

NO.

JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
DIVISIONSHM 2601, LLC
12705 Crestmoor Circle
Prospect, KY 40059

PLAINTIFFS

and

DINA, LLC d/b/a DINO'S FOOD MART
2601 West Broadway
Louisville, KY 40211

v.

DENISE BENTLEY
IN HER INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY
Louisville Metro Council
601 W. Jefferson St.
Louisville, KY 40202

DEFENDANTS

and

DONNA PURVIS
IN HER INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY
Louisville Metro Council
601 W. Jefferson St.
Louisville, KY 40202

and

DAVID JAMES
IN HIS INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY
Louisville Metro Council
601 W. Jefferson St.
Louisville, KY 40202

COMPLAINT
(Filed Electronically)

Come the Plaintiffs, SHM 2601, LLC and DINA, LLC, d/b/a DINO'S FOOD MART, by counsel, and for their complaint against Defendants, DENISE BENTLEY, DONNA PURVIS, and DAVID JAMES, hereby states as follows.

1. Plaintiff SHM 2601, LLC, is now and was at all pertinent times a limited liability company registered to transact business in Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky.

2. Plaintiff Dina, LLC, d/b/a DINO'S FOOD MART, is now and was at all pertinent times a limited liability company registered to transact business in Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky.

3. Defendant Denise Bentley, is now and was at all pertinent times a resident of Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky. She is being sued in her individual capacity.

4. Defendant Donna Purvis, is now and was at all pertinent times a resident of Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky. She is being sued in her individual capacity.

5. Defendant David James, is now and was at all pertinent times a resident of Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky. He is being sued in his individual capacity.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

6. Plaintiff Dino's operates a business located at 2601 West Broadway, Louisville, Kentucky 40211.

7. Plaintiff SHM owns the real estate located at 2601 West Broadway, Louisville, Kentucky 40211.

8. Plaintiffs appeared before Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board for notices of public nuisance issued by Louisville Metro Department of Codes and Regulations.

9. On or about July 24th, 2020, Defendants addressed the Plaintiffs on the record and in a public hearing where Defendants defamed Plaintiffs, and used slanderous language that was false and misleading while describing Plaintiffs' businesses and the atmosphere around them.

10. Defendant Bentley stated the following while addressing the Plaintiffs' businesses:

- A. That Dino's was selling subpar products including chicken wings, black and mild cigars, and beer;
- B. That the premises were unsanitary and unclean;
- C. That the landlord and store allowed the selling of "spice and crack" and "crack kits" on the premises;
- D. That Dino's allows for vulgarity from individuals on their premises;
- F. That Plaintiffs allowed the shooting of persons at their gas pumps;
- G. That Plaintiffs were the cause of the shooting of David McAttee;
- H. That the dumpsters were overflowing with garbage and waste: and
- I. That Plaintiffs were engaged in or allowed criminal activity including the sale of drugs, prostitution, and other crimes on the premises.

Said allegations are false.

11. Defendant Purvis stated the following while addressing the Plaintiffs' businesses:

- A. That Dino's was selling subpar products including chicken wings, black and mild cigars, and beer;
- B. That the premises were unsanitary and unclean;
- C. That the landlord and store allowed the selling of "spice and crack" and "crack kits" on the premises;
- D. That Plaintiffs allowed the shooting of persons at their gas pumps;
- E. That Plaintiffs were the cause of the shooting of David McAttee and that David McAttee would still be alive if it weren't for Dino's;
- F. That Dino's serves anyone with a social disfunction;
- G. That Dino's engages in the sale of items to conceal illicit drug use;
- H. That the dumpsters were overflowing with garbage and waste: and

I. That Plaintiffs were engaged in or allowed criminal activity including the sale of drugs, prostitution, and other crimes on the premises.

Said allegations are false.

