


<b>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE</b> Central Justice Center 700 W. Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92702	
<b>SHORT TITLE:</b> Animal Protection and Rescue League, Inc. vs. Chabad of Irvine	
<b>CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER:</b> <b>30-2015-00809469-CU-BT-CJC</b>

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that a true copy of the above Minute Order dated 06/23/17 has been placed for collection and mailing so as to cause it to be mailed in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid pursuant to standard court practice and addressed as indicated below. This certification occurred at Santa Ana, California on 6/23/17. Following standard court practice the mailing will occur at Sacramento, California on 6/26/17.

KAUFMAN & KAUFMAN  
1001 N ROSS STREET  
SANTA ANA, CA 92701-3315

LAW OFFICES OF BRYAN W. PEASE  
302 WASHINGTON STREET 404  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103


SIMON LAW GROUP  
17595 S HARVARD AVENUE C515  
IRVINE, CA 92614

Clerk of the Court, by: , Deputy

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that the following document(s), Minute Order dated 06/23/17, have been transmitted electronically by Orange County Superior Court at Santa Ana, CA. The transmission originated from email address on June 23, 2017, at 4:52:42 PM PDT. The electronically transmitted document(s) is in accordance with rule 2.251 of the California Rules of Court, addressed as shown above. The list of electronically served recipients are listed below:

RONAN COHEN  
RONANCOHEN@YAHOO.COM

STEPHANIE N. TAUB  
STATUB@FIRSTLIBERTY.COM

Clerk of the Court, by: , Deputy

**CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE**

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,  
COUNTY OF ORANGE  
CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 06/23/2017

TIME: 04:38:00 PM

DEPT: C34

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Martha K. Gooding

CLERK: Javier Espino, Delia Sanchez

REPORTER/ERM: None

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT:

CASE NO: **30-2015-00809469-CU-BT-CJC** CASE INIT.DATE: 09/11/2015

CASE TITLE: **Animal Protection and Rescue League, Inc. vs. Chabad of Irvine**

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: Business Tort

---

EVENT ID/DOCUMENT ID: 72613513

EVENT TYPE: Under Submission Ruling

---

**APPEARANCES**

There are no appearances by any party.

The Court, having taken the above-entitled matter under submission on 6/20/2017 and having fully considered the arguments of all parties, both written and oral, as well as the evidence presented, now rules in accordance with the Statement of Ruling attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Court orders Clerk to give notice.

**FILED**  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ORANGE  
CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

**JUN 23 2017**

DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court

BY: PK, DEPUTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ORANGE - CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

ANIMAL PROTECTION AND  
RESCUE LEAGUE, INC. ,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHABAD OF IRVINE AND THE  
CHABAD HEBREW ACADEMY-  
LUBAVITCH OF ORANGE  
COUNTY ,

Defendant.

30-2015-00809469

STATEMENT OF RULING

Hon. Martha K. Gooding

Dept. C34

This action is brought by Plaintiff Animal Protection and Rescue League, Inc. ("APRL" or "Plaintiff") against Chabad of Irvine ("Chabad-Irvine") and The Chabad Hebrew Academy-Lubavitch of Orange County ("Lubavitch") under the California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"). At the heart of the action is an annual Jewish religious ritual known as Kaporos (also called Kapporot), in which live chickens are used to perform an atonement ritual and, later, ritually slaughtered in accordance with Jewish law. APRL contends Defendants' participation in the Kaporos ritual constitutes an "unlawful business practice" within the meaning of Section 17200 of the Business and Professions Code,

1 because the manner in which the chickens are kept, slaughtered and disposed of is a violation of  
2 various state statutes or local municipal codes.

3 APRL asserts a single cause of action under Section 17200 et seq. of the Business and  
4 Professions Code, alleging “Defendants illegally harbored, slaughtered, and disposed of hundreds of  
5 chickens” in connection with the Kaporos ritual. See 8/31/2016 First Amended Verified Complaint  
6 (“FAC”) ¶¶ 30. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief on that cause of action, specifically, preliminary and  
7 permanent injunctions enjoining defendants “from killing any chicken or other animal for, or on behalf  
8 of, another person, for compensation or a donation” and “from harboring, slaughtering, and/or  
9 disposing of any chicken or other animal in violation of any of the” statutes alleged in the FAC. See  
10 FAC, Prayer at ¶¶ 1, 2.<sup>1</sup>

11 Defendant Chabad-Irvine filed an Answer to the FAC and asserted 25 affirmative defenses.  
12 Defendant Lubavitch did not respond to the FAC, and its default was entered on June 8, 2017.

