

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):  <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NUHA SAYEGH</b>  <b>5634 Noel Drive Temple City, CA 91780</b></p> <p>TELEPHONE NO.: (626) 348-3039      FAX NO. (Optional):</p> <p>EMAIL ADDRESS (Optional): <b>nuha@recovery-compass.org</b></p> <p>ATTORNEY FOR (Name): <b>Plaintiff in Pro Per</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>FOR COURT USE ONLY</i></p>
<b>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</b> STREET ADDRESS: <b>150 West Commonwealth Avenue</b> MAILING ADDRESS: <b>150 West Commonwealth Avenue</b> CITY AND ZIP CODE: <b>Alhambra, CA 91801</b> BRANCH NAME: <b>Alhambra Courthouse</b>	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: <b>NUHA SAYEGH</b>	CASE NUMBER:
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: <b>GARY W. KEARNEY, an individual; and DOES 1-10</b>	JUDICIAL OFFICER:
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOTICE OF RELATED CASE</b></p>	DEPT.:

Identify, in chronological order according to date of filing, all cases related to the case referenced above.

1.
  - a. Title: **Sayegh v. Kearney**
  - b. Case number: **26NNCV00412**
  - c. Court: ☒ same as above  
☐ other state or federal court(name and address):
  - d. Department: **X**
  - e. Case type: ☐ limited civil ☒ unlimited civil ☐ probate ☐ family law ☐ other(specify):
  - Filing date: **01/21/2026**
  - g. Has this case been designated or determined as "complex?" ☐ Yes ☒ No
  - h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above (check all that apply):
    - ☒ involves the same parties and is based on the same or similar claims.
    - ☒ arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
    - ☒ involves claims against, title to, possession of, or damages to the same property.
    - ☒ is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.
    - ☒ Additional explanation is attached in attachment 1h
  - i. Status of case:
    - ☒ pending
    - ☐ dismissed ☐ with ☐ without prejudice
    - ☐ disposed of by judgment
2.
  - a. Title: **Kearney v. Jones** (or **Kearney v. Sayegh** - The notice lists "GARY KEARNEY vs ERIC BRAKEBILL JONES, et al.")
  - b. Case number: **26PDUD00325**
  - c. Court: ☐ same as above  
☒ other state or federal court(name and address): **Pasadena Courthouse 300 East Walnut Street Pasadena, CA 91101**
  - d. Department: **Unassigned**

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: NUHA SAYEGH DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: GARY W. KEARNEY, et al.	CASE NUMBER: 26NNCV00412
--	-----------------------------

## 2. (continued)

- e. Case type: ☒ limited civil ☐ unlimited civil ☐ probate ☐ family law ☐ other(*specify*):
- f. Filing date: 01/28/2026
- g. Has this case been designated or determined as "complex?" ☐ Yes ☒ No
- h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above (*check all that apply*):
- ☒ involves the same parties and is based on the same or similar claims.
- ☒ arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
- ☒ involves claims against, title to, possession of, or damages to the same property.
- ☒ is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.
- ☒ Additional explanation is attached in attachment 2h
- i. Status of case:
- ☒ pending
- ☐ dismissed ☐ with ☐ without prejudice
- ☐ disposed of by judgment

## 3. a. Title:

b. Case number:

- c. Court: ☐ same as above  
☐ other state or federal court(*name and address*):

d. Department:

- e. Case type: ☐ limited civil ☐ unlimited civil ☐ probate ☐ family law ☐ other(*specify*):
- f. Filing date:
- g. Has this case been designated or determined as "complex?" ☐ Yes ☐ No
- h. Relationship of this case to the case referenced above (*check all that apply*):
- ☐ involves the same parties and is based on the same or similar claims.
- ☐ arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact.
- ☐ involves claims against, title to, possession of, or damages to the same property.
- ☐ is likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.
- ☐ Additional explanation is attached in attachment 3h
- i. Status of case:
- ☐ pending
- ☐ dismissed ☐ with ☐ without prejudice
- ☐ disposed of by judgment

