Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

Ghirlandi Guidetti (SBN 307342)
gguidetti@publiccounsel.org
David Zhao (SBN 359320)
dzhao@publiccounsel.org
PUBLIC COUNSEL
610 S. Ardmore Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90005
Telephone: (213) 637-3836
Facsimile: (213) 201-4722

Pro Bono Attorneys for Defendant
And Cross-Complainant
Lisa Neville

Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles 11/18/2025 4:09 PM David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, By M. Bell, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COUNTY, SAN FERNANDO COURTHOUSE

CREDIT CORP SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Lisa Neville,

Defendant.

Case No. 24CHLC30511

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A CROSS-COMPLAINT AND TO POSTPONE THE APRIL 22, 2026, TRIAL DATE; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES; DECLARATION OF DAVID ZHAO

([PROPOSED] Order filed concurrently herewith)

Limited Civil Case to be Reclassified as Unlimited Civil Case by Cross Complaint

Date: February 4, 2026
Time: 8:30AM
Department: K
RES ID: 716139138190

Complaint Filed: April 16, 2025
Trial Date: April 22, 2026

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

TO THE COURT AND TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on February 4, 2026, at 8:30AM, or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, in Department K of the above-entitled Court, located at 900 Third Street, San Fernando, California 91340, Defendant, Lisa Neville ("Ms. Neville") by and through her attorneys will and hereby does move the Court pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 426.5 and § 473(a)(2) for an Order Granting Leave to File a Cross-Complaint and to Postpone the April 22, 2026 Trial Date.

This motion is based on this Notice, as well as the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the supporting Declaration of David Zhao and exhibits attached thereto, all pleadings and records filed herein, and such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing of this motion.

Date: 11/18/2025

David Zhao

David Zhao
Attorney for Defendant
Lisa Neville

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Lisa Neville ("Ms. Neville") respectfully requests leave to file the cross-complaint attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of David Zhao filed herewith. The proposed cross-complaint alleges claims against Plaintiff Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. ("Credit Corp") for violations of the Fair Debt Buying Practices Act, Rosenthal Fair Debt Collections Act, and the Unfair Competition Law, and would reclassify the case as an Unlimited Civil action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 403.030. The violations alleged in the proposed cross-complaint each arose out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions and occurrences as the cause of action stated in Credit Corp's complaint. In particular, the violations arise from Credit Corp's allegation that Ms. Neville owes Credit Corp money on an alleged debt that Credit Corp owns, culminating in the filing of the instant action to collect the alleged debt. Even though Ms. Neville could not have known this was the case until she later found legal aid support, out of an abundance of caution Ms. Neville seeks leave to file a compulsory cross complaint subject to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §§ 426.10 – 426.70.

The Court should grant the motion because Ms. Neville was not represented by counsel when she filed her general denial and she was unaware of both the violations and that she should have filed the compulsory cross-complaint at that time. Courts liberally construe Cal. Code Civ. Proc., § 426.50 – mandating that courts grant leave to file a cross complaint as a cure for any oversight, inadvertence, mistake, or neglect – at any time during the course of the action unless there is bad faith. Here, there is no evidence—let alone substantial evidence—of any bad faith on Ms. Neville's part. (Code Civ. Proc., § 426.50; *Silver Orgs. Ltd. v. Frank* (1990) 217 Cal.App.3d 94, 99.) Accordingly, the Court "must grant" the motion. (*Silver Orgs.*, *supra*, at p. 99). Ms. Neville also respectfully requests that the Court postpone the currently scheduled April 22, 2026 trial date and, on its own motion, reclassify the case as an unlimited civil case.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On April 16, 2025, Credit Corp filed a breach of contract lawsuit against Ms. Neville in Los Angeles Superior Court Limited Civil, seeking $2,064.89 for an alleged debt from a PayPal Synchrony Bank credit card, plus the cost of the suit. *See* Complaint in Register of Actions.

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

On July 11, 2025, Ms. Neville filed a General Denial. *See* General Denial in Register of Actions. In her General Denial, Ms. Neville asserted the affirmative defense that, among other things, Credit Corp failed to include a valid assignment of any debt by an assignor to Credit Corp and thus lacked standing. *See* General Denial in Register of Actions. Credit Corp's Complaint alleges that it purchased Ms. Neville's alleged debt from Synchrony Bank on or around May 16, 2022. *See* Exhibit A of the Complaint. However, the documents purporting to show the alleged assignment of Ms. Nevilles alleged debt are heavily redacted, making it impossible to determine whether the document actually establishes what it purports to. *See* Exhibit A of the Complaint.