13 The case was scheduled for trial on June 19, 2017. Pursuant to Section 598 of the California  
14 Code of Civil Procedure, the Court determined that justice – as well as the economy and efficiency  
15 of handling the litigation – would be promoted by ordering trial to proceed first on the threshold issue  
16 whether the challenged conduct constitutes a “business practice” under Section 17200.<sup>2</sup> The Court  
17 therefore ordered that this issue to be tried first.

18 Before trial commenced, the Court also addressed another preliminary matter raised by the  
19 parties: the status of defaulted Defendant Lubavitch. Plaintiff persuasively argued that the witnesses  
20 who would testify in a default prove-up hearing with respect to Lubavitch would be essentially  
21

22  
23 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s Prayer states that it seeks “declaratory relief” in the form of a declaration that Defendant’s conduct described in  
24 the FAC is illegal. That does not allege a claim for declaratory relief. First, it is not asserted as a separate cause of action  
25 and does not appear to come with the scope of Section 1060 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Second, it seeks a  
26 declaration only for the redress of past wrongs, rather than operating prospectively. See *Babb v. Superior Court* (1971) 3  
27 Cal.3d 841, 848; *Baldwin v. Marina City Properties, Inc.* (1978) 79 Cal.App.3d 393, 407. Third, in any event, such a  
28 declaration is unnecessary. See Code. Civ. Proc. § 1061 (“The court may refuse to exercise the power granted by this  
chapter in any case where its declaration or determination is not necessary or proper at the time under all the  
circumstances.”) Whether Defendants’ conduct of the 2014 Kaporos ritual was unlawful is squarely put at issue by  
Plaintiff’s single cause of action for unlawful business practices under the UCL. A declaratory relief action seeking the  
same relief is therefore redundant and unnecessary.

<sup>2</sup> All statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

1 identical to those needed for trial of the "business practice" issue with respect to Chabad-Irvine.  
2 Accordingly, the Court combined, in a single evidentiary hearing, (1) the trial on the initial "business  
3 practice" issue as to Chabad-Irvine; and (2) the "prove-up" hearing as to Lubavitch, in which Plaintiff  
4 could produce evidence to prove its entitlement to the relief it seeks against Lubavitch.<sup>3</sup>

5 Pursuant to that order, trial commenced and was conducted on June 20, 2017 in well less  
6 than a day. Plaintiff was represented by Bryan W. Pease and Alanna J. Pearl. Defendant Chabad-  
7 Irvine was represented by Leslie Keith Kaufman and Stephanie N. Taub.

8 At the conclusion of all evidence and closing argument, the parties submitted the matter to the Court  
9 for ruling. Neither party requested a Statement of Decision pursuant to Section 632 of the Code of  
10 Civil Procedure, and the requirements of that statute therefore do not apply here. Nevertheless, the  
11 Court issues this Statement of Ruling to briefly summarize its decision and the bases therefor. The  
12 Court's findings and conclusions below are based on the Court's consideration of all the evidence  
13 admitted at trial, including the parties' Joint List of Stipulated Facts ("Stip.Facts"), and reflect the  
14 Court's evaluation of the credibility of each of the witnesses who testified.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 <sup>3</sup> Attorney Ronan Cohen ("Cohen"), counsel of record for Lubavitch, appeared at the outset of trial and stated the following:  
20 First, Lubavitch no longer exists; it is currently defunct and has been for years. Indeed, it was suspended by the California  
21 Secretary of State several years ago. Second, Cohen mistakenly filed an answer to Plaintiff's Complaint on behalf of the  
22 defunct Lubavitch and thus appeared (and is listed) as its counsel of record in this action. Third, in connection with an anti-  
23 SLAPP motion filed by Chabad-Irvine in this action, Cohen filed a declaration, dated November 12, 2015, stating that  
Lubavitch is "a defunct entity that ha[s] not operated in many years and ha[s] been suspended by the California Secretary  
of State several years ago." However, Cohen never withdrew as counsel of record for Lubavitch, sought to be relieved as  
counsel of record, sought to correct the unauthorized filing of the Answer, or otherwise sought to correct, or be relieved of  
the consequences of, his mistaken filing of the Answer. Cohen also never sought to set aside the default entered against  
Lubavitch.

