

FILED
ENDORSED

2018 AUG -6 AM 9: 34

SACRAMENTO COURTS
DEPT. #54

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

EDWARD MISLEH and THE LAW OFFICES
OF EDWARD MISLEH, APC,
v.
MICHAEL JOHNSON; CHARLOTTE
YBARRA-TEAGUE, and DOES 1 to 25.

Case Number: 34-2017-00206726
**AMENDED ORDER ON MOTION FOR
DEFAULT JUDGMENT AND AWARD
OF DAMAGES**

I. Introduction

On January 19, 2017, plaintiffs Edward Misleh and The Law Offices of Edward Misleh, APC¹ filed a Complaint against unnamed defendants alleging two counts of defamation and one count each of invasion of privacy, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and “injunctive relief.” Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint on August 18, 2017 that named Michael Johnson and Charlotte Ybarra-Teague as defendants.²

Plaintiffs filed proofs of service of the Amended Complaint on Mr. Johnson and Ms. Ybarra-Teague in October 2017. When neither of them answered or otherwise responded to the Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs requested entry of defaults, which the clerk granted on

¹ Edward Misleh and The Law Offices of Edward Misleh, APC will collectively be referred to as the “Plaintiffs.”

² Michael Johnson, Charlotte Ybarra-Teague, and Does 1-25 will collectively be referred to as the “Defendants.”

1 November 30, 2017. Plaintiffs filed requests for judgment on January 12, 2018. The court issued
2 a minute order informing Plaintiffs that their submitted evidence did not clearly support the relief
3 sought and directing them to schedule a prove-up hearing. That hearing occurred on June 14,
4 2018. The court heard evidence and took the matter under submission. The court now rules as
5 set forth below.

6 **II. Parties and Allegations**

7 In the original Complaint in this matter, Plaintiffs did not name any defendants. The
8 original Complaint alleged that Plaintiffs were ignorant of the true names and capacities of the
9 defendants sued as Does 1-25 “and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names.”
10 (Verified Complaint for Damages and Injunctive Relief, filed Jan. 19, 2017, ¶ 1.) The Complaint
11 alleged that negative reviews had been posted on the website Yelp.com regarding Plaintiffs. The
12 reviews had been posted under seven different user names: “E K,” “Alex K,” “Leia S,” “R R,”
13 “Emmlie D,” “Charlotte Y,” and “Michael J.” (Verified Complaint, ¶ 10.) Plaintiffs alleged
14 that, upon seeing the reviews, they “thereafter conducted a diligent and comprehensive
15 investigation to determine if Plaintiffs had ever represented anyone who identified themselves”
16 using those initials and “either determined that Plaintiffs had not done so or was unable to
17 determine if a past client is the same person who submitted a review using the aforementioned
18 initials.” (Verified Complaint, ¶ 10.) The Complaint did not assign the seven user names to
19 particular numbered Doe defendants. The Complaint attached the seven Yelp reviews as exhibits
20 A through G.

21 On August 18, 2017, Plaintiffs filed two amendments to their Complaint. One
22 amendment named Michael Johnson as a defendant, and the second named Charlotte Ybarra-
23 Teague. Each amendment said that the newly named defendant had been previously designated
24 in the Complaint as “Does 1-25.” (See Amendments to Verified Complaint, filed Aug. 18,
25 2017.)

1 Plaintiffs also filed a First Amended Complaint on August 18, 2017. This Amended
2 Complaint named Michael Johnson and Charlotte Ybarra-Teague as Sacramento County
3 residents. (First Amended Complaint, ¶¶ 2,3.) Other than those two amendatory paragraphs, the
4 text of the Amended Complaint was virtually identical to the original pleading. Significantly, the
5 Amended Complaint continued to allege that Plaintiffs could not determine if the seven user
6 names who posted reviews on Yelp were current or former clients of Plaintiffs. (First Amended
7 Complaint, ¶ 12.) The version of the Amended Complaint filed with the court also omitted the
8 exhibits that were attached to the original Complaint, even though the Amended Complaint's text
9 referenced those exhibits.

10 **A. Allegations of the Complaint Regarding the Parties**

11 Plaintiffs alleged that defendant "Charlotte Y" posted a Yelp review on December 1,
12 2016, stating, "Would never recommend him. It took over 2 years to complete a case that should
13 have only took [sic] 6 months. Had to hire a different attorney to complete the case." (First
14 Amended Complaint, ¶ 10.) Plaintiffs alleged that this review "necessarily implies falsely" that
15 defendant was a consumer, and that Plaintiffs provided incompetent and inadequate legal
16 services. (*Id.* at ¶ 21(f).)

