ELY, KADISON & QUINN

LAWYERS 550 SOUTH FLOWER STREET LOS ANGELES 17, CALIFORNIA MADISON 6-1314

ATTORNEYS FOR

Plaintiff

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

GENERAL BAKING COMPANY, a New York corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ANNETTE BECKER, WOODROW COLEMAN, GERALD FARBER, JAY FRANK, MARI GOLDMAN, F. DANIEL GRAY, ROBERT HALL, BRUCE HARTFORD, RICHARD THOMSON, SHELIA TOMLINSON, NON-VIOLENT ACTION COMMITTEE, JOHN DOES I THROUGH L, JANE DOES I THROUGH L,

Defendants.

No. 840711

DECLARATION OF RUSSEL I. KULLY

RUSSEL I. KULLY declares:

I am an attorney at law of the law firm of Ely, Kadison & Quinn, counsel for plaintiff herein within the state of California, and am fully familiar with the files herein.

On or before July 2, 1964, I received information that defendants herein intended to conduct a demonstration at the coffee shop of plaintiff located at 5665 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California (the "Wilshire coffee shop" herein). I arrived at the Wilshire coffee shop at approximately 4:00 o'clock p.m. on July 2, 1964 and departed at approximately 8:30 o'clock p.m. on the same date. In the intervening period, I was at all times on or about the premises of said coffee shop and had occasion at no less

frequently than ten minute intervals to observe the conduct of the 2 defendants described hereinbelow.

Upon arriving at said coffee shop, I conferred with and instructed Gordon E. Anderson, an investigator and process server who had been engaged by plaintiff to act as process server of the papers described herein and William Banks, a free lance photographer who had been engaged by plaintiff to take motion picture photographs at the Wilshire coffee shop.

While at the Wilshire coffee shop on said date, I observed the following actions and conduct of each of the named defendants listed hereinbelow.

Defendant Annette Becker: Defendant Annette Becker (defendant "Becker" herein) arrived at the Wilshire coffee shop at approximately 6:30 p.m. on July 2, 1964 and remained therein until approximately 8:20 p.m.. Defendant Becker was promptly identified 16 to me and while defendant Becker remained in the lobby of the Wilshir 17 coffee shop, I directed Gordon E. Anderson immediately to effect ser-18 vice upon her of the Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause, Complaint for Injunction, Declaration of William Banks in Support of Application for Injunctive Relief, Declaration of Robert A. Minium in Support of Application for Injunctive Relief, and Memo-22 randum of Points and Authorities in Support of the Application for Injunctive Relief Pendente Lite (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "pleadings"). In accordance with my directions and under my direct supervision, Mr. Anderson exhibited to defendant Becker the original summons issued herein and handed to her a copy of the pleadings. The service of the pleadings upon defendant Becker was photographed by motion picture photographs made by William Banks.

Defendant Becker was seated at a table at approximately 6:35 p.m. and remained at such table until she and the other defendants herein departed from the Wilshire coffee shop at approximately 8:20 p.m.. While in the Wilshire coffee shop, defendant Becker

3

9

11

12

13

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

and on one or more beverages but did not order a complete meal, and on one or more occasions after defendant Becker had been at her table more than thirty minutes, an employee, or employees, of plaintiff requested defendant Becker to vacate her table so as to make it available to other customers of plaintiff, many of whom were waiting and had waited for a considerable period of time in order to obtain a table. Defendant Becker declined to surrender her table until she departed from said coffee shop as aforesaid.

2. and 3. Defendants Gerald Farber and Jay Frank: Defendants Gerald Farber (defendant "Farber" herein) and Jay Frank (defendant "Frank" herein) arrived together at the Wilshire coffee shop and were seated together at a table therein at approximately 4:15 p.m. on July 2, 1964. Both of said defendants remained at their table until departing from the restaurant at approximately 8:20 p.m. One or both of said defendants carried into the restaurant a placard advising against the purchase of the plaintiff's products and such placard was placed upon said defendants' table so as to be readily viewable from other tables. At my direction, one of the employees of plaintiff requested that said defendants remove their placard from view, but said defendants declined to do so. At approximately 4:45 p.m., I directed Gordon E. Anderson to effect service of the pleadings upon said defendants, and each of them, and he promptly did so, under my direct supervision, by exhibiting the original summons to each of said defendants and by handing to each of them a set of the pleadings. Mr. Anderson's service of the pleadings upon each of said defendants was also photographed by motion picture photographs made by William Banks. While in the Wilshire coffee shop, defendants Farber and Frank ordered one or more beverages and pastries but did not order a complete meal. On at least two separate occasions between the time of said service of the pleadings and prior to 7:30 p.m. on said date, I personally advised defendants Farber and Frank together that the continued exhibition of said placard