On October 30, 2025, Ms. Neville formally retained Public Counsel, a pro bono law firm, to represent her in this case. *See* Declaration of David Zhao ("Zhao Decl.") at ¶2. Exhibit A to Credit Corp's Complaint – which purports to establish that Ms. Neville's specific alleged debt was included in a portfolio of debts assigned to Credit Corp. – is the same 6th page of an 81-page document that Plaintiff has offered in other debt-collection lawsuits as "proof" of its purchase of a defendant's alleged debt. In a number of Plaintiff's other lawsuits, the alleged debt appears on the same spreadsheet line about one third of the way down the page, even when those different alleged debts were purportedly purchased in different transactions and in different portfolios. On information and belief, Plaintiff has created assignment documents for purposes of litigation and falsely represented the legal status of a debt in violation of the Fair Debt Buying Practices Act (*see* Cal. Civ. Code § 1788), the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (*see* Cal. Civ. Code § 1877) and Unfair Competition Law (California Business and Professions Code § 17200) as set forth in the proposed cross-complaint that Ms. Neville now seeks leave to file.

Ms. Neville's counsel contacted Credit Corp's counsel on October 31, 2025, to request that Credit Corp stipulate to the filing of Ms. Neville's proposed cross-complaint pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 428.50(c) and asked for a response by November 15, 2025. *See* Exhibit B. On November 15, 2025, Credit Corp's counsel responded, denying the request to stipulate, necessitating Ms. Neville file this motion. *See* Zhao Decl. at ¶4, Exh. B.

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

III. ARGUMENT

The Court should allow Ms. Neville to file a cross-complaint under California Code of Civil Procedure section 426.50. The section provides that "[a] party who fails to plead a cause of action subject to the requirements of this article, whether through oversight, inadvertence, mistake, neglect, or other cause, may apply to the court for leave to amend [her] pleading, or to file a cross-complaint, to assert such cause at any time during the course of the action." (Code Civ. Proc., § 426.50.) Such a motion "must be granted" if forfeiture would otherwise result unless there is substantial evidence of bad faith on the part of the moving party. (*Silver Orgs.*, *supra*, 217 Cal.App.3d at p. 99; *accord* Code Civ. Proc., § 426.50 ["The court, after notice to the adverse party, shall grant, upon such terms as may be just to the parties, leave to amend the pleading, or to file the cross-complaint, to assert such cause if the party who failed to plead the cause acted in good faith."].)

In the present case, Ms. Neville would forfeit the claims in the proposed cross-complaint if she is not granted leave to pursue them in the instant action. Moreover, there is no evidence—let alone substantial evidence—of bad faith on Ms. Neville's part. The Court, therefore, "must grant" the motion. (*Silver Orgs.*, *supra*, 217 Cal.App.3d at p. 99.)

A. Ms. Neville's Claims Will Be Forfeited If Leave Is Denied

California Code of Civil Procedure section 426.30 provides that "if a party against whom a complaint has been filed and served fails to allege in a cross-complaint any related cause of action which (at the time of serving [her] answer to the complaint) [s]he has against the plaintiff, such party may not thereafter in any other action assert against the plaintiff the related cause of action not pleaded." (Code Civ. Proc., § 426.30, subd. (a).) The term "related cause of action" means "a cause of action which arises out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences as the cause of action which the plaintiff alleges in his complaint." (Code Civ. Proc., § 426.10, subd. (c).) Causes of action are "related" when the claims are "logically interrelated." (*Align Technology, Inc. v. Tran* (2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 949, 960.)

In the present case, the allegations and claims in Ms. Neville's proposed cross-complaint all arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions as the cause of action stated in Plaintiff's complaint — namely, the allegation that Ms. Neville owes money to Credit Corp on

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

an alleged debt that Credit Corp owns. Her related claims, therefore, would be forfeited if leave to file the cross-complaint were not granted. (*Swain v. CACH, LLC* (N.D. Cal. 2009) 699 F.Supp.2d 1117, 1123 [holding that claim for declaratory relief that plaintiff did not owe a deficiency balance was "compulsory counterclaim that Plaintiff should have asserted in the underlying state action when she was sued by Defendants."].).

B. Ms. Neville Has Acted in Good Faith and Acted Quickly

Ms. Neville acted quickly in filing this motion a mere 18 days after retaining counsel on October 30, 2025, and two business days after Plaintiff's counsel refused to stipulate. *See* Zhao Decl. at ¶2 and ¶4, Exh. B. Regardless, undue delay is not a basis to deny the motion. (Code Civ. Proc., § 426.50; see also *Silver Organizations*, *supra*, 217 Cal.App.3d at p. 101 ["While it may be argued that appellants, acting as their own counsel, may have been guilty of neglect, inadvertence or oversight, thereby causing delay, section 426.50 expressly disallows denial of a motion based on these grounds."].) What is required is bad faith. (*Silver Orgs*, *supra*, at p. 99.)