17 Plaintiffs alleged that defendant "Michael J" posted a Yelp review on December 1, 2016
18 as well, stating, "Mr MISLEH is a quick talking attorney that doesn't follow thru [sic] with his
19 promises. I was my case was a [sic] open & close case that should take no longer then [sic] 6
20 months. This case ended up taking 2 years & 4 months and he still didn't complete it. I had to
21 hire a different attorney to complete it and it was done within 2 months. I STRONGLY don't
22 trust or recommend him or his firm." (First Amended Complaint, ¶ 11.) Plaintiffs alleged that
23 this review "necessarily implies falsely" that Plaintiffs provided incompetent and inadequate
24 legal services. (*Id.* at ¶ 21(g).)

1 but not contentions, deductions, or conclusions of fact or law.” (*Serrano v. Priest*, 5 Cal. 3d 584,
2 591 (1971).)

3 **A. Plaintiffs Fail to Plead Sufficient Factual Allegations Entitling Them to Recover**
4 **against Defendants**

5 Plaintiffs have obtained a default against Defendants in this matter. Substantively, a
6 default “is said to ‘confess’ the material facts alleged by the plaintiff, i.e. the defendant’s failure
7 to answer has the same effect as an express admission of the matters well pleaded in the
8 complaint.” (*Steven M. Garber & Assoc. v. Eskandarian*, 150 Cal. App. 4th 813, 823 (2007).)
9 Nevertheless, a complaint must plead allegations sufficient to state a proper cause of action, or
10 else a default in the plaintiff’s favor cannot stand. (*Kim v. Westmoore Partners Inc.*, 201 Cal.
11 App. 4th 267, 282 (2011).)

12 *i. Plaintiffs fail to establish a connection between Doe Defendants’ conduct and*
13 *Named Defendants’ identities in the First Amended Complaint*

14 In the instant matter, Plaintiffs included factual allegations to establish the existence of
15 negative Yelp reviews. Plaintiffs additionally included factual allegations that Michael Johnson
16 and Charlotte Ybarra-Teague reside in Sacramento County. Beyond these factual assertions—
17 which may be taken as true due to Defendants’ default—Plaintiffs fail to proffer any explanation
18 of how these two named individuals connect to the alleged harmful conduct. Plaintiffs do not
19 identify named Defendants as responsible for the conduct of any particular unnamed defendant.
20 Without Plaintiffs’ doing so, the court is left to speculate whether Plaintiffs claim Defendants are
21 responsible for all alleged defamatory postings; several postings each; one posting per
22 Defendant; one posting between both Defendants; or any such permutation. The court cannot
23 simply infer that Plaintiffs’ allegations correlate one-to-one according to the similarities between
24 an internet alias and a named Defendant. Plaintiff has offered no evidence or facts pleaded to
25 clarify such an ambiguity.

1 That Plaintiffs later asserted defendant Ybarra-Teague to be Yelp accountholder
2 “Charlotte Y.”, and defendant Johnson to be accountholder “Michael J.” is irrelevant. These
3 subsequent allegations were contained in Plaintiffs’ Declaration in Support of Application for
4 Default Judgment filed January 12, 2018. By this time, the court had already entered default as to
5 Defendants on November 30, 2017. Defendants cannot be held responsible to answer allegations
6 made for the first time at a default judgment hearing after their entry of default has already been
7 granted. (*See, e.g., Jackson v. Bank of Am.*, 188 Cal. App. 3d 375, 388 (1986) [holding that
8 plaintiff’s failure to amend the complaint prior to the default hearing precluded him from proving
9 at the hearing that defendant’s conduct caused the alleged damages].)

10 *ii. Plaintiffs fail to show their harm suffered is sufficiently attributable to*
11 *Defendants’ conduct*

12 While Plaintiffs’ recovery is barred on procedural grounds, as established above, the
13 court notes that Plaintiffs have also failed to connect their alleged losses to the conduct of the
14 two named Defendants in particular. In evaluating a cause of action, California courts require
15 material allegations to establish that a defendant’s conduct “plausibly caused” harm to the
16 plaintiff. (*Prakashpalan v. Engstrom, Lipscomb & Lack*, 223 Cal. App. 4th 1105, 1130 (2014).)
17 Complaints that include only a “vague . . . causal connection between the [defendant’s conduct]
18 and the harm [to plaintiffs]” are insufficient to establish a cause of action. (*Stansfield v. Starkey*,
19 220 Cal. App. 3d 59, 74 (1990).)