12. Defendant James stated the following while addressing the Plaintiffs' businesses:

- A. "Nothing rarely good happens there", "there" being Dino's lot;
- B. Referred to Dino's as a "shell game", and claimed that if "they" do not own property "they" should "give the [rent] money back";
- C. Claimed that Dino's is only a façade;
- D. That Dino's has sold drug paraphernalia, crack cocaine "kits" behind the counter, and urine alteration kits to conceal illicit drug use by those who are on probation and parole;
- E. Claimed there are "stacks and stacks" of citations for various crimes including murder, robbery, the sale of spice (K2), and prostitution occurring on Dino's lot, is limited to Dino's, and that Dino's is in some way facilitating these acts;
- F. Made the assertion that Dino's (a convenience store) would not "last a day on the corner of Hurstbourne and Shelbyville Road;
- G. Referred to Dino's as a "vampire, sucking the life out of west Louisville";
- H. Claimed that in all the years he has been working for the Louisville Metro Council across the street, he has "never" seen any off-duty officers patrolling Dino's lot despite the numerous receipts provided by Dino's and also despite that the off duty officers patrolled at night and the Louisville Metro Council's hours of operation being 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.;
- I. Claimed that this testimony was not an assertion but the "truth" without any evidence to support these claims.

Again, said allegations are false.

13. Defendants have engaged in conduct that constitutes discrimination against Plaintiffs specifically due to their race and ethnic background. Out of all the businesses in Jefferson County, Kentucky, Defendants have selected to middle eastern stores to claim they are a public nuisance due third persons commission of crimes on and off their property. Plaintiffs have not been charged or convicted of crimes on or off their property. Defendants have stated Plaintiffs

are vampires who take money from Defendants' neighborhood. Defendants have openly advocated the closure of the middle eastern businesses so that the businesses may be operated by persons of African-American descent.

**COUNT 1
NEGLIGENCE
BY BENTLEY**

14. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

15. Defendant Bentley owed Plaintiffs a duty to exercise reasonable care in addressing the Plaintiffs on the record to the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board, to the media, and to the general public.

16. Defendant Bentley breached her duty when she failed to exercise reasonable care while making false and malicious allegations against Plaintiffs.

17. Defendant Bentley knew or should have known that Plaintiffs would foreseeably suffer injury to their reputation and standing in the community as a result of Defendant Bentley's failure to exercise ordinary care.

18. As a direct and proximate cause of the negligent actions of Defendant Bentley, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

19. Furthermore, the actions of the Defendant Bentley were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 2
DEFAMATION PER SE
BY BENTLEY**

20. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

21. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defamation and Defamation Per Se, by Defendant Bentley, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

22. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Bentley were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 3
INVASION OF PRIVACY
BY BENTLEY**

23. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

24. Defendant Bentley invaded the Plaintiffs' rights of privacy. She invaded Plaintiffs' right to be free from unwarranted publicity, or the right to live without unwarranted interference by the public about matters with which the public is not necessarily concerned. Defendant acted recklessly and unreasonably. Defendant engaged in (1) unreasonable intrusion upon seclusion of Plaintiffs; (2) unreasonable publicity given to Plaintiffs' private life; or (3) conduct constituting false light invasion of privacy.

25. The false light that the Plaintiffs were placed in is one that would be highly offensive to a reasonable person and business owner.

26. Defendant Bentley had knowledge of, or acted in reckless disregard, as to the falsity of the accusations against Plaintiffs.

27. As a direct and proximate cause of the invasion of privacy by Defendant Bentley, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

28. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Bentley were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 4
TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE OF A BUSINESS
BY BENTLEY**

29. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

30. Defendant Bentley intentionally interfered with Plaintiffs' business by defaming the Plaintiffs by publicly stating a slew of false claims. Defendant Bentley knew that Plaintiffs owned or operated a competing convenience store in Louisville. Defendant Bentley acted with malice by purposefully defaming the Plaintiffs. As a result of Defendant Bentley's allegations against the Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' business suffered a pecuniary loss from customers who believed the Defendant's false accusations.

31. As a direct and proximate cause of the tortious interference of Plaintiffs' businesses by Defendant Bentley, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

32. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Bentley were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 5
WRONGFUL USE OF CIVIL PROCEEDINGS
BY BENTLEY**

33. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

34. Defendant Bentley continued the civil proceeding involving Plaintiffs' notice of public nuisance beyond the scope of what Plaintiffs were before the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board for.