ELY, KADISON & QUINN LAWYERS

constituted, in my opinion, a violation of the Temporary Restraining Order theretofore served upon them as did their continued conduct in 2 remaining at their table for an unreasonable period of time without 3 ordering more than a token amount of food and beverages. On the first of such occasions, defendant Farber stated, smiling to me, that 5 he had not been able to read past the heading of the Temporary Re-6 7 straining Order, although, to the contrary, I had been observing defendant Farber closely following the service of the pleadings and noticed that he and defendant Frank had been examining the pleadings 9 for a long period of time and with considerable concentration. 10 least one of the occasions of my statement to said defendants, I 11 directed their attention to paragraphs D and J of said Temporary 12 13 Restraining Order set forth at page 3 thereof and advised them that such paragraphs contained the prohibitions against exhibition of 14 placards and the actions described therein as "sip-in" demonstrations. 15 Nevertheless, said defendants continued exhibiting their said placard 16 17 until approximately 7:30 p.m. when such placard was taken from their possession and was not returned to them until they departed from the 18 19 restaurant. On at least three separate occasions, one or more 20 employees of plaintiff requested that defendants vacate their table 21 so that other patrons of plaintiff might be seated, but they declined 22 to do so until their departure at approximately 8:20 p.m.. 23

4. Defendant Mari Goldman. Defendant Mari Goldman (defendant "Goldman" herein) arrived at the Wilshire coffee shop at approximately 4:15 p.m. on July 2, 1964 and was promptly seated at a table, remaining there until her departure from the restaurant at approximately 8:20 p.m., over four hours after she was first seated. At approximately 4:47 p.m. on said date, I directed Gordon E. Anderson to effect service of the pleadings upon defendant Goldman, whereupon Mr. Anderson, under my direct supervision, promptly effected service of the pleadings upon defendant Goldman by exhibiting to her the original summons issued herein and by handing to her a copy of

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

the pleadings. Mr. Anderson's service upon defendant was also photographed by motion picture photographs made by William Banks. While in the Wilshire coffee shop, defendant Goldman ordered one or more beverages and pastries but did not order a complete meal. is my belief, and based upon such belief I declare, that on one occasion following said service of the pleadings, I specifically advised defendant Goldman that her continued conduct in remaining within the Wilshire coffee shop for an unreasonably long period of time while ordering only a token amount of food or beverages.constituted a violation of paragraph J of the Temporary Restraining Order theretofore served upon her. On no less than three occasions, one or more of the employees of plaintiff, at my direction, requested that defendant Goldman surrender her table and depart the Wilshire coffee shop but she declined to do so, notwithstanding that there were many other patrons of plaintiff waiting to be seated.

Defendant Bruce Hartford. Defendant Bruce Hartford 17 (defendant "Hartford" herein) arrived at the Wilshire coffee shop at approximately 5:30 p.m., carrying with him a placard advising against the purchase of plaintiff's products. While still in the waiting room of the Wilshire coffee shop, I directed Gordon E. Anderson to effect service of the pleadings upon Hartford, whereupon Mr. Anderson promptly so acted by exhibiting to defendant Hartford the original summons and handing to him a copy of the pleadings. Defendant Hart-24 ford refused to take possession of the pleadings and permitted them to fall and remain at his feet while waiting to be seated. Mr. Anderson's service upon defendant Hartford was also photographed by motion picture photographs made by William Banks. Defendant Hartford was promptly seated and remained in the Wilshire coffee shop until approximately 8:20 p.m. when he departed from said restaurant. Upon being seated, defendant Hartford placed his placard opposite him so that it could be read by bystanders. On one or more occasions there-32 after, I advised defendant Hartford that his actions, in my opinion,

3

5

12

13

16

23

27

28

29

31.

constituted one or more violations of the Temporary Restraining Order and advised him that he continued so to act as his own risk. Defendant Hartford declined to remove his sign but, to the contrary, it remained in full view all or a substantial portion of the time in which he was seated. Defendant Hartford, similarly to the defendants described above, ordered a token amount of beverages and/or food during his stay in the restaurant. Defendant Hartford was also asked by one or more employees of plaintiff on several occasions to surrender his table so that other waiting patrons of plaintiff could 10 be seated, but he declined to do so until his said departure.