"Bad faith" is found where there is "not simply bad judgment or negligence, but rather ... the conscious doing of a wrong because of dishonest purpose or moral obliquity" (*Pugh v. See's Candies, Inc.* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 743, 764.) In other words, bad faith requires an intent to act with ill will. *Pugh, supra*, at p. 764. For example, bad faith is waiting until the first day of trial to file a cross-complaint because this can be interpreted as evidence of a lack of good faith. *Gherman v. Colburn* (1977) 72 Cal.App.3d 544, 559. On the other hand, securing experienced counsel when the prospect of trial becomes a reality and filing a cross-complaint based on grounds timely uncovered by the newly retained attorney's diligent investigation is not bad faith (*Silver Orgs. Ltd.*, *supra*, 217 Cal.App.3d at pp. 100-101.)

In the present case, Ms. Neville only retained counsel on October 30, 2025, and Public Counsel requested that the Plaintiff stipulate to the filing of the proposed cross-complaint, which Plaintiff denied. *See* Zhao Decl. at ¶4, Exh. B. Trial, moreover, is not set to begin until April 22, 2026, and should be vacated and rescheduled in Unlimited Civil after reclassification. Under these circumstances, the Plaintiff will be hard pressed to produce any evidence—let alone substantial evidence—of bad faith given that there has been no attempt to defraud the Plaintiff or deceive or mislead the Plaintiff. Accordingly, the Court must grant Ms. Neville's motion and

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

prevent the injustice that would otherwise arise from the forfeiture of his compulsory cross-claims. (*Silver Orgs.*, 217 Cal.App.3d at p. 99 ["A motion to file a cross-complaint at any time during the course of the action must be granted unless bad faith of the moving party is demonstrated where forfeiture would otherwise result."].).

IV. CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Ms. Neville hereby respectfully requests that the Court grant her leave to file the cross-complaint set forth in ¶3, Exhibit A, of the Declaration of David Zhao and vacate the April 22, 2026 Trial Date, which would be rescheduled by the Unlimited Civil Department after reclassification.

Date: 11/18/2025

David Zhao

David Zhao
Attorney for Defendant
Lisa Neville

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

DECLARATION OF DAVID ZHAO

I, David Zhao, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law, duly licensed to practice in the State of California, and an attorney at Public Counsel, counsel for Defendant Lisa Neville in this matter. I have personal knowledge of all information stated below, or the information is based upon my review of the file in this matter, and I am competent to testify thereto.

2. Defendant Lisa Neville retained Public Counsel to represent her in this matter on October 30, 2025.

3. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a copy of Defendant Lisa Neville's proposed Cross-Complaint.

4. On October 31, I emailed Plaintiff's counsel to request a stipulation to allow Ms. Neville to file a cross-complaint and asked for a response by November 15, 2025. On November 15, 2025, Credit Corp's counsel responded, denying the request. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of my correspondence with the Plaintiff's attorneys.

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

Executed at Los Angeles, California on 11/18/2025.

David Zhao

David Zhao
Attorney for Defendant
Lisa Neville

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

EXHIBIT A

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

Ghirlandi Guidetti (SBN 307342)
gguidetti@publiccounsel.org
David Zhao (SBN 359320)
dzhao@publiccounsel.org
PUBLIC COUNSEL
610 S. Ardmore Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90005
Telephone: (213) 637-3836
Facsimile: (213) 201-4722

Pro Bono Attorneys for Defendant
And Cross-Complainant
Lisa Neville

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, SAN FERNANDO COURTHOUSE

CREDIT CORP SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

LISA NEVILLE,

Defendant.

LISA NEVILLE,

Cross-Complainant,

v.

CREDIT CORP SOLUTIONS, INC.; and ROES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Cross-Defendants,

Case No.: 25CHLC17110

DEFENDANT LISA NEVILLE'S CROSS-COMPLAINT AGAINST PLAINTIFF FOR VIOLATIONS OF FAIR DEBT BUYING PRACTICES ACT, ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW, AND FOR FRAUD

LIMITED CIVIL CASE TO BE RECLASSIFIED AS UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE BY CROSS COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Complaint Filed: April 16, 2025

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

Defendant and Cross-Complainant, LISA NEVILLE ("Cross-Complainant" or "Ms. Neville"), complains against Cross Defendant CREDIT CORP SOLUTIONS, INC. ("Credit Corp"); and ROES 1-10, inclusive (collectively, "Cross-Defendants"), and on information and believe alleges the following:

