Charles C.H. Wu, SBN 166756 Mark H. Cheung, SBN 150690 Carolyn N. Ko, SBN 223540 Vikram M. Reddy, SBN 228515 WU & CHEUNG, LLP 98 Discovery Irvine, California 92618-3105 (949) 251-0111

1

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



MAY -3 2006

ALAN SLATER, Clerk of the Count Bounch

Attorneys for Defendants/Cross-Complainant Bradley J. Chrustawka, Anjanette Chrustawka, and Katherine M. Matonic

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ORANGE - CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

HERITAGE MARKETING AND INSURANCE SERVICES, INC., a California corporation; HERITAGE MARKETING AND INSURANCE SERVICES, a general partnership; STANLEY NORMAN, an individual; JEFFREY L. NORMAN, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

BRADLEY J. CHRUSTAWKA, an individual; ANJANETTE CHRUSTAWKA (nee PRICE), an individual; KATHERINE M. MATONIC, an individual; CAROL CARROLL, an individual; CHARLES RITINOUR, an individual; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION.

CASE NO. 04 CC 05195

[Assigned to Judge Robert J. Moss, Dept. C181

[PROPOSED]

JUDGMENT RE: DEFENDANTS ANJANETTE CHRUSTAWKA (nee PRICE) AND KATHERINE M. MATONIC

DATE: April 14, 2006

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

DEPT: C18

TO PLAINTIFFS/CROSS-DEFENDANTS AND TO THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on March 24, 2006 and April 14, 2006, respectively at 10:00 a.m., in Department C18 of this Court, located at 700 Civic Center Drive West, Santa Ana, California, 92701, the

JUDGMENT RE: DEFENDANTS ANJANETTE CHRUSTAWKA AND KATHERINE MATONIC

J.\Chrustawka.1013\Pleadings\Prop Judgment(B).wpd

Motion for Summary Adjudication of Issues by defendants Bradley J. Chrustawka, Anjanette Chrustawka (nee Price), and Katherine M. Matonic came on regularly for a hearing before the Hon. Robert J. Moss, Judge presiding.

March 24, 2006 Hearing

For the March 24, 2006 hearing: Mark H. Cheung and Alan Unterman appeared on behalf of the moving parties, defendants Bradley J. Chrustawka, Anjanette Chrustawka (nee Price), and Katherine M. Matonic (Snyder). Robert L. Wishner and Nils Rosenquest appeared on behalf of the responding parties, plaintiffs Heritage Marketing and Insurance Services, Inc., Heritage Marketing and Insurance Services, Jeffrey Norman and Stanley Norman.

The Court, after having issued a tentative ruling on the internet on March 23, 2006, and after receiving argument of counsel, requested supplemental briefing from the parties, and continued the hearing on said motion to April 14, 2006.

April 14, 2006 Hearing

For the April 14, 2006 hearing, the Court received supplemental briefing from the parties, and the Court issued its tentative ruling on April 13, 2006. Based thereon, all parties submitted on said tentative ruling without an appearance.

Thereafter, the Court filed an Order granting said motion for summary adjudication with the effect of summarily adjudicating the plaintiffs' causes of action in favor of defendants Anjanette Chrustawka (nee Price) and Katherine M. Matonic as follows:

- * Second cause of action for conspiracy to defraud,
- * Third cause of action for defamation,
- * Fourth cause of action for tortuous interference with economic advantage,
- * Fifth Cause of Action for slander, and
- * Sixth cause of action for violation of the California trade secrets act.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED, DECREED AND ORDERED that:

- (1) Plaintiffs Heritage Marketing and Insurance Services, Inc., a California corporation; Heritage Marketing and Insurance Services, a general partnership; Stanley Norman, an individual, and Jeffrey L. Norman, an individual, shall recover nothing on their Complaint against defendants Anjanette Chrustawka (nee Price) and Katherine M. Matonic.
- (2) Defendants Anjanette Chrustawka (nee Price) and Katherine M. Matonic shall have and recover from plaintiffs Heritage Marketing and Insurance Services, Inc., a California corporation; Heritage Marketing and Insurance Services, a general partnership; Stanley Norman, an individual, and Jeffrey L. Norman, an individual, their costs and attorney's fees in the amount of subject motion pursuant to a Memorandum of Costs and/or motion that defendants may hereinafter file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 5/3/06

ROBERT J. MOSS

Hon`. Robert J. Moss Judge of the Superior Court

PROOF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 18103 SKYPARK SOUTH # B, Irvine, CA 92614.

On April 27, 2006, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT RE: DEFENDANTS ANJANETTE CHRUSTAWKA AND KATHERINE M. MATONIC

on all interested parties in this action

by placing [] the original [X] a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows:

Gregory J. Shebest, Esq. PACIFIC LAW OFFICES 340 Commerce Street, Suite 200 Irvine, California 92602

Nils Rosenquest, Esq Robert Wishner, Esq 18008 Sky Park Circle, Suite 203 Irvine, CA 92614

J. Christawka 1012 Diagdia ... in

Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Cross-defendants

- By Fax: 949-955-3918 (Mr. Wishner) and 800-926-6816 (Mr. Shebest)
- [X]BY MAIL

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

[] *I deposited such envelope in the mail at Irvine, California.

The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

As follows: I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Irvine, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

Executed on April 27, 2006, at Irvine, California.

- [BY PERSONAL SERVICE] I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressee. (C.C.P. 1011)
- [X] I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of (State) California that the above is true and correct.

26

27

28