6. Defendant Richard Thomson. Defendant Richard Thomson 12 (defendant "Thomson" herein) arrived at the Wilshire coffee shop at 13 approximately 4:15 p.m. on July 2, 1965 and was promptly seated at 14 a table therein. At approximately 4:47 p.m. on said date, I directed 15 Gordon E. Anderson to effect service of the pleadings upon defendant 16 Thomson, whereupon Mr. Anderson, under my direct supervision, prompt-17 ly effected service of the pleadings upon defendant Thomson by ex-18 hibiting to him the original summons issued herein and by handing 19 to him a copy of the pleadings. Mr. Anderson's service upon defend-20 ant was again photographed by motion picture photographs made by 21 William Banks. Defendant Thomson remained at the table until approxi-22 mately 8:20 p.m. when he departed from the Wilshire coffee shop after having remained at his table for over four hours. During his approxi-24 mate four hours stay in said coffee shop, defendant Thomson sipped one or more cups of coffee and little or nothing else. It is my belief, and based upon such belief I declare, that on one occasion following said service of the pleadings, I specifically advised defendant Thomson that his continued conduct in remaining within the Wilshire coffee shop for an unreasonably long period of time while ordering only a token amount of food or beverages constituted a violation of paragraph J of the Temporary Restraining Order theretofore served upon him. On no less than three occasions, one or more

of the employees of plaintiff, at my direction, requested that defendant Thomson surrender his table and depart the Wilshire coffee shop.

On or before July 11, 1964, I was again informed that defendants herein intended to conduct a further demnnstration against plaintiff, but, on this occasion, at the coffee shop of plaintiff located at 6261 Laurel Canyon Boulevard, North Hollywood, California (the "Valley coffee shop" herein). I arrived at the Valley coffee shop at approximately 2:45 p.m. on July 11, 1964, and remained there until approximately 7:45 p.m. when I departed from the premises. Upon arriving at said Valley coffee shop, I conferred with and instructed Everett W. Brown, an investigator and process server who had been engaged to act as process server of the pleadings.

While at the Valley coffee shop on July 11, 1964, I observed the following actions and conduct of each of the named defendants listed hereinbelow.

1. Defendant Becker. Defendant Becker arrived at the Valley coffee shop premises at approximately 3:50 p.m. on July 11, 1964. At approximately 6:15 p.m., defendant Becker was seated at a table in said restaurant and remained there until she and the other defendants herein departed at approximately 7:35 p.m.. During the approximately two and one-half hours preceding her seating, defendant Becker spent most of her time wandering about and in and out of the coffee shop lobby and "table-hopping" within the seating area, spending the remaining portion of the time engaged in a picketing demonstration on the sidewalk of said premises. At approximately 6:00 p.m., while in the lobby of said restaurant, I overheard defendant Becker protest to the manager of the restaurant that others were being seated before her and I thereupon asked defendant Becker if she was waiting to be seated. She answered, somewhat evasively, that she was waiting for a friend. I thereupon asked the manager if defendant Becker had been offered a table

LY, KADISON & QUINN LAWYERS

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

29

30

31

previously, and he advised me that on several occasions she had been offered a table either by herself or with one or more of her friends, but that she had declined each said offer and made it clear to him that she did not wish to be seated. The manager told me that he was aware of his instructions previously received from his superior, Mr. Robert Hudecek, to seat defendant Becker as quickly as possible and that he had attempted to act in accordance with these instructions on several occasions as aforesaid. ly upon defendant Becker being seated at approximately 6:15 p.m., I went to defendant Becker's table for the purpose of advising her that any "sip-in" demonstration on her part would, in my opinion, constitute a further violation of the Temporary Restraining Order theretofore served upon her. I commenced the conversation by advising defendant Becker that it obviously was not necessary for me to provide her with a new copy of the Temporary Restraining Order for her review so that she could refresh her memory as to the prohibitions set forth therein since she had placed the pleadings previously served upon her on the table in front of her. I thereupon directed her attention to paragraph J of the Temporary Restrain ing Order and read such paragraph in its entirety and then stated to her that she had had ten days to study the document and that, in my opinion, she would be charged with knowledge of its contents. Defendant Becker made no comment in response. While in the Valley coffee shop, defendant Becker ordered and was served one dinner roll and one cup of coffee, receiving a bill for 26¢.

2. Defendant Farber. Defendant Farber arrived at the Valley coffee shop at approximately 4:05 p.m. on July 11, 1964 and was promptly seated, remaining at his table until approximately 7:35 p.m.. At approximately 5:30 p.m., I approached the table at which defendant Farber was seated, introduced myself as having directed the service of the pleadings upon him on July 2, 1964, and handed him a copy of the Temporary Restraining Order theretofore

served upon him. I thereupon read to said defendant the full text of paragraph J of said Temporary Restraining Order and advised defendant Farber that he had had approximately ten days to study this document, and stated that, in my opinion, he would be charged with knowledge of its contents, to which he made no reply. At approximately 6:50 p.m., I again approached defendant Farber and advised him that I was aware that he had been asked to surrender his table on several occasions but had declined to do so, notwithstanding that he had been at his table for over two and one-half hours, and I stated to defendant Farber that apparently he had no intention of obeying the Temporary Restraining Order. Defendant Farber again made no response to my statement but purported to ignore me. Defendant Farber remained at the table until approximately 7:35 p.m. when he departed from the restaurant. While in said restaurant, defendant Farber ordered for himself and an unknown female companion an aggregate of three cups of coffee and two donuts.