4. ☐ Additional related cases are described in Attachment 4. Number of pages attached: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 02/01/2026

Nuha Sayegh

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY)



Nuha Sayegh

(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY)

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: NUHA SAYEGH DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: GARY W. KEARNEY, et al.	CASE NUMBER: 26NNCV00412
--	-----------------------------

**PROOF OF SERVICE BY FIRST-CLASS MAIL  
NOTICE OF RELATED CASE**

**(NOTE: You cannot serve the Notice of Related Case if you are a party in the action. The person who served the notice must complete this proof of service. The notice must be served on all known parties in each related action or proceeding.)**

1. I am at least 18 years old and **not a party to this action**. I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing took place, and my residence or business address is *(specify)*:
  
  2. I served a copy of the *Notice of Related Case* by enclosing it in a sealed envelope with first-class postage fully prepaid and *(check one)*:
    - a. ☐ deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service.
    - b. ☐ placed the sealed envelope for collection and processing for mailing, following this business's usual practices, with which I am readily familiar. On the same day correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service.
  3. The *Notice of Related Case* was mailed:
    - a. on *(date)*:
    - b. from *(city and state)*:
  4. The envelope was addressed and mailed as follows:
 

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Name of person served:</li>   <li>Street address:</li> <li>City:</li> <li>State and zip code:</li>   <li>b. Name of person served:</li>   <li>Street address:</li> <li>City:</li> <li>State and zip code:</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Name of person served:</li>   <li>Street address:</li> <li>City:</li> <li>State and zip code:</li>   <li>d. Name of person served:</li>   <li>Street address:</li> <li>City:</li> <li>State and zip code:</li> </ol>
--	--
- ☐ Names and addresses of additional persons served are attached. *(You may use form POS-030(P).)*

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

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)

SHORT TITLE: <b>Sayegh v. Kearney</b>	CASE NUMBER: <b>26NNCV00412</b>
--	------------------------------------

ATTACHMENT (Number): 1h & 2h

(This Attachment may be used with any Judicial Council form.)

1. **CHRONOLOGICAL PRIORITY** The Unlimited Civil action, Sayegh v. Kearney (Case No. 26NNCV00412), was filed and assigned to Dept. X (Hon. Lauren A. R. Lofton) at the Alhambra Courthouse on January 21, 2026.

The Limited Civil Unlawful Detainer action, Kearney v. Sayegh (Case No. 26PDUD00325), was filed seven days later on January 28, 2026.

2. **OVERLAPPING SUBJECT MATTER (VALIDITY OF LEASE)** Both actions involve the exact same parties and the exact same real property located at 5634 Noel Drive, Temple City, CA 91780.

The "Earlier Case" (Unlimited Civil) seeks to rescind the lease and recover damages based on Fraud in the Inducement, Violation of Civil Code § 789.3 (Utility Theft), and the illegality of the premises (an unpermitted "Ghost Unit" with code violations rendering the lease void). The "Later Case" (Unlawful Detainer) attempts to enforce the very lease that is the subject of the fraud and rescission action in the Unlimited Civil court.

3. **JURISDICTIONAL PRIORITY (ASUNCION DOCTRINE)** The "Earlier Case" is an Unlimited Civil matter with an amount in controversy exceeding \$35,000. The "Later Case" is a Limited Civil summary proceeding. Under Asuncion v. Superior Court (1980) 108 Cal.App.3d 141, the Limited Civil court lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate the complex issues of title, fraud, and rescission raised in the prior Unlimited Civil filing. A determination of possession in the Unlawful Detainer court cannot be equitably made without first resolving the validity of the lease and the fraud allegations pending in the Superior Court.

4. **REQUEST FOR ASSIGNMENT** To avoid inconsistent rulings, judicial waste, and the risk of evicting a tenant based on a potentially void lease, the later-filed Unlawful Detainer action (26PDUD00325) should be related to the earlier-filed Unlimited Civil action (26NNCV00412) and assigned to Dept. X (Hon. Lauren A. R. Lofton) for all purposes.

(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

Page 1 of 1

(Add pages as required)