INTRODUCTION

1. Ms. Neville brings this action under the California Fair Debt Buying Practices Act, California Civil Code section 1788, *et. Seq.* (hereinafter the "FDBPA"), the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collections Practices Act, California Civil Code section 1877, *et. Seq.* (hereinafter the "Rosenthal Act"), the Unfair Competition Law, California Business & Professions Code section 17200 *et seq*. (hereinafter the "UCL"), and other applicable laws to challenge the unlawful, unfair, and deceptive practices of Cross-Defendant Credit Corp as they relate to Credit Corp's collection of debt allegedly owed by Ms. Neville.
2. The California legislature enacted these laws to, among other things, protect consumers from unsubstantiated lawsuits and unfair and deceptive practices from debt buyers.
3. These laws require, among other things, that debt buyers possess and provide documents establishing that they are the sole owner or have authority to assert rights of ownership of the debt at issue. *See* California Civil Code §§ 1788.52.
4. Plaintiff and Cross-Defendant Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. ("Cross-Defendant" or "Credit Corp"), a debt buyer, has attempted to collect Ms. Neville on a debt it alleges she owes.
5. In the Complaint, Credit Corp provided a document purporting to show that Ms. Neville's specific alleged debt was included in a portfolio of debts assigned to Credit Corp. However, on further inspection, Cross-Complainant identified a troubling pattern consistent with other Credit Corp lawsuits. Instead of using different documents for different portfolios of debts, Credit Corp reused the same 6th page of an 81-page document as "proof" of its purchase of every defendant's alleged debt, with every alleged debt appearing on the same spreadsheet line about one third of the way down the page, even when those different alleged debts were purportedly purchased in different transactions with different dates.

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

6. On information and belief, Credit Corp manufactured a spreadsheet to create the illusion of valid assignment for Ms. Neville's alleged debt. Therefore, the document that Credit Corp created is not, in fact, proof of assignment as required by debt buyer collection laws in California, specifically California Civil Code section 1788.58.
7. On information and belief, Credit Corp offers this document as proof of valid assignment and ownership both in its collection efforts and in its lawsuit against Ms. Neville and has repeated the same practice in other collection efforts and lawsuits against other consumers.
8. By offering this document as proof of valid assignment, when it appears to be a manufactured document created after the fact, Credit Corp misleads alleged debtors.
9. Through their conduct toward Ms. Neville further described herein, each Cross-Defendant has violated the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, the California Fair Debt Buying Practices Act, and/or the California Unfair Competition Law.
10. Ms. Neville seeks public injunctive relief to stop Cross-Defendants' unlawful practice of manufacturing assignment documents to collect from consumers like Ms. Neville. In addition, Ms. Neville seeks actual damages, statutory damages, punitive damages, attorney fees and costs.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County under California Code of Civil Procedure § 395.5 because the violations at issue occurred in Los Angeles County, where Credit Corp sought collection from, and ultimately sued, Ms. Neville. Venue is also proper in Los Angeles County under California Code of Civil Procedure § 395(b) because this action arises from a loan or extension of credit intended primarily for personal, family, or household use, and Ms. Neville resided in Los Angeles County at the time of the commencement of the action.
12. The Court has jurisdiction over Ms. Neville's claims because it is a court of general jurisdiction and is thus a court of competent jurisdiction that may hear this action for enforcement under California Civil Code § 1788.30(f).
13. The Court has jurisdiction over each Cross-Defendant because each Cross-Defendant is qualified to do business and regularly conducts business in California. Furthermore, Cross-Defendant brought the Complaint against Ms. Neville in Los Angeles, County.

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

14. Ms. Neville requests that the Court reclassify this action to unlimited civil because, by seeking injunctive relief, this action exceeds the requirements for a limited civil case. Under California Code of Civil Procedure section 403.030, reclassification shall occur at the time of filing the cross-complaint, and Ms. Neville has been granted a fee waiver to cover the reclassification fee.

PARTIES

15. Ms. Neville is a natural person residing in Los Angeles County, California.

16. Cross Defendant Credit Corp is a Delaware corporation that is regularly engaged in the business of purchasing charged-off consumer debt for collection purposes in California and is licensed by the California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation as a debt collector. Its principal place of business is 121 West Election Road Suite 200, Draper, UT 84020.

17. The true names and capacities of Cross-Defendants sued herein as ROES 1 through 10, inclusive, are unknown to Ms. Neville at the present time, and Ms. Neville, therefore, sues said cross-defendants by such fictitious names. Ms. Neville, after obtaining leave of court, if necessary, will amend this complaint to show such true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

18. Ms. Neville is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each Cross-Defendant designated herein as a ROE is responsible, negligently or in some actionable manner, for the events and happenings hereinafter referred to, and caused damages thereby to Ms. Neville, as hereinafter alleged.

19. Ms. Neville is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned, each of the Cross-Defendants was the agent, servant, employee, alter ego and/or joint venturer of his/her/its Co-Defendants, and each of them, and at all times, each Cross-Defendant was acting in the full course and scope of said agency, service, employment and/or joint venture. Any reference hereafter to "Cross-Defendants" without further qualification is meant by Ms. Neville to refer to each Cross-Defendant, and all of them, named above.

