Case No.: 2:18-cy-05052

CROSSCLAIM BY KEITH M. DAVIDSON AGAINST MICHAEL D. COHEN AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE,

[Filed Concurrently with:

- 1) Answer to Complaint; and
- 2) Counterclaim against Stephanie Clifford; Michael Avenatti; Avenatti & Associates, A Professional Corporation; And Eagan Avenatti, LLP; and Counterclaim 1

Assigned For All Purposes: Hon. S. James Otero

Defendant and cross-claimant KEITH M. DAVIDSON (hereinafter "DAVIDSON")

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Fax. (323) 658-5424

658-5444 - ~

Tel. (323) 18

### **INTRODUCTION**

- 1. Defendant and Crossclaimant Keith M. Davidson (DAVIDSON) is a resident of the State of California and an Attorney who formerly represented plaintiff / counterclaim defendant Stephanie Clifford (CLIFFORD).
- 2. Crossdefendant Michael D. Cohen is a resident of the State of New York and is an attorney who was adverse to DAVIDSON's representation of CLIFFORD.
- 3. DAVIDSON and COHEN negotiated a Confidential Settlement Agreement and Assignment of Copyright involving CLIFFORD in October of 2016.
- 4. DAVIDSON'S first interaction with COHEN was telephonic and began as a heated conversation with COHEN screaming at DAVIDSON about CLIFFORD's purported efforts in selling information regarding CLIFFORD's alleged 2007 affair with Donald Trump to the tabloid media.
- 5. Though DAVIDSON and COHEN had first spoken on the phone in 2011, the two lawyers had never met face-to-face until after there were competing allegations of breach by CLIFFORD on the one side and COHEN on the other side, (roughly January of 2018).
- 6. The two lawyers never spoke about family, sports, politics or current events. The relationship between DAVIDSON and COHEN was professional and adversarial.
- 7. DAVIDSON and COHEN conducted the CLIFFORD negotiation via phone calls and e-mail correspondence while DAVIDSON was in California.
- 8. DAVIDSON never consulted to any of his phone calls being recorded by COHEN.

# **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

- 9. The court may assert personal jurisdiction over the parties because the parties have submitted themselves to this court's jurisdiction.
- 10. The court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The parties are citizens of different states, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 11. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391. A substantial part of the events or omissions that give rise to DAVIDSON's claims which occurred in the Central District of California.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION CIVIL VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA INVASION OF PRIVACY ACT Cal. (Cal. Pen. Code §637 et seq.) AGAINST MICHAEL D. COHEN

- 12. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in all prior paragraphs as though fully set forth herein;
- Act for the express purpose "to protect the right of privacy of the people of this state." *Cal. Pen. Code §630*. The California Legislature declared that with the advent of new devices and technology used "for the purposes of eavesdropping upon private communications," the resulting invasion of privacy from the "use of such devices and techniques has created a serious threat to the free exercise of personal liabilities and cannot be tolerated in a free and civilized society." Sections 632 & 637 of the Act make it illegal to record telephonic communications without consent of all participants to the telephone call.
- 14. Anyone who secretly records any part to a telephone conversation with a party in California may be violating Penal Code section 632, which provides that intentional recording of any confidential communication by means of any electronic amplifying or recording device without the consent of all parties to the communication is guilty of a crime and may be subject to a civil action.

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

Fax. (323) 658-5424

- 15. To show a violation of section 632, a party needs to show nothing more than the existence of a reasonable expectation by a party to a conversation that no one was listening in on the conversation and that the conversation was intentionally recorded by someone through the use of an electronic amplifying or recording device.
- 16. DAVIDSON is informed and believes and thereon alleges that COHEN on surreptitiously and intentionally recorded several telephone calls between he and DAVIDSON while Davidson was in California.
- 17. DAVIDSON never consented to the recordation of any phone calls he had with COHEN as he believed the calls were confidential.
- DAVIDSON is informed believes and thereon alleges that COHEN's 18. surreptitious recordation of telephonic communications between the two was contrary to California law and that the recording of the calls has caused DAVIDSON tremendous actual damages no less than the minimum jurisdictional limit of this Court.

# WHEREFORE, Defendant prays that:

- 1. Treble damages of no less than \$75,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Pen. Code §637.2;
- 2. For attorneys' fees and costs of the suit herein;
- 3. For such other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Dated June 7, 2018 DAVIDSON & ASSOCOATES, PLC

> By: /S/ Keith M. Davidson Pro Se Attorney

27 28

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

KEITH M. DAVIDSON respectfully demands trial by jury for all claims that may be tried to a jury.

DATED: June 7, 2018 DAVIDSON & ASSOCIATES, PLC

By: /S/ Keith M. Davidson Keith M. Davidson, Esq. Pro Se Attorney

# PROOF OF SERVICE

# STATE OF CALIFORNIA **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

I am a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is 8383Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 510, Beverly Hills, CA 90211.

On June 7, 2018, I served a true copy of Crossclaim by Keith M. Davidson against Michael D. Cohen on the interested parties in said action by placing as stated below:

### SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

(BY MAIL) I deposited such envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Calabasas, California.	ıe
(BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressee.	of
(BY FACSIMILE) The above-described document (s) were sent by facsimil transmission to the facsimile number(s) of the law office(s) stated above. The transmission was reported as complete and without error. A copy of the transmission report is made part of this proof of service pursuant to CRC §2008.	n
(BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) I placed the Federal Express package for overnight delivery in a box or location regularly maintained by Federal Express at my office or I delivered the package to an authorized courier or driver authorized by Federal Express to receive documents. The package was placed in a sealed envelope or package designate by Federal Express with delivery fees paid or provided for, addressed to the person(s) of whom it is to be served at the address(es) shown above, at the office address(es) as last give by that person on any document filed in the cause and served on the party making service otherwise at that party's place of residence.	ess ed on en
(State) I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Californithat the foregoing is true and correct.	ia
( <b>Federal</b> ) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of the court at whose direction the service was made.	is
Executed on June 7, 2018 at Beverly Hills, California.	
/S/ Vilma Duarte Vilma Duarte	

# SERVICE LIST (DAVIDSON vs. COHEN)

Attorney For MICHAEL D. COHEN:
Brent Blakely, Esq.
Blakely Law Group
1334 Parkview Avenue, Suite 280
Manhattan Beach, California 90266
Telephone: (310) 546-7400

Telephone: (310) 546-7400 Facsimile: (310) 546-7401

Attorney for STEPHANIE CLIFFORD; MICHAEL AVENATTI; EAGAN AVENATTI, LLP; AND AVENATTI & ASSOCIATES, PLC:

520 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1400

Newport Beach, CA 92660 Telephone: (949) 706-7000 Facsimile: (949) 706-7050