24 Of course, Cohen's representations to the Court are not evidence. Nor do they constitute a motion to set aside the  
25 default entered against or to otherwise cure the consequences of Cohen's acknowledged errors. Thus, as of the trial date,  
26 the record before the Court reflected that (a) Lubavitch was properly served (through its counsel of record) with the FAC;  
27 (b) Lubavitch failed to respond to the FAC; and (c) default was entered against Lubavitch on June 8, 2017. As a result of  
28 that default, all well-pleaded allegations against Lubavitch in the First Amended Complaint are deemed admitted – that is,  
all "material facts properly pleaded, but not contentions, deductions or conclusions of fact or law." *Kim v. Westmoore  
Partners, Inc.* (2011) 201 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 267, 281 (citations and quotations omitted). Thus, the Court proceeded to conduct a  
prove-up proceeding to determine what, if any, remedy Plaintiff can prove it is entitled to obtain vis a vis Lubavitch. As set  
forth below, the Court concludes Plaintiff has not proven it is entitled to any relief against Lubavitch.

1 THE FACTS<sup>4</sup>

2 **The Kaporos Ritual**

3 Kaporos is an ancient religious ritual practiced by those of the Orthodox Jewish religion. See  
4 Stip.Facts ¶¶ 9, 10. Although the parties stipulated the Kaporos ritual has been practiced by  
5 Orthodox Jewish congregations for “at least several hundred years” (*id.* ¶ 11), credible trial testimony  
6 showed the ritual has been practiced since at least the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Kaporos is an atonement ritual  
7 performed during the Jewish high holy days, between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. See *id.* ¶  
8 7. It is an exercise of sincerely held religious beliefs (*id.* ¶ 6) that historically incorporates chickens  
9 as a central part of the ritual. See *id.* ¶ 8.

10 Rabbi Alter Tenenbaum of Chabad-Irvine credibly testified about the nature and purpose of  
11 Kaporos. To perform the Kaporos ritual, an individual gently holds a live chicken while atoning for  
12 his or her sins, reciting Hebrew prayers and reflecting on human frailty, mortality, and the gift of life.<sup>5</sup>  
13 The chicken is then slaughtered in a ritual manner by a schochet (a ritual slaughterer) and disposed  
14 of in accordance with Jewish law. All this is done as a means of helping participants to appreciate  
15 the transitory nature of human life, to atone for their sins, and to be inspired to cherish life,  
16 appreciate the gift of life bestowed on them, and live every day in the best way they possibly can.

17  
18  
19 **Chabad of Irvine**

20 Defendant Chabad-Irvine is a local, “full-service” Jewish synagogue. As such, it provides a  
21 broad range of faith-based ministry to the Jewish community, including, by way of example, religious  
22 services, rituals, ceremonies and observances (such as weddings, namings, bar mitzvahs, bat  
23 mitzvahs, funerals), religious programs, religious education for children, teens and adults (including

24  
25 <sup>4</sup> To the extent facts are recited in the “Conclusions” section below that are not stated in this “Facts” section, they are also  
26 part of the Court’s factual findings. Likewise, to the extent legal conclusions are included in this “Facts” section that are not  
stated in the “Conclusions” section, they are part of the Court’s conclusions.

27 <sup>5</sup> Ideally, the gender of the chicken used during Kaporos matches the gender of the participant. It is possible for more than  
28 one ritual participant to “share” a single chicken, and there are times a single participant may use more than one chicken.  
For example, a pregnant woman who does not know the gender of her unborn baby would use three chickens: a female  
chicken for herself, another female chicken in case her baby is a girl; and a male chicken in case her baby is a boy.

1 a Hebrew school), Jewish holiday observances, community outreach, hospital visitation, and  
2 counseling. The U.S. Internal Revenue Service recognizes Chabad-Irvine as a non-profit  
3 organization and has granted it 501(c)(3) tax exempt, non-profit status. Its non-profit status has  
4 never been revoked.