20. Ms. Neville is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that all times herein mentioned, Cross-Defendants, ROES 1-10, inclusive, were and are individuals, corporations, partnerships, unincorporated associations, sole proprietorships and/or other business entities organized and

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California, or the laws of some other state or foreign jurisdiction, and that said Cross-Defendants, and each of them, have regularly conducted business in the County of Los Angeles, California.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

21. On April 16, 2025, Credit Corp filed a breach of contract lawsuit against Ms. Neville in Los Angeles Superior Court Limited Civil Division, seeking $2,064.89 for an alleged debt from a PayPal Synchrony Bank credit card, plus the cost of the suit.
22. According to the Complaint, Credit Corp alleges that it purchased Ms. Neville's charged-off account from Synchrony Bank on or around May 16, 2022.
23. Upon information and belief, Credit Corp, in the ordinary course of business, regularly engages in purchasing and collecting charged-off consumer debts, such as Ms. Neville's alleged debt.
24. In the Complaint, Credit Corp failed to provide its California debt buyer license number.
25. Credit Corp failed to provide a copy of Ms. Neville's alleged agreement in the complaint. Instead, Credit Corp provided a template agreement that did not have Ms. Neville's name, account number, or a date.
26. Upon information and belief, in its collection efforts and in its lawsuit to Ms. Neville, Credit Corp made written statements to collect the alleged debt without documentation showing that it is the sole owner or has authority to assert ownership rights over the alleged debt.
27. Upon information and belief, Credit Corp lacks the documentation necessary to provide that it is the sole owner or has authority to assert ownership rights over the alleged debt.
28. By attempting to collect the alleged debt without possessing the required documentation of the contract and its ownership of the debt, Credit Corp made false and misleading statements, and misrepresented the amount, character, and legal status of the debt.
29. Ms. Neville has been injured by Credit Corp sending numerous threatening collection letters and repeatedly calling her phone. As a result, Ms. Neville, who suffers from PTSD and severe anxiety, is afraid to answer her phone altogether.
30. Ms. Neville has also been injured by Credit Corp by the stress of dealing with the lawsuit as a single mother with disabilities. It has negatively impacted her ability to enjoy life and maintain

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

her physical and mental health.

31. Credit Corp has engaged in the same unlawful conduct with other consumers. Public records show that Credit Corp has used an identical assignment document in multiple collections cases, inserting each alleged debtor's information at the same position – about one third down page six. In *Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Randi Townsend* (LASC 24STCV29057), Credit Corp sued a consumer for an alleged Sallie Mae Bank student loan that was purportedly assigned to Credit Corp. Credit Corp attached a Bill of Sale and assignment with a closing date of February 17, 2022. The defendant's alleged debt appears on a spreadsheet line about one-third of the way down page 6 out of 81 pages.

32. In *Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Valarie Carrell, et al.* (LASC 25VECV01379), Credit Corp sued a consumer for an alleged Sallie Mae Bank student loan that was purportedly assigned to Credit Corp. Credit Corp attached a Bill of Sale and assignment with a closing date of September 16, 2021. The defendant's alleged debt appears on a spreadsheet line about one-third of the way down page 6 out of 81 pages.

33. In *Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Kiera Carroll.* (LASC 24CHCV04422), Credit Corp sued a consumer for an alleged Sallie Mae Bank student loan that was purportedly assigned to Credit Corp. Credit Corp attached a Bill of Sale and assignment with a closing date of March 17, 2022. The defendant's alleged debt appears on a spreadsheet line about one-third of the way down page 6 out of 81 pages.

34. In *Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Mark Ferrera.* (LASC 24TRCV03924), Credit Corp sued a consumer for an alleged Sallie Mae Bank student loan that was purportedly assigned to Credit Corp. Credit Corp attached a Bill of Sale and assignment with a closing date of May 13, 2021. The defendant's alleged debt appears on a spreadsheet line about one-third of the way down page 6 out of 81 pages.

35. In *Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Oleg Muzica.* (LASC 25VECV01857), Credit Corp sued a consumer for an alleged Citibank credit card debt that was purportedly assigned to Credit Corp. Credit Corp attached a Bill of Sale. The defendant's alleged debt appears on a spreadsheet line about one-third of the way down page 6 out of 81 pages.

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

36. In *Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Naren Oganesian.* (LASC 25VECV01857), Credit Corp sued a consumer for an alleged Synchrony Bank card debt that was purportedly assigned to Credit Corp. Credit Corp attached a Bill of Sale. Unlike Ms. Neville's case, Credit Corp's Bill of Sale was dated October 19, 2021. The defendant's alleged debt appears on a spreadsheet line about one-third of the way down page 6 out of 81 pages.