35. Defendant Bentley pursued Plaintiffs with malice aforethought and slandered their businesses in a public hearing.

36. Defendant Bentley pursued civil proceedings with a lack of probable cause and with no criminal charges being brought against Plaintiffs, which she alleged.

37. As a direct and proximate cause of the wrongful civil proceeding by Defendant Bentley, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

38. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Bentley were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 6
ABUSE OF PROCESS
BY BENTLEY**

39. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

40. Defendant Bentley attempted to use the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board against Plaintiffs primarily to accomplish a purpose for which the Louisville Metro Code Board was not designed.

41. As a direct and proximate cause of the abuse of process by Defendant Bentley, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

42. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Bentley were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 7
NEGLIGENCE
BY PURVIS**

43. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

44. Defendant Purvis owed Plaintiffs a duty to exercise reasonable care in addressing the Plaintiffs on the record to the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board, to the media, and to the general public.

45. Defendant Purvis breached her duty when she failed to exercise reasonable care while addressing the notices of public nuisance against Plaintiffs.

46. Defendant Purvis knew or should have known that Plaintiffs would foreseeably suffer injury to their reputation and standing in the community as a result of Defendant Purvis' failure to exercise ordinary care.

47. As a direct and proximate cause of the negligence by Defendant Purvis, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

48. Furthermore, the actions of the Defendant Purvis were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 8
DEFAMATION AND DEFAMATION PER SE
BY PURVIS**

49. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

50. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defamation and Defamation Per Se by Defendant Purvis, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

51. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Purvis were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 9
INVASION OF PRIVACY
BY PURVIS**

52. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

53. Defendant Purvis invaded the Plaintiffs' rights of privacy. She invaded Plaintiffs' right to be free from unwarranted publicity, or the right to live without unwarranted interference by the public about matters with which the public is not necessarily concerned. Defendant acted recklessly and unreasonably. Defendant engaged in (1) unreasonable intrusion upon seclusion of Plaintiffs; (2) unreasonable publicity given to Plaintiffs' private life; or (3) conduct constituting false light invasion of privacy.

54. The false light that the Plaintiffs were placed in is one that would be highly offensive to a reasonable person and business owner.

55. Defendant Purvis had knowledge of, or acted in reckless disregard, as to the falsity of the accusations against Plaintiffs.

56. As a direct and proximate cause of the invasion of privacy by Defendant Purvis, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

57. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Purvis were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

COUNT 10
TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE OF A BUSINESS
BY PURVIS

58. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

59. Defendant Purvis intentionally interfered with Plaintiffs' business by defaming the Plaintiffs by publicly stating a slew of false claims. Defendant Purvis knew that Plaintiffs owned or operated a competing convenience store in Louisville. Defendant Purvis acted with malice by purposefully defaming the Plaintiffs. As a result of Defendant Purvis' allegations against the Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' business suffered a pecuniary loss from customers who believed the Defendant's false accusations.

60. As a direct and proximate cause of the tortious interference of a business by Defendant Purvis, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

61. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Purvis were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

COUNT 11
WRONGFUL USE OF CIVIL PROCEEDINGS
BY PURVIS

62. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

63. Defendant Purvis continued the civil proceeding involving Plaintiffs' notice of public nuisance beyond the scope of what Plaintiffs were before the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board for.

64. Defendant Purvis pursued Plaintiffs with malice aforethought and slandered their businesses in a public hearing.

65. Defendant Purvis pursued civil proceedings with a lack of probable cause and with no criminal charges being brought against Plaintiffs, which she alleged.

66. As a direct and proximate cause of the wrongful civil proceeding by Defendant Purvis, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

67. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Purvis were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

COUNT 12
ABUSE OF PROCESS
BY PURVIS

68. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

69. Defendant Purvis attempted to use the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board against Plaintiffs primarily to accomplish a purpose for which the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board was not designed.

70. As a direct and proximate cause of the abuse of process by Defendant Purvis, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present,

and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

71. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant Purvis were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 13
NEGLIGENCE
BY JAMES**

72. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

73. Defendant James owed Plaintiffs a duty to exercise reasonable care in addressing the Plaintiffs on the record to the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board, to the media, and to the general public.

74. Defendant James breached his duty when he failed to exercise reasonable care while addressing the notices of public nuisance against Plaintiffs.