3. Defendant Frank. Defendant Frank arrived at the Valley coffee shop at approximately 4:06 p.m. and was promptly seated, remaining there until his departure at 7:35 p.m.. At approximately 5:30 p.m., I made the same statement to defendant Frank that I had made to defendant Farber as set forth above, again reading to defendant Frank the full text of paragraph J of the Temporary Restraining Order. Defendant Frank's only response was a "thank you". At approximately 6:50 p.m., I again approached defendant Frank and advised him that I was aware that he had been asked to surrender his table on several occasions but had refused so to act, notwithstanding that he had been at the table for over two and one-half hours, and stated to defendant Frank that apparently he had decided to pay no attention to the Temporary Restraining Order, to which statement defendant Frank made no response. While in the restaurant, defendant Frank ordered food and beverages resulting in a bill of 40¢.

LY, KADISON & QUINN LAWYERS

1

2

3

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

4. Defendant Hartford. Defendant Hartford arrived at the Valley coffee shop premises at approximately 3:50 p.m. on July 11, 1964 and proceeded to march in a picketing demonstration on the sidewalks of the premises until entering the said coffee shop and being seated at approximately 4:50 p.m.. Defendant Hartford remained at his table until his departure at approximately 7:35 p.m... At approximately 5:40 p.m., I approached the table at which defendant Hartford was seated, handed him a copy of the Temporary Restraining Order and read the full text of paragraph J of said Temporary Restraining Order, advising him, as I had done with defendants Farber and Frank, that he had had approximately ten days to study the document and would, in my opinion, be charged with full knowledge of its contents. Defendant Hartford made no response. At approximately 6:55 p.m., I again approached defendant Hartford's table and advised him that he had been at the table for approximately two hours and that he apparently had no intention of obeying the Temporary Restraining Order and that he acted at his own risk. He made no response to my statement. While in said restaurant, defendant Hartford consumed beverages and food resulting in a bill of 446.

5. Defendant Shelia Tomlinson. Defendant Shelia Tomlinson (defendant "Tomlinson" herein) arrived at the Valley coffee shop at approximately 4:15 p.m. and was promptly seated. Defendant Tomlinson was identified to me shortly thereafter and at approximately 5:25 p.m I directed Everett W. Brown to effect service of the pleadings upon her and he did so immediately by exhibiting the original summons issued herein and by handing her a copy of the pleadings. At the time of said service, I directed defendant Tomlinson's attention to the Temporary Restraining Order and, more particularly, to paragraph J of the Temporary Restraining Order and read her the full text of paragraph J of said Temporary Restraining Order. I asked defendant Tomlinson if she had any questions and she merely shook her head.

ELY, KADISON & QUINN

Defendant Tomlinson remained at her table until departing the Valley coffee shop at approximately 7:35 p.m., and while in the said restaurant, she consumed one glass of juice. At approximately 6:57 p.m., I returned to defendant Tomlin's table and directed her attention to the fact that she had been in said restaurant over two and one-half hours, had consumed only one drink, and was obviously violating paragraph J of the Temporary Restraining Order, manifestly with full knowledge of its contents. Defendant Tomlinson merely smiled and declined to respond to my statement.

Newsreel films were made, and are available, of the service of the pleadings upon defendants herein at the Valley coffee shop and of all or a substantial portion of my statements to said defendants described herein.

I was at the Valley coffee shop from approximately 2:45 p.m. until approximately 7:40 p.m. on July 11, 1964. During the entirety of my stay in said coffee shop, I constantly observed the actions of each of the defendents described hereinabove and was never out of the view of any of them for more than five minutes at any one time. Copies of the pleadings were served on many other defendants under fictitious name designations, many of whose actions, in my opinion, constituted violations of one or more provisions of the Temporary Restraining Order served upon him or her; however, I believe based upon my personal observations and upon information provided me that the defendants named hereinabove constitute the initiators and leaders of the demonstrations and as such should be held principally responsible for their actions and those of the other participants, and, for that reason, plaintiff has not at this time sought contempt citations for other defendants herein.

Executed on July 15 %, 1964 at Los Angeles, California.

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Russel I. Kully