37. Ms. Neville therefore seeks a public injunction to stop Credit Corp from continuing its alleged unlawful practice of manufacturing assignment documents to collect from and sue members of the general public.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

CALIFORNIA FAIR DEBT BUYING PRACTICES ACT

(Against Credit Corp Solutions, Inc.)

38. Ms. Neville realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations in each and every paragraph above.

39. The Fair Debt Buying Practices Act ("FDBPA") was enacted in 2013 to address issues with debt buyers filing unsubstantiated lawsuits against consumers across California.

40. Ms. Neville is a "debtor" under California Civil Code § 1788.50(c).

41. Credit Corp is a "debt buyer" under California Civil Code § 1788.50(a)(1).

42. Because Ms. Nevile's alleged debt is money alleged to be due or owing from a natural person by reason of a consumer credit transaction, it is a "consumer debt" under the FDBPA, California Civil Code § 1788.2(f) as incorporated by § 1788.50(c).

43. Because Ms. Neville's alleged debt was purportedly sold or resold after January 1, 2014, Cross-Defendants' collection of the alleged debt is subject to the FDBPA, California Civil Code § 1788.50(d).

44. Through its conduct alleged above, Credit Corp has violated the FDBPA. The violations include, but are not limited to, the following:

    a. Credit Corp made written statements to Ms. Neville in an attempt to collect a consumer debt without possessing the required assignment information in violation of California Civil Code § 1788.52(a); and

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

b. Credit Corp failed to provide a copy of Ms. Neville's alleged agreement in the complaint in violation of California Civil Code § 1788.58(b).

c. Credit Corp failed to provide its California debt buyer license in its collection action against Ms. Neville in violation of California Civil Code § 1788.52(a)(7).

45. As a result of Credit Corp's violations of the FDBPA, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of her actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.62(a)(1).

46. As a result of Credit Corp's violations of the FDBPA, Credit Corp is not entitled to a judgment because it has not complied with California Civil Code § 1788.60.

47. As a result of Credit Corp's violations of the FDBPA, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of statutory damages in an amount not less than one hundred dollars ($100) nor greater than one thousand dollars ($1,000) pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.62(a)(2).

48. As a result of Credit Corp's violations of the FDBPA, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs, pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.62(c).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

(All Cross-Defendants and ROES 1-10)

49. Ms. Neville realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations made in each every paragraph above.

50. The Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (the "Rosenthal Act") was enacted in 1976 to ensure the integrity of the banking and credit industry. Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.1(b). The California Legislature found that "unfair or deceptive debt collection practices undermine the public confidence which is essential to the continued functioning of the banking and credit system and sound extensions of credit to consumers." Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.1(a)(1).

51. Ms. Neville's alleged debt is a "covered debt" under the Rosenthal Act, California Civil Code § 1788.2(l).

52. Credit Corp is a "debt collector" under California Civil Code § 1788.2(c).

53. Credit Corp's actions are "debt collection" under the Rosenthal Act, California Civil Code § 1788.2(b).

54. Through its conduct alleged above, Cross-Defendants have violated the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collections Practices Act (the "Rosenthal Act"). The violations include, but are not limited to, the following:

    a. Cross-Defendants made and used false, deceptive, and misleading representations in an attempt to collect the alleged debt(s) in violation of California Civil Code § 1788.17;[1] and

    b. Cross-Defendants misrepresented the character, amount, or legal status of the alleged debt(s) in violation of California Civil Code § 1788.17.[2]

55. Cross-Defendants' violations alleged herein were committed willfully and knowingly.

56. As a result of Cross-Defendants' violations of the Rosenthal Act, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code §§ 1788.17[3] and 1788.30(a).

57. As a result of Cross-Defendants' violations of the Rosenthal Act, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of statutory damages in an amount not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000) against each Cross-Defendant, pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.17.[4]

58. As a result of Cross-Defendants' willful and knowing violations of the Rosenthal Act, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of statutory damages in an amount not less than one hundred dollars ($100) nor greater than one thousand dollars ($1,000) pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.30(b).

59. As a result of Cross-Defendants' violations of the Rosenthal Act, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs, pursuant to California Civil Code §§ 1788.17[5] and 1788.30(c).

60. Pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.32, the remedies provided under the Rosenthal Act are intended to be cumulative and in addition to any other procedures, rights, or remedies that Ms. Neville may have under any other provision of law.

---

[1] Incorporating 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e and 1692e(10).
[2] Incorporating 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
[3] Incorporating 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1).
[4] Incorporating 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A).
[5] Incorporating 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3).

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

(All Cross-Defendants and ROES 1-10)

61. Ms. Neville realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations made in each and every paragraph above.

62. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") forbids acts of "unfair competition," which includes "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.