75. Defendant James knew or should have known that Plaintiffs would foreseeably suffer injury to their reputation and standing in the community as a result of Defendant James' failure to exercise ordinary care.

76. As a direct and proximate cause of the negligence by Defendant James, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

77. Furthermore, the actions of the Defendant James were so malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 14
DEFAMATION PER SE
BY JAMES**

78. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

79. As a direct and proximate cause of the defamation per se by Defendant James, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional amount of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

80. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant James were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 15
INVASION OF PRIVACY
BY JAMES**

81. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

82. Defendant James invaded the Plaintiffs' rights of privacy. She invaded Plaintiffs' right to be free from unwarranted publicity, or the right to live without unwarranted interference by the public about matters with which the public is not necessarily concerned. Defendant acted recklessly and unreasonably. Defendant engaged in (1) unreasonable intrusion upon seclusion of

Plaintiffs; (2) unreasonable publicity given to Plaintiffs' private life; or (3) conduct constituting false light invasion of privacy.

83. The false light that the Plaintiffs were placed in is one that would be highly offensive to a reasonable person and business owner.

84. Defendant James had knowledge of, or acted in reckless disregard, as to the falsity of the accusations against Plaintiffs.

85. As a direct and proximate cause of the invasion of privacy by Defendant James, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

86. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant James were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 16
TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE OF A BUSINESS
BY JAMES**

87. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

88. Defendant James intentionally interfered with Plaintiffs' business by defaming the Plaintiffs by publicly stating a slew of false claims. Defendant James knew that Plaintiffs owned or operated a competing convenience store in Louisville. Defendant James acted with malice by purposefully defaming the Plaintiffs. As a result of Defendant James' allegations against the Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' business suffered a pecuniary loss from customers who believed the Defendant's false accusations.

89. As a direct and proximate cause of the tortious interference of a business by Defendant James, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

90. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant James were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 17
WRONGFUL USE OF CIVIL PROCEEDINGS
BY JAMES**

91. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

92. Defendant James continued the civil proceeding involving Plaintiffs' notice of public nuisance beyond the scope of what Plaintiffs were before the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board for.

93. Defendant James pursued Plaintiffs with malice aforethought and slandered their businesses in a public hearing.

94. Defendant James pursued civil proceedings with a lack of probable cause and with no criminal charges being brought against Plaintiffs, which he alleged.

95. As a direct and proximate cause of the wrongful civil proceeding by Defendant James, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

96. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant James were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 18
ABUSE OF PROCESS
BY JAMES**

97. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs.

98. Defendant James attempted to use the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board against Plaintiffs primarily to accomplish a purpose for which the Louisville Metro Code Enforcement Board was not designed.

99. As a direct and proximate cause of the abuse of process by Defendant James, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

100. Furthermore, the actions of Defendant James were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT 19
CIVIL CONSPIRACY**

101. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate herein by reference the averments in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

102. Defendants Bentley, Purvis, and James were engaged in a civil conspiracy wherein they were involved in the unlawful\corrupt combination or agreement to slander, defame, and deprive Plaintiffs of their property.

103. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants Bentley, Purvis, and James' conspiracy, Plaintiffs have suffered loss, harm, and damage, to their businesses including lost income, past, present, and future, and to their reputations and esteem in the amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

104. Furthermore, the actions of Defendants Bentley, Purvis, and James were so oppressive, malicious, willful, wanton, and outrageous so as to warrant the award of punitive damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs demand judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. Judgment against the Defendants, for compensatory damages in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.
2. Judgment against the Defendants, for punitive damages in an amount which exceeds the jurisdictional prerequisite of Circuit Court, the specific amount to be proven at trial.
3. For Plaintiffs' costs herein expended;
4. For leave of Court to amend this Complaint to conform to the evidence;
5. For any and all other relief to which this Court may find Plaintiffs entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Nader George Shunnarah

NADER GEORGE SHUNNARAH

Shunnarah Law

917 Lily Creek Road

Louisville, KY 40243

Telephone: 502-200-9000

Facsimile: 844-927-4560

shunnarahlaw@gmail.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs