

SEP 1 4 2021

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT BY: B. PACKHAM, DEPUTY CLERK

Gerald Singleton (SBN 208783)
gsingleton@ssmsjustice.com
J. Ross Peabody (SBN 98190)
rpeabody@ssmsjustice.com
Tommy H. Vu (SBN 273760)
tvu@ssmsjustice.com
SINGLETON SCHREIBER MCKENZIE & SCOTT, LLP
450 A Street, 5th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel. (619) 771-3473
Fax. (619) 255-1515

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

### SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

#### **COUNTY OF SHASTA**

DEBORAH FASSBINDER; VANESSA FASSBINDER;

Plaintiffs,

v.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

PG&E CORPORATION, a California Corporation; PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, a California Corporation; DOES 1-200, inclusive,

Defendants.

No. 198186

Unlimited Jurisdiction

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJURIES

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiffs Deborah Fassbinder, Vanessa Fassbinder ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby file the following complaint for damages and injuries ("Complaint") against all Defendants and DOES 1-200.

22 | /

23 | | //

24 || .

25 || ,

26 ||

27 |

28

14

#### INTRODUCTION I.

1. This Complaint arises from a wildfire that PG&E's power lines caused on July 13, 2021—a wildfire now called the "Dixie Fire."



Flames from the Dixie Fire (Greenville Plumas County) - Photo by J.D. Morris via San Francisco Chronicle

- 2. The Dixie Fire started when electrical equipment within PG&E's utility infrastructure contacted, or caused sparks to contact, surrounding vegetation.
- To date, the Dixie Fire has been burning for approximately two months. It has destroyed 3. approximately 1 million acres, more than 1,300 structures, and has significantly impacted Shasta County. The Dixie Fire is now the second-largest wildfire in California's history and is expected to become the largest.
- 4. Plaintiffs are homeowners, renters, business owners, and other individuals and entities whose property and lives were, literally and figuratively, burned to the ground by the Dixie Fire.



Example of Destruction Caused by Dixie Fire (Greenville Plumas County) -Photo Josh Edelson/AFP via Getty Images

4

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

19

18

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

5. Plaintiffs now sue PG&E CORPORATION, PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, and DOES 1-200 for damages and all other available remedies arising from the harms

#### II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

caused by the Dixie Fire.

- This Shasta County Superior Court, as a court of general jurisdiction, has subject-matter jurisdiction over this unlimited civil case, as well as personal jurisdiction over each of Defendants.
- Venue is proper in Shasta County as a substantial part of the events, acts, omissions, 2. and/or transactions complained of herein occurred in Shasta County. All of the individual claims set forth herein arise from events or occurrences within Shasta County, and the damages, losses, and injuries suffered by Plaintiffs occurred in Shasta County, California.
- 3. The Superior Court of Shasta, as a court of general jurisdiction, has subject-matter jurisdiction over this unlimited civil case, as well as personal jurisdiction over each of the Defendants.

#### III. **PARTIES**

#### Α. **Plaintiffs**

- 4. Plaintiffs are individuals and other legal entities who were, at all times relevant to this pleading, homeowners, renters, business owners, and/or other individuals and legal entities who were residents, occupants, and/or had property located in Shasta County.
- 5. Plaintiffs have elected to join their individual lawsuits in a single action under rules of permissive joinder. Plaintiffs do <u>not</u> seek class certification or relief on any class-wide, collective, or other group basis, but instead seek the damages and other remedies identified herein on an individual basis according to proof at trial or through alternative dispute resolution efforts.

#### В. **Defendants**

6. Defendant PG&E CORPORATION was, at all times relevant to this pleading, a California corporation authorized to do, and doing business, in California, with its headquarters in San Francisco, California. At all times relevant to this pleading, PG&E Corporation acted to provide a utility, including electrical services, to members of the public in California, including residents of Shasta County. PG&E CORPORATION did so through its agents and subsidiaries, including PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY.

- 7. Defendant PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY was, at all times relevant to this pleading, a California corporation authorized to do, and doing business, in California, with its headquarters in San Francisco, California. At all times relevant to this pleading, PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY acted to provide a utility, including electrical services, to members of the public in California, including residents of Shasta County. PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY is a subsidiary or other entity wholly controlled by PG&E CORPORATION.
- 8. PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY is one of the largest combination natural gas and electric utilities in the United States. PG&E CORPORATION and PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY are jointly and severally liable for each other's wrongful acts and/or omissions as alleged herein. These companies do not compete against one another but instead operate as a single enterprise, integrating their resources to achieve a common business purpose. These companies are so organized and controlled that one is a mere instrumentality, agent, and/or conduit of the other. Officers, managers, and directors are intertwined and not fully independent of one another. These companies share legal counsel, share unified policies and procedures, file consolidated financial statements and regulatory documents. Thus, as used herein, "PG&E" refers collectively to defendants PG&E CORPORATION and PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY.
- 9. PG&E is in the business of providing electricity to the residents of, among other places, Shasta County through a utility infrastructure, including a network of electrical transmission and distribution lines. PG&E is a "public utility" under Public Utilities Code sections 216(a)(1) and 218(a).
- 10. The true names and capacities of defendants DOES 1 through 200 are currently unknown to Plaintiffs who, therefore, sue these defendants under these fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 474. These defendants are each directly and/or vicariously responsible, in some manner, for the harms alleged herein. If/when Plaintiffs learn these defendants' true names and capacities, Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this pleading accordingly.
  - 11. "Defendants" refers collectively to PG&E and DOES 1 through 200.
- 12. At all times relevant to this pleading, Defendants, and/or each of them, were the agents, servants, employees, partners, aiders and abettors, co-conspirators, and/or joint venturers of each of the other Defendants; and were operating within the purpose and scope of said agency, service,

employment, partnership, enterprise, conspiracy, and/or joint venture; and each of Defendants has ratified and approved the acts of each of the remaining Defendants. Each of Defendants aided and abetted, encouraged, and rendered substantial assistance to the other Defendants in breaching their obligations and duties to Plaintiffs, as alleged herein. In taking action to aid and abet and substantially assist the commission of these wrongful acts and other wrongdoings alleged herein, each of Defendants acted with an awareness of his/her/its primary wrongdoing and realized that his/her/its conduct would substantially assist the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct, wrongful goals, and wrongdoing.

#### IV. FACTS

- 13. In an incident report to the California Public Utilities Commission ("Public Utilities Commission") dated July 18, 2021, PG&E reported that, "[o]n July 13, 2021 at approximately 0700 hours, PG&E's outage system indicated that Cresta Dam off of Highway 70 in the Feather River Canyon lost power." Feather River Canyon is a few miles east of where the 2018 Camp Fire originated.
- 14. A PG&E field technician responded to the power outage at the Bucks Creek 1101 12kV Overhead Distribution Circuit. He "observed two of three fuses blown and what appeared to him to be healthy green tree leaning into the Bucks Creek 1101 12 kV conductor, which was still intact and suspended on the poles. He also observed a fire on the ground near the base of the tree."



Douglas Fir Tree leaning into PG&E's Lines

- 15. Although the power outage was reported at 7 a.m., the PG&E field technician "was not able to reach the pole with the fuse until approximately [4:40 p.m.]" due to the challenging terrain and road work resulting in a bridge closure.
- 16. On the afternoon of July 22, 2021, PG&E found another fallen tree ("White Fir") leaning against its power line near the ignition site of the Fly Fire, a smaller fire that eventually merged with the Dixie Fire on the night of July 24, 2021.
  - 17. The White Fir was resting on PG&E's Gansner 1101 Circuit.
- 18. Butte County District Attorney Mike Ramsey said his office directed Cal Fire to treat the area where the Dixie Fire started as a crime scene, and a criminal investigation is underway to determine whether criminal charges against PG&E are warranted.
- 19. The United States Forest Service and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection ("Cal Fire") conducted site visits and collected and are currently examining PG&E's equipment as well as both the Douglas Fir and White Fir trees at issue.
- 20. PG&E stated the pole in question was last replaced on June 21, 2019 by a contractor identified as "UECC."
- 21. PG&E stated the most recent tree work near the origin of the Dixie Fire was performed in June 2019 by a contractor identified as Mountain F. Enterprises.
- 22. PG&E has admitted its equipment malfunctions may have sparked the Dixie Fire. Subsequently after this admission, PG&E announced a plan committing to spend more than \$15 billion burying 10,000 miles of its power lines underground to reduce wildfire risks in California. Indeed, Patricia Poppe, CEO of PG&E, stated more power lines needed to go underground to keep communities safe. PG&E stated it would prioritize areas with a large concentration of trees that could fall on distribution lines.
- 23. U.S. District Judge William Alsup, who is overseeing PG&E's federal criminal probation for its felony conviction resulting from the fatal San Bruno gas pipeline explosion, has ordered PG&E to explain its role in igniting the Fly and Dixie Fires, and to identify each fire PG&E started or is suspected of starting this wildfire season.
  - 24. Plaintiffs are informed and believe the Dixie Fire was caused by the Douglas Fir tree

leaning into PG&E's high voltage distribution line, which the blown fuses were designed to protect. Moreover, the Dixie Fire occurred because: (1) PG&E's utility infrastructure was intended, designed, and constructed to pass electricity through exposed power lines in vegetated areas; (2) PG&E negligently, recklessly, and wantonly failed to maintain and operate the electrical equipment in its utility infrastructure; and/or (3) PG&E negligently, recklessly, and wantonly failed to maintain the appropriate clearance area between the electrical equipment in its utility infrastructure and surrounding vegetation.

- 25. The conditions and circumstances surrounding the ignition of the Dixie Fire, including the nature and condition of PG&E's electrical infrastructure, low humidity, strong winds, and tinder-like dry vegetation were foreseeable by any reasonably prudent person and, therefore, were certainly foreseeable to Defendants—those with special knowledge and expertise as electrical services providers and their employees and agents.
- 26. The Dixie Fire caused Plaintiffs to suffer substantial harms, including: damage to and/or destruction of real property; damage to and/or loss of personal property, including cherished possessions; out-of-pocket expenses directly and proximately incurred as a result of the fire; alternative living expenses; evacuation expenses; personal injuries; wrongful death; medical bills; lost wages; loss of earning capacity; loss of business income and/or goodwill; and various types of emotional distress, annoyance, inconvenience, disturbance, mental anguish, and loss of quiet enjoyment of property. The harms caused by the Defendants are extensive and ongoing.



Example of Devastation Caused by Dixie Fire -Photo by Noah Berger Associated Press via Washington Press

#### V. PG&E'S PRIOR HISTORY

- 27. At the time the Dixie Fire ignited in July 2021, Defendants were actually aware that the nature and condition of its electrical equipment, along with geographic, weather, ecological, and other conditions, gave rise to a high risk that PG&E's electrical equipment would ignite a wildfire like the Dixie Fire.
- 28. Defendants' awareness of this risk arose, in large part, from an extensive history of PG&E's electrical equipment causing devastating and deadly wildfires. There are numerous examples of PG&E's electrical equipment igniting wildfires over the years under conditions and circumstances similar to those of the Dixie Fire. Since 2013, PG&E's electrical equipment has caused more than 1,500 wildfires across the state, including, but not limited to, the 2015 Butte Fire, the 2017 North Bay Fires, the 2018 Camp Fire, the 2019 Kincade Fire, and the 2020 Zogg Fire. The Camp Fire is the state's deadliest wildfire to date, killing 85 people, and one of the North Bay Fires (namely, the Tubbs Fire) is currently the state's fourth deadliest wildfire. PG&E is, moreover, currently on federal criminal probation following its conviction arising from the fatal San Bruno gas explosion.
- 29. These previous wildfires put Defendants on actual notice that PG&E's ineffective vegetation management programs, unsafe equipment, and aging electrical infrastructure created a predictable risk that PG&E's electrical equipment would ignite a wildfire such as the Dixie Fire.
- 30. These wildfires are not the result of an "act of God" or other *force majeure*. These wildfires were started by sparks from high-voltage transmission lines, distribution lines, appurtenances, and other electrical equipment within PG&E's utility infrastructure that ignited surrounding vegetation. Despite these previous wildfires, Defendants have deliberately, and repeatedly, prioritized profits over safety. That is, Defendants have a history of acting recklessly and with conscious disregard to human life and safety, and this history of recklessness and conscious disregard was a substantial factor in bringing about the Dixie Fire.

//

27 ||

28 II

#### VI. CAUSES OF ACTION

# 

#### 

### 

## 

## 

# 

## 

## 

## 

## 

# 

### 

## 

### 

## 

### 

# 

### 

## 

## 

### 

### 

#### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

## **Inverse Condemnation**

- 31. All previous paragraphs are incorporated into this cause of action.
- 32. On July 13, 2021, Plaintiffs were the owners of real property and/or personal property in the area of the Dixie Fire.
- 33. Prior to and on July 13, 2021, Defendants had each designed, constructed, installed, operated, controlled, used, and/or maintained the facilities, lines, wires, and/or other electrical equipment within PG&E's utility infrastructure, including the transmission and distribution lines in and around the location of the Dixie Fire, for the purpose of providing electrical services to large swaths of the public.
- 34. On July 13, 2021, Defendants were actually aware of the inherent dangers and risks that the electrical equipment within PG&E's electrical-utility infrastructure (as deliberately designed and constructed) would ignite a wildfire like the Dixie Fire.
- 35. This inherent risk was realized on July 13, 2021, when electrical equipment within PG&E's utility infrastructure ignited the Dixie Fire, which resulted in the taking of Plaintiffs' real property and/or private property.
- 36. This taking was legally and substantially caused by Defendants' actions and inactions in designing, constructing, installing, operating, controlling, using, and/or maintaining the facilities, lines, wires, and/or other electrical equipment within PG&E's utility infrastructure.
  - 37. Plaintiffs have not been adequately compensated, if at all, for this taking.
- 38. Plaintiffs further seek, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1036, to recover all reasonable costs, disbursements, and expenses, including reasonable attorney, appraisal, and engineering fees, actually incurred because of this proceeding in the trial court and/or in any appellate proceeding in which Plaintiffs prevail on any issue.

#### 

# 

## 

### 

## 

# 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

# 

## 

# 

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

#### **Trespass**

- 39. All previous paragraphs are incorporated into this cause of action.
- 40. On July 13, 2021, Plaintiffs were the owners, tenants, and/or lawful occupiers of real properties in the area of the Dixie Fire.
- 41. Defendants negligently and/or recklessly allowed the Dixie Fire to ignite and/or spread out of control, which caused damage to Plaintiffs' properties.
  - 42. Plaintiffs did not grant permission for any fire to enter their properties.
- 43. This trespass was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs to suffer damages including, but not limited to, destruction of and damage to real property, destruction of and damage to structures, destruction of and damage to personal property and cherished possessions, discomfort, annoyance, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of quiet enjoyment, and emotional distress. Plaintiffs each seek damages to be determined, on an individual basis, according to proof at trial.
- 44. Those of Plaintiffs whose real property was under cultivation or used for the raising of livestock have hired and retained counsel to recover compensation for their losses and damages caused by the Dixie Fire. Thus, they also seek to recover all reasonable attorneys' fees, expert fees, consultant fees, and litigation costs and expense, as allowed under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.9.
- 45. Those of Plaintiffs who suffered damage to timber, trees, or underwood as a result of the Dixie Fire also seek treble or double damages for wrongful injuries to their property inclusive of timber, trees, or underwood, as permitted by Civil Code section 3346.
- 46. Defendants, including one or more PG&E officers, directors, and/or managers, have deliberately, and repeatedly, prioritized profits over safety. That is, Defendants have a history of acting recklessly and with conscious disregard to human life and safety, and this history of recklessness and conscious disregard was a substantial factor in bringing about the Dixie Fire. This is despicable and oppressive conduct. Plaintiffs thus seek punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants' long history of prioritizing profits over safety and to deter such conduct in the future.

#### \_

## 

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

#### Nuisance

- 47. All previous paragraphs are incorporated into this cause of action.
- 48. On July 13, 2021, Plaintiffs were the owners, tenants, and/or lawful occupiers of real properties in the area of the Dixie Fire.
- 49. Defendants' actions and inactions created a condition and/or permitted a condition to exist that was harmful to health; offensive to the senses; an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life and property; unlawfully obstructed the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of public streets and highways; and a completely predictable fire hazard.
- 50. These conditions interfered with Plaintiffs' quiet enjoyment of their properties in a way unique to each of Plaintiffs.
  - 51. These conditions also affected a substantial number of people at the same time.
- 52. At no time did Plaintiffs consent to Defendants' actions and inactions in creating these conditions.
- 53. An ordinary person would be reasonably annoyed and disturbed by Defendants' actions and inactions in creating these conditions.
- 54. Defendants' actions and inactions in creating these conditions were a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs to suffer damages unique to each plaintiff (and different from damages suffered by other plaintiffs) including, but not limited to, destruction of and damage to real property, destruction of and damage to structures, destruction of and damage to personal property and cherished possessions, discomfort, annoyance, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of quiet enjoyment, and emotional distress. Plaintiffs each seek damages to be determined, on an individual basis, according to proof at trial.
- 55. The seriousness of the harm Defendants have caused Plaintiffs outweighs any public benefit that Defendants may provide.
- 56. Defendants, including one or more PG&E officers, directors, and/or managers, have deliberately, and repeatedly, prioritized profits over safety. That is, Defendants have a history of acting

recklessly and with conscious disregard to human life and safety, and this history of recklessness and conscious disregard was a substantial factor in bringing about the Dixie Fire. This is despicable and oppressive conduct. Plaintiffs thus seek punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants' long history of prioritizing profits over safety and to deter such conduct in the future.

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Public Utilities Code § 2106**

- 57. All previous paragraphs are incorporated into this cause of action.
- 58. PG&E was on July 13, 2021, and is, a "public utility" for purposes of the Public Utilities Code. PG&E was, therefore, required to comply with the Public Utilities Act.
- 59. Prior to and on July 13, 2021, PG&E was also required to obey and comply with every order, decision, direction, or rule made or prescribed by the Public Utilities Commission in the matters specified under the Public Utilities Act, and any other matter in any way relating to or affecting its business as a public utility, and was required to do everything necessary or proper to secure compliance therewith by all of its officers, agents, and employees.
- 60. Defendants failed to furnish and maintain such adequate, efficient, just, and reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment, and facilities as are necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of PG&E patrons and the public, as required by Public Utilities Code section 451.
- 61. Defendants failed to comply with the requirements for overhead line design, construction, and maintenance, the application of which will ensure adequate service and secure safety to persons engaged in the construction, maintenance, operation or use of overhead lines and to the public in general, as required by Public Utilities Commission General Order 95, including Rules 31.2, 35, and 38, which set forth inspection, vegetation-management, and minimum-clearance requirements.
- 62. Defendants failed to comply with the requires for electric distribution and transmission facilities regarding inspections in order to ensure safe and high-quality electrical service, as required by Public Utilities Commission General Order 165.
  - 63. Defendants' failure to comply with applicable provisions of the Public Utilities Act and

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28

with applicable Public Utilities Commission orders and rules, was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs to suffer damages including, but not limited to, destruction of and damage to real property, destruction of and damage to structures, destruction of and damage to personal property and cherished possessions, discomfort, annoyance, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of quiet enjoyment, and emotional distress. Plaintiffs each seek damages to be determined, on an individual basis, according to proof at trial.

64. Defendants, including one or more PG&E officers, directors, and/or managers, have deliberately, and repeatedly, prioritized profits over safety. That is, Defendants have a history of acting recklessly and with conscious disregard to human life and safety, and this history of recklessness and conscious disregard was a substantial factor in bringing about the Dixie Fire. This is despicable and oppressive conduct. Plaintiffs thus seek punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants' long history of prioritizing profits over safety and to deter such conduct in the future.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### Health & Safety Code § 13007

- 65. All previous paragraphs are incorporated into this cause of action.
- 66. Defendants negligently, recklessly, and/or in violation of law, allowed the Dixie Fire to be set and allowed the Dixie Fire to escape to Plaintiffs' properties.
- 67. Defendants' negligent, reckless, and/or illegal actions and inactions in allowing the Dixie Fire to be set and escape to Plaintiffs' properties was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs to suffer damages including, but not limited to, destruction of and damage to real property, destruction of and damage to structures, destruction of and damage to personal property and cherished possessions, discomfort, annoyance, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of quiet enjoyment, and emotional distress. Plaintiffs each seek damages to be determined, on an individual basis, according to proof at trial.
- 68. Those of Plaintiffs whose real property was under cultivation or used for the raising of livestock have hired and retained counsel to recover compensation for their losses and damages caused by the Dixie Fire. Thus, they also seek to recover all reasonable attorneys' fees, expert fees, consultant fees, and litigation costs and expense, as allowed under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.9.

69. Defendants, including one or more PG&E officers, directors, and/or managers, have deliberately, and repeatedly, prioritized profits over safety. That is, Defendants have a history of acting recklessly and with conscious disregard to human life and safety, and this history of recklessness and conscious disregard was a substantial factor in bringing about the Dixie Fire. This is despicable and oppressive conduct. Plaintiffs thus seek punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants' long history of prioritizing profits over safety and to deter such conduct in the future.