63. Ms. Neville's alleged debt is a "consumer financial product or service" under the California Consumer Financial Protection Law ("the CFPL"), California Financial Code §§ 90005(e), 90005(k), and the federal Dodd Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act ("Dodd Frank"), 12 U.S.C. § 5481(5).

64. Cross-Defendants are each "covered persons" under the CFPL, California Financial Code § 90005(f), and Dodd Frank, 12 U.S.C. § 5481(6).

65. The CFPL and Dodd Frank both prohibit covered persons from engaging in any unfair, deceptive, or abusive act or practice with respect to consumer financial products or services. Cal. Fin. Code § 90003(a)(1); 12 U.S.C. § 5336(a)(1)(B).

66. Cross-Defendants' actions alleged herein constitute deceptive acts and practices because they include material misrepresentations and omissions likely to mislead the consumer.

67. Cross-Defendants' actions alleged herein constitute fraudulent acts and practices because they involve false and misleading representations and omissions likely to deceive reasonable consumers.

68. Cross-Defendants' actions alleged herein constitute unlawful and deceptive acts and business practices that violate the UCL, Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, including all of the following:

    a. The California Fair Debt Buying Practices Act, California Civil Code §§ 1788.60-1788.64;

    b. The California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, California Civil Code §§ 1788-1788.33;

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

c. The California Consumer Financial Protection Law, California Financial Code §§ 90000-90019; and

d. The federal Dodd Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, 12 U.S. C. § 5531.

69. Cross-Defendants' actions constitute unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices in violation of the UCL.

70. Ms. Neville is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Credit Corp has engaged in a pattern and practice of violating these provisions of law, including by using the same manufactured documents to sue and collect from numerous Californians.

71. Ms. Neville has been injured as a result of these practices.

72. As a result of Cross-Defendants' violations of the UCL, Ms. Neville seeks a public injunction to enjoin Cross-Defendants from continuing their unlawful collection activity.

73. As a result of Cross-Defendants' violations of the UCL, Ms. Neville also seeks individual injunctive relief, restitution and other equitable relief in order to remedy past harms and prevent future damages, for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FRAUD

(All Cross-Defendants and ROES 1-10)

74. Ms. Neville realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations made in each and every paragraph above.

75. California's Civil Code establishes liability for a person who willfully deceives another with the intent to induce another person to alter his position to his injury or risk. Cal. Civ. Code § 1709.

76. Credit Corp misrepresented to Ms. Neville that it been validly assigned the debt in a manufactured document that listed her alleged debt on the 6th page of an 81-page document.

77. Credit Corp knew the document was a misrepresentation because it reused an identical document in multiple other collection cases against other consumers.

78. Credit Corp intended to induce Ms. Neville to rely on its misrepresentation. Credit Corp knew that by using the manufactured assignment document, Ms. Neville would believe that she owed

Credit Corp for the alleged debt.

79. Ms. Neville reasonably relied on this misrepresentation and believed that she might have to pay Credit Corp for the alleged debt.

80. Ms. Neville suffered emotional and mental distress as a result of Credit Corp's actions.

81. As a result of Credit Corp's fraud, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3333.

82. As a result of Credit Corp's fraud, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3294(a).

83. As a result of Credit Corp's fraud, Ms. Neville is entitled to an award of costs, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Ms. Neville requests a judgment as follows:

1. For a public injunction enjoining Cross-Defendants' from engaging in the unlawful practices alleged herein, and requiring Credit Corp to withdraw any court filings containing the fabricated assignment spreadsheet in pending litigation and refund any money collected against consumers based on lawsuits where the same document has been proffered as proof of ownership;
2. For individual injunctive relief requiring Credit Corp to cease its collection efforts against Ms. Neville for the alleged debt in this matter;
3. For actual damages;
4. For statutory damages;
5. For punitive damages;
6. For attorney's fees and costs of suit;
7. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper under the circumstances.

Dated: 11/18/2025

By: David Zhao
David Zhao
Attorney for Defendant
Lisa Neville

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

EXHIBIT B

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

From: Melinda Lo
To: David Zhao
Cc: SDLegal; Nathalia Aguirre; Aryanna Young
Subject: [Spam] RE: Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Lisa Neville (LASC No. 25CHLC17110)
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 3:40:55 PM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

Good afternoon,

We do not agree to stipulate for filing the cross complaint at this stage of the proceedings. Please advise whether your client is willing to engage in settlement discussions prior to proceeding to trial.