5 Chabad-Irvine is led by Rabbi Alter Tenenbaum, who has been head rabbi since 1991.  
6 Throughout Rabbi Tenenbaum's tenure at Chabad-Irvine, the synagogue has offered the Kaporos  
7 ritual to its congregation (and to others who wish to participate) almost every year, including 2014,  
8 2015 and 2016. Chabad-Irvine's conduct of and participation in the Kaporos ritual is consistent with,  
9 and advances, the religious and spiritual goals and mission of the synagogue.

10 Chabad-Irvine conducted the 2014 Kaporos ritual in the synagogue's yard and parking lot; in  
11 2015, it was conducted the ritual in the synagogue's yard. Individuals who wished to participate went  
12 to the synagogue during a three-hour window on the day designated for the ritual, where Chabad-  
13 Irvine provided them a live chicken to use in performing the ritual. Rabbis were present throughout  
14 the three-hour time period to assist participants in saying the ritual prayers or reciting the prayers in  
15 Hebrew, or otherwise to provide spiritual or religious guidance to participants. Some participants  
16 chose to avail themselves of the rabbis' assistance; some did not. After the ritual concluded, the  
17 chickens were slaughtered by a schochet, whose fee was paid by Chabad-Irvine. Because Jewish  
18 law does not allow waste, the chickens' carcasses were then returned for rendering to the company  
19 that provided them.

20 In 2014 and 2015 (as in prior years), Chabad-Irvine suggested that each participant in the  
21 Kaporos ritual make an \$18 donation to the synagogue.<sup>6</sup> The donation, however, was completely  
22 optional. Some participants made larger donations, some smaller. Some made no donation.  
23 Individuals who made no donation – e.g., because they were unable to do so, had insufficient funds  
24 to make a donation on the day of the ritual, or simply chose not to donate – nevertheless could and  
25 did participate in Kaporos. No one wishing to participate in the ritual would be excluded or turned  
26

---

27 <sup>6</sup> Rabbi Tenenbaum credibly testified that Chabad-Irvine did not refer to the \$18 donation as a purchase. It was a  
28 suggested, but no means mandatory, donation, and it was referred to as such.

1 away for lack of a donation. Anyone who wished to bring their own chicken to use in performing the  
2 ritual could certainly do so; however, in all the years he has been at Chabad-Irvine, Rabbi  
3 Tenenbaum cannot recall any instance in which a ritual participant chose to do so.

4 The \$18 amount of the suggested donation has important spiritual symbolic significance in  
5 the Jewish religion. When Hebrew letters are assigned a numerical value, the letters that spell the  
6 Hebrew word "chai" (meaning "life") equal the number 18. For this reason, since at least 1991 when  
7 Rabbi Tenenbaum joined Chabad-Irvine (and, indeed, in his experience, throughout his entire  
8 childhood and adult life), the suggested donation for the Kaporos ritual has been \$18.<sup>7</sup>

9 To enable individuals to participate in the ritual in 2014 and 2015, Chabad-Irvine arranged  
10 with a private company to supply the live chickens and then, after they had been slaughtered by the  
11 schochet, to render the carcasses. Chabad-Irvine paid for the cost of the chickens (which included  
12 the cost of disposing of them after being slaughtered), and also paid for the schochet's fee. Since at  
13 least 1991, every year Chabad-Irvine has conducted the Kaporos ritual, the expenses it incurred in  
14 connection with the ritual exceeded the amount of the donations it obtained from participants.  
15 Performance of the Kaporos ritual was never intended to be – and it was not at any time – a fund-  
16 raising or profit-generating activity for the synagogue. It was never intended to (and it never did)  
17 generate positive cash flow for Chabad-Irvine. It was, as the parties' stipulated, an exercise of  
18 sincerely-held religious beliefs with ancient origins.

19 In 2016, the Kaporos ritual was not conducted at the Chabad-Irvine synagogue, but rather at  
20 Baladi Poultry, a commercial poultry company in Midway City. As always, Chabad-Irvine rabbis  
21 were present during the three-hour period set aside for the ritual, to assist participants in performing  
22 Kaporos or otherwise to provide spiritual guidance at the event. Instead of Chabad-Irvine  
23 purchasing the chickens for participants as it had in prior years, however, participants purchased the  
24 chickens directly from Baladi Poultry, which not only provided the chickens but also made  
25 arrangements with the ritual slaughterer and provided disposal of the carcasses.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>7</sup> Witness Ronnie Steinau – who testified for Plaintiff at trial and also signed the verified FAC as "an agent of Plaintiff" (see  
28 Verification to FAC) – testified she called Chabad-Irvine on the telephone and was told by a woman who answered that  
she could participate in the Kaporos ritual at Chabad-Irvine only if she purchased a chicken for \$27. The Court finds this  
testimony unreliable and not credible.



