| Ca | se 2:11-cv-08081-BRO-MAN Document | 17 Filed 12/02/11 Page 1 of 7 Page ID #:96 FILED |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | MARY CUMMINS Plaintiff 645 W. 9th St. #110-140 Los Angeles, CA 90015 In Pro Per Telephone: (310) 877-4770 Email: mmmaryinla@aol.com | 2011 DEC -2 PM 2: 03 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES BY BY COLUMN |
| 7 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 8 | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 9 10 | MARY CUMMINS Plaintiff |) Case No. CV11 08081 DMG (MANx) |
| 11 12 13 | v. AMANDA LOLLAR aka BAT |)) REPLY OF PLAINTIFF CUMMINS) IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S) OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' |
| 14 | WORLD SANCTUARY an individual person, BAT WORLD SANCTUARY an unknown business entity, JOHN |) ALTERNATIVELY, TRANSFER) VENUE) |
| 16 17 | DOES 1-10 Defendants |) Date: December 12, 2011) Time: 9:30 a.m. Courtroom 7 |
| 18 19 | Plaintiff Mary Cummins, (hereinafter "Plaintiff") alleges as follows: | |
| 20 | INTRODUCTION | |
| 21 | For the reasons set forth below, this Court is the proper venue in this action. | |
| 22 | Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court deny Defendants' Motion to | |
| 23 | Dismiss for Improper Venue or in the alternative, Motion to Transfer Venue. | |
| 25 | 1. The evidence clearly establishes that this Court is the proper jurisdiction and | |
| 26 | venue through the Doctrine of Diversity of Citizenship. In an attempt to avoid | |
| 27 | jurisdiction and venue, Defendants argue that ALL Defendants are located in Texas. | |
| 28 | They forget that Plaintiff is also suing John Does 1-10. Plaintiff firmly believes that the | |
| | REPLY OF PLAINTIFF CUMMINS IN SUPPORT OR PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS OR ALTERNATIVELY, TRANSFER VENUE | |

John Does are located in states other than California or Texas. Plaintiff is not 100% positive of the true identities and will need to subpoen the Internet user names in order to be certain. An Internet user could list their name as "Jesus H. Christ" with a location such as "Pluto" and one would not know if that were their true identity or not. One user "wingedsonar" lists her name as Sarah Kennedy located somewhere in New York. Another user "evidtech9" lists her name as Sharon Warner located in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. There is no way to know if these are their true names or not without a subpoena to Yahoo. Plus, there may be more than one Sarah Kennedy in New York. Plaintiff needs to know which Sarah Kennedy made the Internet postings.

- 2. This Court is the proper venue Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a)(2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred. Plaintiff was damaged in this District. Plaintiff is a licensed California real estate appraiser and licensed California wildlife rehabilitator. Plaintiff conducts business in this District only. Plaintiff's personal and business reputation was damaged where she works in this district in California. Plaintiff is not licensed in Texas and does not conduct business in Texas.
- 3. Defendants argue that this case in the alternative should be transferred to the District Court of Tarrant County, Texas because there is currently pending a previously filed action between Plaintiff and two of the defendants, Lollar v. Cummins, Case No. 352-248169-10. The parties, allegations and damages are completely and absolutely different and unrelated.
- a. The Plaintiffs in Amanda Lollar, Bat World Sanctuary v. Mary Cummins lawsuit are Amanda Lollar an individual and Bat World Sanctuary a non-incorporated organization. The Defendant is Mary Cummins. The Plaintiff in Cummins v. Lollar et al lawsuit is Mary Cummins. The Defendants are Amanda Lollar aka Bat World Sanctuary an individual, Bat World Sanctuary an unknown business entity and John Does 1-10. The parties are **NOT** the same. The suit against Cummins in Texas was

filed September 2010 before Bat World Sanctuary incorporated in December 2010. The current suit against Bat World Sanctuary is as an unknown business entity. Cummins was defamed by the non-incorporated organization and the newly incorporated organization besides the individual Amanda Lollar and other unknown John Does.

b. The main claim in Lollar v. Cummins is supposed breach of contract, sharing proprietary/copyrighted data and then supposed defamation. The main claims in Cummins v. Amanda Lollar, Bat World Sanctuary, John Does 1-10 are defamation, defamation per se, interference with business relations, interference with prospective economic advantage and infliction of emotional distress. The claims are not the same. Plaintiff Cummins reported Defendant Amanda Lollar for animal cruelty and neglect. In retaliation Cummins was falsely accused of and sued for breach of contract and defamation. Cummins never defamed Lollar or Bat World Sanctuary. The defamation in both cases are completely and absolutely unrelated. Defendant Lollar posted that Plaintiff Cummins is a "convicted criminal." Plaintiff Cummins merely reported Defendant Lollar for animal cruelty and neglect.

4. Plaintiff tried to reply to Defendants' opposition in a timely manner but Defendant failed to properly notify Plaintiff that they filed an opposition. Defendant's attorney later admitted that the mailing had been returned yet he refuses to show Plaintiff a copy of the returned mail. Plaintiff again did not notify Defendant that they filed their December 1, 2011 reply. Fortunately Plaintiff just happened to check Pacer December 2, 2011 and filed this response that same day.

CONCLUSION

The evidence that Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction and venue in this Court is overwhelming. Through their conduct Defendants have established the

Case 2:11-cv-08081-BRO-MAN Document 17 Filed 12/02/11 Page 4 of 7 Page ID #:99

[PROPOSED] ORDER RE: DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS FOR IMPROPER VENUE, OR ALTERNATIVE,
TO TRANSFER VENUE

Case 2:11-cv-08081-BRO-MAN Document 17 Filed 12/02/11 Page 6 of 7 Page ID #:101