

1 NUHA SAYEGH  
2 5634 Noel Drive  
3 Temple City, CA 91780  
4 (626) 348-3039  
5 Defendant In Pro Per  
6  
7

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – PASADENA COURTHOUSE**  
10

11 GARY W. KEARNEY, an individual,

**Case No.: 26PDUD00325**

12  
13 Plaintiff,

**DEMURRER TO COMPLAINT FOR  
UNLAWFUL DETAINER**

14  
15 vs.

**[CCP §§ 1170, 430.10(e), 430.10(c)]**

16  
17 ERIC BRAKEBILL JONES, et al.,

Date: [Leave Blank]

18  
19 Defendants.

Time: [Leave Blank]

Dept: [Leave Blank]

Action Filed: January 28, 2026

20  
21  
22 **TO PLAINTIFF GARY W. KEARNEY AND TO HIS ATTORNEY OF RECORD:**  
23

24 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on the date and time assigned by the Court Clerk in  
25 the Department to be assigned, Defendant NUHA SAYEGH (“Defendant”) will, and  
26 hereby does, demur to the Complaint for Unlawful Detainer filed by Plaintiff GARY  
27 W. KEARNEY (“Plaintiff”).

28 This Demurrer is based on the following grounds pursuant to CCP § 430.10:

1       **1. FAILURE TO STATE FACTS SUFFICIENT TO CONSTITUTE A CAUSE OF ACTION**  
2       **(CCP § 430.10(e))**

3       The Complaint fails to state a cause of action for Unlawful Detainer because the  
4       underlying lease agreement is void *ab initio* as a matter of law. The subject  
5       premises (5634 Noel Drive) is an unpermitted dwelling unit maintained in violation  
6       of Temple City Municipal Code (TCMC) density and zoning ordinances. Under  
7       *Espinoza v. Calva* (2008) 169 Cal.App.4th 1393, a landlord cannot recover  
8       possession or rent based on a lease for an illegal unit. Because the lease is void,  
9       the 3-Day Notice to Pay Rent or Quit is fatally defective.

10  
11       **2. ANOTHER ACTION PENDING (CCP § 430.10(c))**

12       There is another action pending between the same parties on the same cause of  
13       action. Defendant filed a Verified Complaint for Damages and Rescission against  
14       Plaintiff on **January 21, 2026** (Case No. **26NNCV00412**), seven days *prior* to the  
15       filing of this Unlawful Detainer action. The prior pending action (“The First  
16       Action”) challenges the validity of the lease and seeks rescission. The determination  
17       of the lease’s validity in the First Action is a prerequisite to any adjudication of  
18       possession in this summary proceeding. A "Notice of Related Case" linking these  
19       matters was filed on February 3, 2026.

20  
21       **PRAYER**

22       WHEREFORE, Defendant prays for judgment as follows:

- 23               1. That this Demurrer be sustained without leave to amend;
- 24               2. That the Unlawful Detainer Complaint be dismissed with prejudice;
- 25               3. For costs of suit; and
- 26               4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

27  
28       DATED: February 3, 2026

---

**NUHA SAYEGH**

Defendant in Pro Per

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

This Unlawful Detainer action is a retaliatory attempt to enforce a void lease on an illegal dwelling. Plaintiff filed this action on January 28, 2026. However, Defendant had already filed a unlimited civil action against Plaintiff on January 21, 2026 (*Sayegh v. Kearney*, Case No. 26NNCV00412), alleging Fraud and seeking Rescission. Because the First Action challenges the existence of the landlord-tenant relationship and was filed first, this Court should sustain the demurrer.

### **II. THE LEASE IS VOID AB INITIO (CCP § 430.10(e))**

A contract for an illegal purpose is void (Civil Code § 1598). A lease for a unit that violates local zoning or building codes is void and unenforceable (*Espinoza v. Calva*). Here, the premises violate Temple City Municipal Code regarding density and mandatory access width. A 3-Day Notice that demands rent for an illegal unit is invalid on its face.

### **III. FIRST-IN-TIME PRIORITY (CCP § 430.10(c))**

Under CCP § 430.10(c), a party may demur when "there is another action pending between the same parties on the same cause of action." The validity of the Lease is the subject of the prior pending unlimited civil action (*Case No. 26NNCV00412*).

DATED: February 3, 2026