1 Chabad-Irvine intends to continue to participate in the annual performance of the ancient  
2 Kaporos ritual in the future.

3

4 **Chabad Hebrew Academy-Lubavitch of Orange County**

5 Plaintiff offered little evidence about Defendant Lubavitch. Witnesses Jill Mulato and Ronnie  
6 Steinau each testified that, on the day of the Kaporos ritual in October 2014, after observing the  
7 events at Chabad-Irvine, she went to the Hebrew Academy in Huntington Beach to observe its  
8 Kaporos ritual, understanding and believing it to be the academy run by Defendant Lubavitch.<sup>8</sup>  
9 There, both Mulato and Steinau saw live chickens in cages and saw chickens being handed to  
10 individuals. Steinau spoke to a woman in the parking lot who expressed displeasure with the ritual  
11 taking place at the Hebrew Academy.

12 The Court finds the evidence proved that a Kaporos ceremony was conducted in 2014 at  
13 Defendant Lubavitch's Hebrew Academy in Huntington Beach and that it is the event conducted by  
14 Lubavitch that is referred to in Plaintiff's FAC. However, Plaintiff presented no evidence that  
15 Lubavitch performed – or had any involvement in the performance of – a Kaporos ritual in 2015 or  
16 2016; that Lubavitch intends to perform the Kaporos ritual in the future; or, indeed, that Lubvitch  
17 even still exists.<sup>9</sup>

18

19

20

21

22

23

---

24 <sup>8</sup> Steinau previously had researched the names and locations of Chabad and Hebrew Academy organizations in Orange County that perform the Kaporos ritual; Lubavitch is one of the entities whose name and address she identified.

25 <sup>9</sup> The allegation in the FAC that “[o]n information or belief, Defendants engage in these events annually every October”  
26 (FAC ¶ 19) does not fill the evidentiary gap. By reason of Lubavitch's default, only the well-pled material factual allegations  
27 of the FAC are deemed admitted; “contentions, deductions or conclusions or fact or law” are not. *Kim v. Westmoore*  
28 *Partners, Inc.* (2011) 201 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 267, 281 (citations and quotations omitted). An allegation made on “information or  
belief,” particularly (as here) in a verified complaint, does not constitute a well pled factual allegation; it is no more than a  
contention, deduction or factual conclusion. See *Gomes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.* (2011) 192 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1149,  
1158 (for purposes of demurrer, a pleading made on information and belief is insufficient if it merely asserts the facts so  
alleged without alleging the information that leads the plaintiff to believe the allegations are true).

1  
2 **CONCLUSIONS**

3 **Chabad-Irvine**

4 Pursuant to the Court's CCP Section 598 order, the only issue tried to the Court at this  
5 juncture as to Chabad-Irvine is whether the challenged conduct by Chabad-Irvine constitutes a  
6 "business practice" within the meaning of Section 17200. As explained below, the Court concludes it  
7 does not. The evidence shows the conduct of the Kaporos ritual is a religious practice – a religious  
8 ritual of atonement – not a "business practice" that comes within the ambit of Section 17200.<sup>10</sup>

9 The California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") prohibits and provides civil remedies for unfair  
10 competition. *Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court* (2011) 51 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 310, 320. "Unfair competition" is  
11 defined as "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.  
12 The purpose of the UCL "is to protect both consumers and competitors by promoting fair competition  
13 in commercial markets for goods and services." *Kwikset*, 51 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> at 320 (citing and quoting *Kasky*  
14 *v. Nike, Inc.* (2002) 27 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 939, 949.

