

<p>ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (<i>Name, State Bar number, and address</i>):  <b>Ilse C. Scott (SBN 233433)</b>  <b>NOSSAMAN LLP</b>  <b>50 California Street, 34<sup>th</sup> Floor</b>  <b>San Francisco, CA 94111</b>          TELEPHONE NO.: <b>415.398.3600</b> FAX NO. (<i>Optional</i>): <b>415.398.2438</b>          E-MAIL ADDRESS (<i>Optional</i>): <b>iscott@nossaman.com</b>          ATTORNEY FOR (<i>Name</i>): <b>Defendant City of Los Angeles</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">FOR COURT USE ONLY</p>
<p><b>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</b>          STREET ADDRESS: <b>111 N. Hill Street</b>          MAILING ADDRESS:          CITY AND ZIP CODE: <b>Los Angeles 90012</b>          BRANCH NAME:</p>	
<p>PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: <b>LA Forward Institute, et al.</b>           DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: <b>City of Los Angeles</b></p>	<p>CASE NUMBER:  <b>24STCV17156</b>           JUDICIAL OFFICER:  <b>Hon. Robert D. Broadbelt III</b></p>
<p><b>NOTICE OF RELATED CASE</b></p>	<p>DEPT.:  <b>53</b></p>

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

1. a. Title: Venice Community Housing Corporation v. The Los Angeles Board of Transportation Commissioners
  - b. Case number: 25STCP00892
  - c. Court:  same as above  
 other state or federal court (*name and address*):
  - d. Department: 86
  - e. Case type:  limited civil  unlimited civil  probate  family law  other (*specify*): Writ
  - f. Filing date: March 7, 2025
  - 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: People Organized for Westside Renewal v. The Los Angeles Board of Transportation Commissioners
  - b. Case number: 25STCP01091
  - c. Court:  same as above  
 other state or federal court (*name and address*):
  - d. Department: 82

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: LA Forward Institute, et al.	CASE NUMBER: 24STCV17156
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: City of Los Angeles	

2. (continued)

e. Case type:  limited civil  unlimited civil  probate  family law  other (specify): Writ

f. Filing date: March 19, 2025

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: April 11, 2025

Ilse C. Scott  
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY)

 /s/ Ilse C. Scott  
(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY)

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: LA Forward Institute, et al.	CASE NUMBER: 24STCV17156
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: City of Los Angeles	

**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*): c/o Nossaman LLP, 50 California Street, 34th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111
  
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*): April 11, 2025
  - b. from (*city and state*): San Francisco, CA
  
4. The envelope was addressed and mailed as follows:

a. Name of person served: Faizah Malik, Mark Rosenbaum  
 Street address: 610 South Ardmore Avenue  
 City: Los Angeles  
 State and zip code: CA 90005

c. Name of person served: Dale K. Larson, Salvador E. Pérez, Tessa Baizer  
 Street address: 1250 6th Street, Suite 205  
 City: Santa Monica  
 State and zip code: CA 90401

b. Name of person served: Katherine J. Gomez McKeon, Robert D. Newman  
 Street address: 3701 Wilshire Boulevard, #208  
 City: Los Angeles  
 State and zip code: CA 90010


d. Name of person served:  
 Street address:  
 City:  
 State and zip code:

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: April 11, 2025

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

 /s/ Anthony Levintow  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)