis cultivation
4 and a nursery.

5 26. Island Breeze Farms, however, has not diligently pursued the required permits
6 as its application has been pending with the County for over two years. The County has
7 routinely requested additional information necessary for processing the application during this
8 time period, which remains pending.

9 27. Island Breeze Farms has not had and does not have a County issued land use
10 entitlement. It also has not had and does not have a County issued cannabis business license.

11 28. Island Breeze Farms is in possession of a total of 16 “temporary” state business
12 licenses for the cultivation of adult use cannabis. An operator is entitled to a provisional state
13 license if it is a legal nonconforming medical cannabis cultivator in the process of complying
14 with local ordinances. Island Breeze Farms is not in possession of any provisional medical
15 cannabis licenses.

16 29. On March 30, 2021, an on-site inspection of the Island Breeze Farms operation
17 revealed cannabis on site and commercial packaging for that cannabis.

18 30. The County Planning and Development Department also has received several
19 complaints in the past two years concerning cannabis odor from the property and about the
20 extent of a cannabis grow.

21 31. At all times relevant to this action, Island View Ranch has caused and/or
22 allowed Island Breeze Farms to operate a commercial cannabis business on its Property
23 without the appropriate land use entitlement or business license.

24 32. At all times relevant to this action, Island Breeze Farms has operated a
25 commercial cannabis business at the Property without the required land use entitlement or
26 business license.

27 33. Operating without the appropriate land use entitlement thwarts the important
28 purposes of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance to:

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

- a. Protect, maintain, and where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the Coastal Zone environment and its natural and manmade resources.
- b. Assure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of Coastal Zone resources taking into account the social and economic needs of the people of this County and of the State.
- c. Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the Coastal Zone consistent with sound resource conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.
- d. Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.
- e. Provide a definite plan for development so as to guide the future growth of the County within the Coastal Zone.
- f. Protect the character and stability (social and economic) of agricultural, residential, commercial, and industrial areas. (County Code § 35-50.)

34. Operating without a business license thwarts the important purposes of Chapter 50 to: “encourage a well regulated cannabis industry, to eliminate illegal cannabis operations and access to illegal and untested cannabis and to protect the health, life, safety and general welfare of residents, particularly vulnerable minors.” (County Code §50-5.)

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR PUBLIC NUISANCE
(Plaintiff County of Santa Barbara Against All Defendants and Does 1-50)**

35. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference as if alleged herein the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 34.

36. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Civil Code §§ 3494, 3496, 3479 and 3480; Code of Civil Procedure § 731; and Santa Barbara County Code §§ 35-185.4.1.a, 35-144U, 50-28, and 50-29.

37. At all times relevant to this action, Island View Ranch has caused and/or

1 allowed Island Breeze Farms to operate a commercial cannabis business on its property
2 without the required land use entitlement and business license. At all times relevant to this
3 action, Island Breeze Farms has operated a commercial cannabis business at the Property
4 without the required land use entitlement and business license.

5 38. Defendants' maintenance and use of the Property for the purpose of a cannabis
6 business constitutes a continuing public nuisance under Santa Barbara County Code §§ 35-
7 185.4.1.a, 35-144U, 50-28, and 50-29.

8 39. It is unlawful for any person to cultivate cannabis without the appropriate land
9 use entitlement or without having the appropriate legal nonconforming status for medical
10 cultivation. Any grower who is cultivating cannabis for commercial or adult-use (not
11 medical) without a land use entitlement is in violation of County Code § 35-144U and/or §
12 35-42.075.

13 40. In addition, it is unlawful under the County Code for a cannabis business to
14 operate without a license. (County Code §§ 35-144U, 50-3, 50-28, 50-29(a).)

15 41. Any use of land in conflict with the zoning ordinances and/or Chapter 50 of the
16 County Code is unlawful and a public nuisance. (County Code §§ 35-185.4.1.a, 35-108.050,
17 50-29(b).)

18 42. The acts of the Defendants described above constitute a public nuisance and/or
19 a nuisance per se, which the County is entitled to have enjoined under Santa Barbara County
20 Code §§ 35-185.4.1.b and 50-29.

21 43. The County is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that unless
22 restrained by this Court, Defendants, and each of them, will continue to maintain the Property
23 in the illegal and unlicensed condition as it presently exists, thereby causing irreparable injury
24 and harm to the public's health, safety, and welfare.