15 To be sure, the scope of the UCL is "broad" and its coverage is "sweeping." *Cel-Tech*  
16 *Comm'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co.* (1999) 20 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 163, 180. In enacting the UCL, the  
17 Legislature intended to include within its ambit "anything that can properly be called a business  
18 practice and that at the same time is forbidden by law." *Id.* (citation/quotation omitted). But the  
19 reach of the statute is not unlimited. *Id.* at 182. A party seeking to invoke the statute must prove  
20 that the challenged conduct is a business act or practice. If it is able to carry that burden of proof,  
21 the UCL provides for injunctive and restitutionary remedies. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

22 The challenged conduct here by Chabad-Irvine is not a business act or business practice.  
23 Chabad-Irvine's purchase of chickens for participants to use in the 2014 and 2015 Kaporos ritual  
24 does not transform its conduct from that of a synagogue meeting, or assisting in meeting, the  
25 religious and spiritual needs of the community to that of a commercial enterprise. As noted, the  
26 purpose of the UCL is to "protect both consumers and competitors by promoting fair competition in

27  
28 <sup>10</sup> The Court notes that a Federal District Court, applying the California UCL, recently reached the same conclusion. See *United Poultry Concerns v. Chabad of Irvine*, No. 8:16-cv-01810-AB-GJS (C.D.Cal. May 12, 2017), Dkt. No. 11.

1 commercial markets for goods and services.” *Kwikset*, 51 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> at 320 (citing and quoting *Kasky v*  
2 *Nike, Inc.* (2002) 27 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 939, 949). It is not to regulate the conduct of religious organizations as  
3 they provide for the religious and spiritual needs of the community by conducting – or by assisting in  
4 the conduct of – religious rituals.

5 That the conduct of a religious ritual or observance entails the purchase of “goods” (here,  
6 chickens) or “services” (here, of a ritual slaughterer) or that it results in donations being made to the  
7 synagogue that conducts, oversees, or assists in the performance of the ritual does not lead to a  
8 different conclusion. Undoubtedly, the performance of many religious ceremonies or rituals requires  
9 the purchase of “goods” necessary to conduct them (e.g., communion wafers, wine, candles) or  
10 payments for “services” (e.g., the services of a minister, rabbi, cantor, organist/musician, or choir  
11 director). And plainly, many religious services or ceremonies result in donations being solicited and  
12 made (e.g., when offering plates or baskets are passed among a congregation during a religious  
13 service for the purpose of requesting and receiving donations). But that does not convert those  
14 religious activities, rituals and observances into business practices. They remain *religious* activities,  
15 rituals and observances. Nor does that convert the synagogue or church that engages in those  
16 religious activities, rituals and observances into a business whose religious activity is subject to the  
17 UCL.

#### 18 19 **Hebrew Academy-Lubavitch Of Orange County**

20 The evidence before the Court showed that Defendant Lubavitch conducted a Kaporos ritual  
21 at its Huntington Beach Hebrew Academy in October 2014. For the reasons set forth above,  
22 however, Plaintiff did not prove a violation of Section 17200 by Lubavitch, as the ritual is (and was) a  
23 religious ritual, not a business practice within the ambit of Section 17200.


24 Even if Plaintiff had proven a Section 17200 violation by Lubavitch, however, there is no  
25 evidence Lubavitch continued to perform the challenged conduct in the years following 2014 or that  
26 it intends to continue to perform the challenged conduct in the future. Thus, Plaintiff failed to prove  
27 its right to the injunctive remedy it seeks against Lubavitch. It is true Section 17203 applies to past  
28

1 conduct. See Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 (any person who “has engaged” in unfair competition may  
2 be enjoined). The statute does not, however, dispense with the requirement that, to obtain an  
3 injunction, a plaintiff must show there exists a threat that the allegedly wrongful act will continue.  
4 “[I]njunctive relief will be denied if at the time of the order of judgment, there is no reasonable  
5 probability that the past acts complained of will recur.” *California Service Stations & Auto. Repair*  
6 *Ass’n v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.* (1991) 232 Cal.App.3d 44, 57. Plaintiffs have not proven there is a  
7 reasonable probability Lubavitch will continue to engage in the challenged conduct in the future.

8 \* \* \* \* \*

9 Chabad-Irvine shall, within ten (10) days of notice of this Statement of Ruling, efile a Proposed  
10 Judgment with the Court that is consistent with this Statement of Ruling, including filing an editable  
11 version of the Proposed Judgment. Chabad-Irvine shall also serve a copy of the Proposed  
12 Judgment by fax, personal service or, if the parties have agreed to email service, by email. Plaintiff  
13 shall have five court days to e-file and serve (in the same manner prescribed for the Proposed  
14 Judgment) any objections to the Proposed Judgment.

15  
16 DATED: 6/23/2017

  
MARTHA K. GOODING  
Judge of the Superior Court

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28