

1 CHARLES S. CUSTER (SBN: 124270)  
[ccuster@grsm.com](mailto:ccuster@grsm.com)

2 LAURA RYAN (SBN: 184363)  
[lryan@grsm.com](mailto:lryan@grsm.com)

3 GORDON REES, LLP  
4 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
5 San Francisco, CA 94111  
6 Telephone: (415) 986-5900  
7 Facsimile: (415) 986-8054

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
9 MULTIDISCIPLINARY ASSOCIATION  
10 FOR PSYCHEDELIC STUDIES, INC.  
11 a.k.a. MAPS, INC.

12 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13 **FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY**

14 CARLA GATLIN and SUSAN YBARRA-  
15 TELIAS, Individually and as Successors-In-  
16 Interest of decedent Baylee Ybarra Gatlin,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 DO LAB INC.; MULTIDISCIPLINARY  
20 ASSOCIATION FOR PSYCHEDELIC  
21 STUDIES, INC. a.k.a. MAPS, INC.; ZENDO  
22 PROJECT, a business entity form unknown;  
23 RGX MEDICAL, a business entity form  
24 unknown; RICHARD GOTTLIEB, an  
25 individual; and DOES 1 to 20, inclusive,

26 Defendants.

27 MULTIDISCIPLINARY ASSOCIATION  
28 FOR PSYCHEDELIC STUDIES, INC. a.k.a.  
MAPS, INC.,

Cross-Complainant,

v.

DO LAB INC.; RGX MEDICAL, a business  
entity form unknown; RICHARD  
GOTTLIEB, an individual; and ROES 1 to  
50, inclusive,

Defendants.

**CASE NO.: 20CV002753**

**CROSS-COMPLAINT FOR  
CONTRIBUTION AND INDEMNITY**

1 Cross-Complainant, MULTIDISCIPLINARY ASSOCIATION FOR PSYCHEDELIC  
2 STUDIES, INC. a.k.a. MAPS, INC. (hereinafter "Cross-Complainant") alleges as follows  
3 against DO LAB INC., RGX MEDICAL, a business entity form unknown, and RICHARD  
4 GOTTLIEB, an individual and ROES 1 to 50 inclusive:

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 1. The true names or capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or  
7 otherwise, of cross-defendants ROES ONE through FIFTY, inclusive, are unknown to Cross-  
8 Complainant, who, therefore, sue said cross-defendants by such fictitious names. Cross-  
9 Complainant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named  
10 cross-defendants are legally responsible in some manner for the injuries and damages alleged  
11 herein; and therefore, Cross-Complainant requests that when the true names and capacities of  
12 said fictitiously named cross-named defendants are ascertained, it be permitted to insert the  
13 same herein.

14 2. Cross-Complainant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times  
15 herein mentioned each of the cross-defendants was the agent, servant or employee of each of  
16 the remaining cross-defendants and was at all times acting within the scope of such agency  
17 and employment. There is now pending in the Superior Court of the State of California,  
18 County of Monterey, Case No. 20CV002753.

19 3. Therein it is alleged, among other things, that Cross-Complainant was among the  
20 parties who were negligent and careless in, or otherwise liable for, their activities, so as to  
21 cause the damages complained of by plaintiffs and other cross-complainants herein. The  
22 allegations of said complaint and cross-complaints are hereby incorporated in this cross-  
23 complaint solely for the purpose of showing the nature of the claim made against Cross-  
24 Complainant, and the status of those who are also named defendants and cross-defendants in  
25 the complaint and cross-complaints, and for no other purpose whatsoever.

26 4. An actual and present controversy exists between Cross-Complainant and Cross-  
27 Defendants. Unless all the joint and several obligations, rights and duties arising out of the  
28 Monterey County Superior Court Case No. 20CV002753 are determined in one proceeding,

1 there will be a multiplicity of suits and Cross-Complainants will be subject to an unreasonable  
2 risk of irreparable injury. All the rights and obligations of the parties herein arise out of one  
3 incident/transaction.

4 5. If there was any negligence or other liability on the part of Cross-Complainant,  
5 which negligence and liability is specifically denied, such negligence or other liability should  
6 be compared to the negligence or other liability of the cross-defendants herein, and cross-  
7 defendants, and each of them, were entirely negligent or liable, or partially negligent or liable,  
8 all in a percentage which the court or jury should determine. Should a judgment be rendered  
9 against the Cross-Complainant for damages allegedly sustained by other cross-complainants,  
10 in equity and good conscience said damages should be borne by cross-defendants herein and  
11 each of them in such an amount as is their comparative fault, and Cross-Complainant should  
12 be entitled to whole or partial indemnity from said cross-defendants.

13 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 6. Cross-Complainant re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every  
15 allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 5 of the Cross-Complaint.

