

1 HERMAN LAW
2 5200 Town Center Circle, Suite 540
3 Boca Raton, Florida 33486
4 Jeff Herman
(pending *pro hac vice admission*)
5 Daniel Ellis
6 California Bar No. 298639
7 dellis@hermanlaw.com
8 Arick Fudali
9 California Bar No. 296364
10 afudali@hermanlaw.com
11 Tel: (305) 931-2200
12 Fax: (305) 931-0877

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiff, Dominique Huett*

14 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
15 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

16 DOMINIQUE HUETT,)	CASE NO: BC680869
)	
17 Plaintiff,)	CIVIL COMPLAINT ALLEGING
18 vs.)	DAMAGES FOR NEGLIGENCE
)	
19 THE WEINSTEIN COMPANY LLC,)	<u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u>
)	
20 Defendant.)	
)	
)	
)	
)	

21 **PARTIES AND JURISDICTION**

- 22 1. Plaintiff Dominique Huett is a citizen and resident of New York.
- 23 2. Defendant The Weinstein Company LLC (hereinafter referred to as "TWC") is a
24 Delaware limited liability company whose principle place of business is in New York, New
25 York.
- 26 3. Venue properly lies in this county in that Defendant regularly conducts business
27 in this county, and the torts described herein were committed in this county. This Court has
28

1 jurisdiction in that this is a claim for damages of not less than \$5 million, well in excess of the
2 jurisdictional minimum of \$25,000.

3
4 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 4. In or about November 2010, Plaintiff Dominique Huett and Harvey Weinstein
6 arranged to meet each other at The Peninsula Beverly Hills hotel in Beverly Hills, California.
7 Plaintiff was an aspiring actress at the time and the purpose of the meeting was to discuss
8 Weinstein's offer to assist Plaintiff in procuring future television and/or film roles. The
9 communications to arrange this meeting included e-mails from the e-mail address of
10 Weinstein's assistant at TWC.
11

12 5. Plaintiff and Weinstein initially met at the bar of The Peninsula hotel, where they
13 discussed Weinstein's interest in assisting Plaintiff with her acting career. During their
14 conversation, Plaintiff noticed Weinstein staring at her breasts. Weinstein asked Plaintiff if she
15 had ever had a "boob job" and asked her to show him her breasts. Plaintiff refused and was
16 made uncomfortable by the question and the request. However, Weinstein informed Plaintiff
17 that the purpose of the questioning was that it would be beneficial for securing future roles if
18 she did not have breast augmentation.
19

20 6. At some point during their conversation, Weinstein, who was at the time living at
21 the hotel, invited Plaintiff to his room under the guise of continuing their business meeting.
22 Plaintiff agreed to move the meeting to his hotel room, believing they were to continue their
23 discussion regarding her career.
24

25 7. While in Weinstein's room, the two continued their conversation regarding
26 Plaintiff's career. At some point, Weinstein excused himself to use the restroom. After several
27 minutes, Weinstein returned from the restroom wearing only a bathrobe.
28

1 8. Upon returning, Weinstein asked Plaintiff to perform a massage on him. Plaintiff
2 said, “No,” and that she did not feel comfortable by his request. However, Weinstein persisted
3 and would not take “no” for an answer. Weinstein laid on the bed and demanded that Plaintiff
4 perform a massage on him. Plaintiff ultimately complied with his demands and performed the
5 massage.
6

7 9. Subsequently, Weinstein requested to perform oral sex on Plaintiff. Plaintiff was
8 shocked and alarmed by the request and initially refused. Again, Weinstein displayed
9 persistence and would not take “no” for an answer. Weinstein initiated and Plaintiff froze as
10 Weinstein removed her clothing and performed oral sex on her. Weinstein performed oral sex
11 on Plaintiff for several minutes. After performing oral sex on Plaintiff, Weinstein masturbated
12 in front of Plaintiff until he reached orgasm.
13

14 10. At some point during their communications, Weinstein gave Plaintiff the contact
15 information for an executive producer with *Project Runaway*, a television program produced by
16 Defendant, and offered to secure a role for Plaintiff on the program.
17