25 44. Furthermore, the commission and continuance of the acts complained of during
26 the pendency of this litigation would produce great and irreparable injury to the County in that
27 they impair the important regulatory and planning purposes behind County Code Chapter 50
28 and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the County is entitled to a preliminary and

1 permanent injunction prohibiting similar future acts.

2 45. The County has no plain, adequate, or speedy remedy at law in that Defendants
3 have continually violated the County Code and continue to violate the County Code
4 notwithstanding the County's efforts to bring Defendants into compliance. Unless restrained
5 by this Court's issuance of injunctive relief as requested herein, Defendants will continue to
6 maintain the nuisance.

7 46. Each and every violation of the County Code constitutes a separate violation
8 and shall be subject to all remedies and enforcement measures authorized by the Santa
9 Barbara County Code or otherwise authorized by law. Any violation shall be subject to
10 injunctive relief, costs of abatement, costs of restoration, costs of investigation, attorney's
11 fees, restitution, and any other relief or remedy available at law or in equity.

12 47. At the time of trial, the County will move the Court to amend this Complaint to
13 include any conditions discovered after filing this Complaint.

14 48. Based upon California Civil Code § 3496, or as otherwise may be provided by
15 law, the County is entitled to recover its costs, including enforcement costs and attorneys'
16 fees, and/or penalties for prevailing in this action.

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR PUBLIC NUISANCE**
18 **(Plaintiff People of the State of California Against All Defendants and Does 1-50)**

19 49. The People, by and through the County, reallege and incorporate by reference
20 as if fully alleged herein the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 48.

21 50. This cause of action is brought in the name of the People of the State of
22 California, through the County of Santa Barbara, pursuant to Civil Code §§ 3494, 3496, 3479
23 and 3480; Code of Civil Procedure § 731; and Santa Barbara County Code §§ 35-42.075, 35-
24 108.050, 35-185.4.1.a, 35-144U, 50-28, and 50-29.

25 51. Defendants, and each of them, have permitted and maintained a continuing
26 public nuisance and/or nuisance per se on the Property for at least the past several years, and
27 continuing presently. The People are informed and believe that the circumstances constituting
28 a public nuisance and/or public nuisance per se, as alleged herein, may have been going on

1 since at least March 2019.

2 52. Defendants’ wrongful conduct alleged, and/or shown by evidence, constitutes a
3 serious threat to the general health, safety, and welfare of the County and its residents and, in
4 particular, the residents surrounding the Property, and their peaceable and safe enjoyment of
5 properties.

6 53. At the time of trial, the People will move the Court to amend this Complaint to
7 include any conditions discovered or occurring after filing this Complaint.

8 54. Unless restrained by this Court’s issuance of injunctive relief as requested,
9 Defendants will continue to maintain said public nuisance and/or public nuisance per se in
10 violation of law.

11 55. Unless and until these activities are restrained by this Court, they will continue
12 to cause great and irreparable injury to the residents of the neighborhood, in that their peace
13 and tranquility are being, and have been, disturbed, and the health and safety of the public is
14 jeopardized by the businesses engaging, and continuing to engage, in activities at and/or in
15 connection with the Property that are a detriment to the public and neighborhood and
16 constitute a nuisance and/or nuisance per se.

17 56. The People have no plain, adequate, or speedy remedy at law; and Defendants
18 have demonstrated a clear unwillingness and/or inability to cease to unlawfully operate the
19 cannabis business on the Property in a manner that is compliant with the law and/or consistent
20 with the People’s legitimate interest in enforcement of zoning ordinances and regulations and
21 preservation of the character of neighborhoods.

22 57. Based upon California Civil Code § 3496, or as otherwise may be provided by
23 law, the People are entitled to recover its costs, including enforcement costs and attorneys’
24 fees, and/or penalties for prevailing in this action.

25 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF**
26 **THE SANTA BARBARA COUNTY CODE**
(Plaintiff County of Santa Barbara Against All Defendants and Does 1-50)

27 58. The County realleges and incorporates by reference as if fully alleged herein
28 the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 57.

COUNTY COUNSEL
County of Santa Barbara
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2950

1 59. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Santa Barbara County Code §§ 35-
2 42.075, 35-108.050, 35-185.4.1.a, 35-144U, 50-28, and 50-29.