16 7. Cross-Complainant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that if Cross-  
17 Complainant is found liable to plaintiffs or other cross-complainants in any amount, it will be  
18 due solely to the passive fault and secondary actions of Cross-complainants; whereas, cross-  
19 defendants, and each of them, were actively negligent and primarily responsible for the  
20 damages, if any, for which plaintiffs and other cross-complainants complain.

21 8. If it be found that Cross-Complainant is liable to the plaintiffs and other cross-  
22 complainants by reason of those things set forth herein above, then, and in that event, Cross-  
23 Complainant is entitled to be indemnified and be held harmless by cross-defendants, and each  
24 of them, from all damages, including all costs and expenses incurred in defending the within  
25 action, and attorneys' fees and other expenses incurred in connection therewith.

26 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**


27 WHEREFORE, Cross-Complainant prays for judgment against cross-defendants, and  
28 each of them, as follows:

Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1. For judgment declaring that Cross-Complainant is entitled to indemnification from cross-defendants and each of them, wholly or partially, as the Court or a jury may determine, for any settlement made in this action or for any judgment rendered against Cross-Complainant and in favor of plaintiffs or other cross-complainants;
2. For indemnification from and against any and all claims, losses, damages, attorneys' fees, judgments and settlement expenses incurred or to be incurred by Cross-Complainant by reason of the complaint and other cross-complaints in this action;
3. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: June 1, 2021

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles S. Custer  
Laura Ryan  
Attorneys for Defendant  
MULTIDISCIPLINARY  
ASSOCIATION  
FOR PSYCHEDELIC STUDIES, INC.  
a.k.a. MAPS, INC.

Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

*Gatlin, Carla, et al. v. Do Lab Inc., et al.*  
Monterey County Superior Court Case No. 20CV002753

I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is: Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP, 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000, San Francisco, CA 94111. On the date below, I served the within documents:

**CROSS-COMPLAINT FOR CONTRIBUTION AND INDEMNITY**

- by transmitting VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL the document(s) listed above to the email address(es) set forth below on this date before 5:00 p.m. (*Per agreement of the parties.*)
- by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in United States mail in the State of California at San Francisco, addressed as set forth below.

Mark R. Pachowicz  
Jennie Hendrickson  
Pachowicz/Goldenring  
6050 Seahawk Street  
Ventura, CA 93003-6622  
Tel: 805-642-6072  
Fax: 805-642-3145  
**Attorneys for Plaintiff**  
**Email:** [Mark@pglaw.law](mailto:Mark@pglaw.law)  
[Jennie@pglaw.law](mailto:Jennie@pglaw.law)

Lowthorp, Richards, McMillan, Miller & Templeman  
John H. Howard  
Brett C. Templeman  
300 East Esplanade Drive, Suite 850  
Oxnard, CA 93036  
Tel: (805) 981-8555  
Fax: (805) 983-1967  
**Attorneys for Plaintiff**  
**Email:** [jhoward@lrmmt.com](mailto:jhoward@lrmmt.com)  
[btempleman@lrmmt.com](mailto:btempleman@lrmmt.com)  
[ElizabethY@lrmmt.com](mailto:ElizabethY@lrmmt.com)  
[tmoore@lrmmt.com](mailto:tmoore@lrmmt.com)

Bremer Whyte Brown & O'Meara LLP  
J. Jackson Briscoe  
21215 Burbank Blvd., Suite 500  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
Tel: 818-712-9800  
Fax: 818-712-9900  
**Attorneys for Defendant**  
**Do Lab Inc.**  
**Email:** [cnathan@bremerwhyte.com](mailto:cnathan@bremerwhyte.com)  
[jbriscoe@bremerwhyte.com](mailto:jbriscoe@bremerwhyte.com)

James Farinaro  
Law Offices of James Farinaro  
852 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
San Leandro, CA 94577  
Tel: 510-740-9269  
Fax: 877-689-0676  
Email: [james@farinarolaw.com](mailto:james@farinarolaw.com)  
cc: [kimberly@farinarolaw.com](mailto:kimberly@farinarolaw.com)  
**Attorney for Defendant**  
**Richard Gottlieb, an individual dba RGX Medical**

Steven A. Adelman  
Adelman Law Group, PLLC  
8776 E. Shea Blvd.,  
Suite 106-510  
Scottsdale, AZ 85260  
Tel: 480-209-2426  
**Attorneys for Defendant Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies, Inc.**  
**(Pro Hac Vice Pending)**  
Tel: 480-209-2426  
**Email:** [sadelman@adelmanlawgroup.com](mailto:sadelman@adelmanlawgroup.com)

Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

I am readily familiar with the firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

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

Executed on June 1, 2021 at San Francisco, California.



Terry Johnson