18 11. Prior to the incident involving Plaintiff, Defendant TWC’s executives, officers
19 and employees had actual knowledge of Weinstein’s repeated acts of sexual misconduct with
20 women. In particular, Defendant was aware of Weinstein’s pattern of using his power to coerce
21 and force young actresses to engage in sexual acts with him. This knowledge was possessed by
22 Defendant’s Board of Directors including, upon information and belief, Bob Weinstein.
23

24 12. Upon information and belief, Defendant was aware of allegations of sexual
25 misconduct against Weinstein going back to the 1990s. Upon information and belief, prior to
26 the incident involving Plaintiff, Defendant was aware of multiple claims of sexual misconduct
27
28

1 which were settled with the victims prior to the filing of suit. This knowledge was possessed by
2 Defendant's Board of Directors including, upon information and belief, Bob Weinstein.

3 13. Prior to the incident involving Plaintiff, Defendant often aided and abetted
4 Weinstein in the commission of his sexual misconduct. For example, female Weinstein
5 Company employees were often used as "honeypots" to lure his victims into a false sense of
6 security. The "honeypots" would initially join a meeting along with a woman Weinstein was
7 interested in, but then Weinstein would dismiss them, leaving him alone with the woman.
8

9 14. Plaintiff did not discover, and a reasonable and diligent investigation would not
10 have disclosed, that prior to her incident Defendant was aware of numerous allegations of
11 sexual misconduct involving Weinstein. Upon information and belief, the allegations of sexual
12 misconduct involving Weinstein that Defendant was aware of were subject to nondisclosure
13 agreements and/or confidential settlements, and were otherwise only known inside TWC. Upon
14 information and belief, the nondisclosure agreements and/or confidential settlements legally
15 prohibited Defendant TWC, Weinstein, and the victims of the sexual misconduct from
16 discussing the allegations and Defendant's knowledge thereof. As such, even if Plaintiff had
17 conducted a timely and reasonable investigation, she could not have discovered Defendant's
18 prior knowledge of Weinstein's sexual misconduct. Plaintiff was unable to discover
19 Defendant's knowledge of Weinstein's propensity to engage in sexual misconduct until the
20 story of Weinstein's pattern of sexual misconduct with young actresses broke in October 2017.
21
22
23

24 **COUNT I**
25 (Negligence)

26 15. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 14 above.

27 16. At all relevant times, Defendant owed a duty to use reasonable care in the
28 retention and supervision of its employee Harvey Weinstein.

1 17. This included a duty to control Weinstein in his interactions with women during
2 meetings taking place within the course and scope of his employment in order to prevent
3 foreseeable harm.

4 18. Prior to the sexual misconduct with Plaintiff, Defendant knew or had reason to
5 believe Weinstein was likely to engage in sexual misconduct with women he came into contact
6 with during the course and scope of his employment. In particular, upon information and belief,
7 Defendant knew or should have known that Weinstein would lure young aspiring actresses into
8 compromising situations under the guise of business meetings. Prior to the incident involving
9 Plaintiff, Defendant's Board of Directors possessed knowledge of Weinstein's propensity to
10 engage in sexual misconduct. Knowledge of Weinstein's propensity to engage in sexual
11 misconduct was additionally possessed by Defendant's executives, officers and employees. At
12 all relevant times Defendant's Board of Directors maintained a supervisory position over
13 Weinstein.

14 19. By possessing knowledge of Weinstein's prior sexual misconduct, Defendant
15 knew or should have known that Weinstein was unfit and that this unfitness created a particular
16 risk to others.

17 20. Defendant did not act in a reasonable manner by failing to terminate Weinstein
18 and instead continued to allow him to meet with prospective actresses in private areas with the
19 knowledge that there was a substantial likelihood for sexual misconduct.

20 21. Weinstein's meeting with Plaintiff at the Peninsula hotel occurred within the
21 course and scope of his employment. The contact between Plaintiff and Weinstein was
22 generated by the employment relationship between Defendant and Weinstein.