#### **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### Negligence

- 70. All previous paragraphs, except those falling under Plaintiffs' cause of action for inverse condemnation, are incorporated into this cause of action.
- 71. Defendants each have special knowledge and expertise far beyond that of a layperson with regard to the safe design, engineering, construction, use, operation, inspection, repair, and maintenance of PG&E's electrical lines, infrastructure, equipment, and vegetation management efforts. The provision of electrical services involves a peculiar and inherent danger and risk of wildfires.
- 72. Prior to and on July 13, 2021, Defendants had a non-delegable duty to apply a level of care commensurate with, and proportionate to, the inherent dangers in designing, engineering, constructing, operating, and maintaining electrical transmission and distribution systems. This duty also required Defendants to maintain appropriate vegetation management programs, for the control of vegetation surrounding PG&E's exposed power lines. This duty also required Defendants to consider the changing conditions PG&E's electrical transmission and distribution systems, as well as changing geographic, weather, and ecological conditions. This duty also required Defendants to take special precautions to protect adjoining properties from wildfires caused by PG&E's electrical equipment.
  - 73. Defendants each breached these duties by, among other things:
    - a. Failing to design, construct, operate, and maintain PG&E's high-voltage transmission and distribution lines and associated equipment, in a way that would withstand the foreseeable risk of wildfires in the area of the Dixie Fire;
    - b. Failing to prevent electrical transmission and distribution lines from

improperly sagging or making contact with other metal;

- c. Failing to properly inspect and maintain vegetation within proximity to energized transmission and distribution lines to mitigate the risk of fire;
- d. Failing to conduct reasonably prompt, proper, and frequent inspections of PG&E's power lines and associated equipment;
- e. Failing to promptly de-energize exposed power lines during fire-prone conditions:
- f. Failing to properly train and supervise employees and agents responsible for maintenance and inspection of power lines; and/or
- g. Failing to implement and follow regulations and reasonably prudent practices to avoid fire ignition.
- 74. Defendants' failure to comply with applicable provisions of the Public Utilities Act and Public Utilities Commission General Orders and Rules, as alleged herein, is negligence per se because these statutes, orders, and rules are aimed at preventing the exact type of harm that Plaintiffs suffered because of Defendants' failure to comply with these statutes, orders, and rules. That is, Plaintiffs are within the class of individuals these statutes, orders, and rules were implemented to protect.
- 75. Defendants' negligence, including Defendants' negligence per se, was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs to suffer damages including, but not limited to, destruction of and damage to real property, destruction of and damage to structures, destruction of and damage to personal property and cherished possessions, discomfort, annoyance, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of quiet enjoyment, and emotional distress. Plaintiffs each seek damages to be determined, on an individual basis, according to proof at trial.
- 76. Defendants, including one or more PG&E officers, directors, and/or managers, have deliberately, and repeatedly, prioritized profits over safety. That is, Defendants have a history of acting recklessly and with conscious disregard to human life and safety, and this history of recklessness and conscious disregard was a substantial factor in bringing about the Dixie Fire. This is despicable and oppressive conduct. Plaintiffs thus seek punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants' long history of prioritizing profits over safety and to deter such conduct in the future.

General damages for personal injury, emotional distress, fear, annoyance,

Past and future medical expenses and incidental expenses;

6.

7.

27

| disturbance, inconvenience, i   | mental anguish, and loss of quiet enjoyment of   |
|---|--|
| property;   |  |
| 8. Attorneys' fees, expert fees, or   | consultant fees, and litigation costs and expense, as  |
| allowed under Code of Civil   | Procedure section 1021.9 and all other applicable  |
| law;  |  |
| 9. Prejudgment interest from Ju   | ly 13, 2021;   |
| 10. For punitive and exemplary of   | lamages against PG&E in an amount sufficient to  |
| punish Defendants' conduct a  | and deter similar conduct in the future, as allowed  |
| under Public Utilities Code se  | ection 2106 and all other applicable law; and  |
| 11. Any and all other and further so  | uch relief as the Court shall deem proper, all   |
| according to proof.   |  |
| VII. JURY TRIAL DEMAND  |  |
| Plaintiffs hereby respectfully request that this Court provide them with a jury trial on all causes   |  |
| 14 of action for which a jury trial is available under the law.   |  |
| S   | SINGLETON SCHREIBER McKENZIE & SCOTT, LLP  |
| Dated: September 14, 2021   | By: Guald Lington  |
| , in the second | Gerald Singleton J. Ross Peabody   |
|   | Tommy H. Vu  |
|   | Attorneys for Plaintiffs DEBORAH FASSBINDER and VANESSA FASSBINDER   |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   | property;  8. Attorneys' fees, expert fees, or allowed under Code of Civil law;  9. Prejudgment interest from Ju 10. For punitive and exemplary of punish Defendants' conduct a under Public Utilities Code so 11. Any and all other and further so according to proof.  VII. JURY TRIAL DEMAND  Plaintiffs hereby respectfully request the of action for which a jury trial is available under September 14, 2021 |