Thank you,

PATENAUDE & FELIX, A.P.C.
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Melinda Lo
Associate Attorney
Law Offices of Patenaude & Felix, APC
9619 Chesapeake Drive Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92123
Phone: (858) 244-7675 ext.7753
Office Fax: (858) 280-0644

REPRESENTING CLIENTS IN ARIZONA, CALIFORNIA, COLORADO, NEVADA, NEW MEXICO, OREGON, PENNSYLVANIA AND WASHINGTON
THIS COMMUNICATION IS FROM A DEBT COLLECTOR AND ANY INFORMATION OBTAINED WILL BE USED FOR THAT PURPOSE

CA DFPI Debt Collector License
Number 10678-99

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS ELECTRONIC MESSAGE CONTAINS INFORMATION FROM THE LAW OFFICES OF PATENAUDE & FELIX, A.P.C. THAT IS PROTECTED BY ATTORNEY-CLIENT AND/OR ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT PRIVILEGE. IT IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE(S) ONLY. IF THE PERSON ACTUALLY RECEIVING THIS ELECTRONIC MESSAGE OR ANY OTHER READER OF THE ELECTRONIC MESSAGE IS NOT THE NAMED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE TO DELIVER IT TO THE NAMED RECIPIENT, ANY USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THE COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED T HIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY ME AT Melinda.Lo@pandf.us

If you do not wish to receive e-mail messages from Patenaude & Felix, APC, please Click Here, or visit this link: https://clicktime.cloud.postoffice.net/clicktime.php?U=https://mailopt.pandf.us/&E=dzhao%40publiccounsel.org&X=XID908dkNXOu0288Xd2&T=PBCL&HV=U,E,X,T&H=b3c87ad902276146502069a0837ada35cae6252d

From: David Zhao <dzhao@publiccounsel.org>
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2025 1:51 PM
To: SDLegal <SD.Legal@Pandf.us>; Nathalia Aguirre <nathalia.aguirre@pandf.us>
Subject: Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Lisa Neville (LASC No. 25CHLC17110)

This email originated outside of P&F. Please help keep our organization and partners safe. Think before you click.

Counsel,

Public Counsel is now representing Defendant Lisa Neville ("Ms. Neville") in the case *Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Lisa Neville* (LASC No. 25CHLC17110). We are writing to request your agreement to a stipulation allowing Ms. Neville to file a cross-complaint in under California Code of Civil Procedure § 426.50. To avoid unnecessary motion

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

practice, Ms. Neville is requesting stipulation to allow her to file a cross-complaint.

Please let us know by November 14, 2025 if you are willing to stipulate, after which we can send a stipulation agreement and proposed order, or if you would like to meet and confer on the matter. If we do not receive a response by that date, we are prepared to file a motion for leave to file a cross-complaint. Thank you for your time and cooperation in advance.

Sincerely,

Public Counsel

David Zhao | he/him
Equal Justice Works Fellow | Amgen Inc. & Munger, Tolles, & Olson LLP | Consumer Rights & Economic Justice
Public Counsel | 610 S. Ardmore Ave., L.A., CA 90005
O: (213) 637-3836 | dzhao@publiccounsel.org

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete any version, response or reference to it. Thank you.

This email originated from P&F. This communication is from a debt collector and any information obtained may be used for that purpose.
If you do not wish to receive e-mail messages from Patenaude & Felix, APC, please Click Here, or visit this link: https://clicktime.cloud.postoffice.net/clicktime.php?U=https://mailopt.pandf.us/&E=dzhao%40publiccounsel.org&X=XID908dkNXOu0288Xd2&T=PBCL&HV=U,E,X,T&H=b3c87ad902276146502069a0837ada35cae6252d
CA DFPI Debt Collector License No. 10678-99

Lawyaw Package ID: acc93bb5-7a0a-4626-9b04-831f3d6a70f1

Make a Reservation

CREDIT CORP SOLUTIONS, INC. vs LISA NEVILLE

Case Number: 25CHLC17110 Case Type: Civil Limited Category: Collections Case - Purchased Debt (Charged Off Consumer Debt Purchased on or after January 1,2014)
Date Filed: 2025-04-16 Location: San Fernando Courthouse - Department K

Reservation

Case Name: CREDIT CORP SOLUTIONS, INC. vs LISA NEVILLE	Case Number: 25CHLC17110
Type: Motion for Leave to File a Cross-Complaint	Status: RESERVED
Filing Party: LISA NEVILLE (Defendant)	Location: San Fernando Courthouse - Department K
Date/Time: 02/04/2026 8:30 AM	Number of Motions: 1
Reservation ID: 716139138190	Confirmation Code: CR-UZMZM7UFJFVRSJ9QX

Fees

Description	Fee	Qty	Amount
Motion for Leave to File a Cross-Complaint *** Fees Exempted by Fee Waiver ***	0.00	1	0.00
TOTAL			**$0.00**

Payment

Amount: $0.00	Type: FEE_WAIVER
Account Number: n/a	Authorization: n/a
Payment Date: n/a	

Print Receipt | + Reserve Another Hearing | View My Reservations

Copyright © Journal Technologies, USA. All rights reserved.

Chat