3 60. It is unlawful for any person to cultivate cannabis without the appropriate land
4 use entitlement or legal nonconforming status for medical cultivation. Any grower who is
5 cultivating commercial cannabis (not medical) without a land use entitlement is in violation of
6 County Code § 35-144U and/or § 35-42.075.

7 61. Under the County Code, any use of land in conflict with the zoning ordinances
8 is unlawful. (County Code §§ 35-185.4.1.a; 35-108.050.)

9 62. In addition, it is unlawful under the County Code for a cannabis business to
10 operate without a license. (County Code §§ 35-144U, 50-3, 50-28, 50-29(a).)

11 63. At all times relevant to this action, Island View Ranch has caused and/or
12 allowed Island Breeze Farms to operate a commercial cannabis business on its property
13 without a land use entitlement and business license. At all times relevant to this action, Island
14 Breeze Farms has operated a commercial cannabis business at the Property without a land use
15 entitlement and business license.

16 64. The County is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that unless
17 restrained by this Court, Defendants, and each of them, will continue to maintain the Property
18 in the illegal and unlicensed condition as it presently exists, thereby causing irreparable injury
19 and harm to the public's health, safety, and welfare.

20 65. Furthermore, the commission and continuance of the acts complained of during
21 the pendency of this litigation would produce great and irreparable injury to the County.
22 Therefore, the County is entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction prohibiting
23 similar future acts.

24 66. Each and every violation of the County Code constitutes a separate violation
25 and shall be subject to all remedies and enforcement measures authorized by the Santa
26 Barbara County Code or otherwise authorized by law. The County Code states that any
27 violation shall be subject to injunctive relief, costs of abatement, costs of restoration, costs
28 of investigation, attorney's fees, restitution, and any other relief or remedy available at law

1 or in equity.

2 67. At the time of trial, the County will move the Court to amend this Complaint to
3 include any conditions discovered after filing this Complaint.

4 68. Based upon the County Code, or as otherwise may be provided by law, the
5 County is entitled to recover its costs, including enforcement costs and attorneys' fees, and/or
6 penalties for prevailing in this action.

7 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF UCL**
8 **(Plaintiff People of the State of California Against All Defendants and Does 1-50)**

9 69. The People, by and through the County, reallege and incorporate by reference
10 as if fully alleged herein the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 68.

11 70. Commencing on or about March 2019, Defendants have committed the
12 following acts of unfair competition, as defined by Business and Professions Code section
13 17200, by engaging in a cannabis business on the Property without the required permits and
14 licenses in violation of Santa Barbara County Code and/or State law.

15 71. The above acts and/or practices are a violation of Santa Barbara County Code
16 §§ 35-42.075, 35-108.050, 35-185.4.1.a, 35-144U, 50-28, and 50-29 and therefore constitute
17 an unlawful business act and/or practice within the meaning of Business and Professions Code
18 section 17200. The act and/or practices were and are likely to mislead the general public in
19 that: Defendants are representing to the public and to cannabis suppliers and cannabis retailers
20 that they are a lawful business, when in fact they are unpermitted and unlicensed and
21 operating in violation of the law. These acts and/or practices are allowing Defendants to
22 conduct a business without complying with regulatory safety measures. These acts and/or
23 practices are also allowing Defendants to profit to the detriment of lawful cannabis businesses
24 operating in the County.

25 72. The unfair and/or unlawful business practices of Defendants are likely to
26 continue and therefore will continue to mislead the public by allowing Defendants to conduct
27 a business without complying with regulatory safety measures, which presents a continuing
28 threat to the public.

1 unfair competition set forth above pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17203.

2 8. Defendants be ordered to pay, pursuant to Business and Professions Code §
3 17206, a civil penalty of \$2,500 for each violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200.

4 9. Defendants be ordered to pay restitutionary disgorgement of unlawful profits
5 in an amount to be proved at trial pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17203.

6 10. Defendants be ordered to pay, pursuant to County Ordinance § 1-7, a civil
7 penalty of \$500.00 per violation.

8 11. Defendants be ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$25,000 for each day the
9 violation continues pursuant to County Code § 35-185-4.2.

10 12. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Civil Code
11 § 3496, County Code § 35-185-4.2, and/or as otherwise permitted by law; and

12 13. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

13
14 Dated: May 21, 2021

MICHAEL C. GHIZZONI
COUNTY COUNSEL

15
16 By: _____
17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
18 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
19 and THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
20 CALIFORNIA by and through the
21 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
22
23
24
25
26