20 In the instant matter, Plaintiffs have provided an exceedingly vague rationale for why
21 their decline in revenue over an entire year is plausibly connected to Defendants’ conduct alone.
22 Unfortunately for Plaintiffs, by their own introduction of evidence, negative Yelp reviews of
23 their services are apparently a common occurrence. At trial, Plaintiffs submitted Exhibit F, a
24 three-page document that included various negative comments from “Nichole A.,” “R.R.,”
25 “Sarah C.,” and “Emmelie D.,” in addition to the comments from “Charlotte Y.” and “Michael

1 J.” that Plaintiffs respectively attribute to Ybarra-Teague and Johnson. The exhibits to the
2 original Complaint likewise contain Yelp reviews negative comments regarding Plaintiffs that
3 appear to be from posters other than “Charlotte Y.” and “Michael J.” (See Verified Complaint
4 Exhibits A-G.) Plaintiffs offer no reason to attribute their \$9,206 decline in revenue solely to
5 Defendants’ reviews at the exclusion of the other reviews. Furthermore, Plaintiffs fail to account
6 for the fact that Defendants’ reviews took place on December 1, 2016, ignoring the possibility
7 that any effect on revenue occurred before 2017 began.

8 Plaintiffs allege receiving phone calls from potential clients, who expressed concern over
9 the Yelp reviews, as a basis for linking the firm’s decline in revenue to Defendants’ conduct.
10 Without any more detail on the timing or content of these phone calls, such an allegation lacks
11 the specificity to exclude other negative Yelp reviews as causing Plaintiffs’ harm. In any event,
12 Plaintiffs provided this allegation at the prove-up hearing but nowhere in their pleadings. The
13 court therefore declines to consider it. (See *Jackson v. Bank of Am.*, supra, at 388.)

14 **B. Plaintiffs Ask for Injunctive Relief against Yelp Based on Inapplicable Case Law**

15 *i. Plaintiffs cited a Superior Court ruling that had been partially reversed*

16 At the default judgment hearing, the court asked Mr. Misleh what legal authority existed
17 to support his request for entry of an injunction against Yelp, which is not a party to this action.
18 Mr. Misleh stated that he sought relief consistent with the San Francisco Superior Court’s default
19 judgment filed on January 14, 2014 in *Hassell v. Bird* (CGC-13-530525). When the court asked
20 whether there existed a case citation, Mr. Misleh provided a citation with an apparent superior
21 court case number. The court informed him that it prefers to receive citations to published
22 decisions of the appellate courts and not by those of other superior courts because published
23 appellate decisions are binding precedent while superior courts’ judgments are not binding
24 authority on other superior courts. (*Auto Equity Sales v. Superior Court*, 57 Cal. 2d 450, 455
25

1 (1962); Cal. Rule of Ct., Rule 8.1115(a).) Nonetheless, the court asked Mr. Misleh to provide a
2 copy of the *Hassell* judgment, which he did.³ The court took this matter under submission.

3 After the hearing concluded, the court noticed that Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint
4 mirrors the *Hassell* order to a significant degree. (See e.g., Amended Complaint at 13; *Hassell*
5 trial court order at 2 [showing identical types of injunctive relief].) The court also performed
6 computerized legal research and discovered two salient facts not disclosed by Mr. Misleh. First,
7 the Superior Court's injunction against Yelp was reversed in part and remanded by the Court of
8 Appeal in June 2016, approximately one half-year prior to the commencement of this litigation.⁴
9 (*Hassell v. Bird*, 247 Cal. App. 4th 1336 (2016). Second, review of that decision had been
10 granted by the California Supreme Court, which had recently heard argument and taken the
11 matter under submission.

12 On July 2, 2018, the Supreme Court rendered its decision in *Hassell v. Bird*, 5 Cal. 5th
13 522, 527 (2018). A summary of the facts set forth in the *Hassell* opinion reveals the close factual
14 similarities between that case and the instant case. In *Hassell*, a one-star (out of five) review of
15 the Hassell Law Group, a law firm, appeared on Yelp.com. (*Hassell v. Bird*, 5 Cal. 5th 522, 527
16 (2018).) The review, written by username "Birdzeye B.", claimed that Hassell "doesn't even
17 deserve one star" and "will probably not do anything for you, except make your situation worse."
18 (*Id.* at 527-28.) The review also claimed that Hassell had dropped the case "because of her
19 mother[']s illness] and seeming lack of work ethic." (*Id.* at 528.) Attorney Dawn Hassell believed
20

21 _____
³ The *Hassell* trial court judgment provided by Mr. Misleh is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

22 ⁴ The Court of Appeal in *Hassell* held that the trial court's injunction could apply against Yelp even though it was a
23 nonparty. (*Hassell v. Bird*, *supra*, 247 Cal.App.4th at 1365.) However, the trial court's order was held to be
24 erroneously overbroad "to the extent it purports to cover statements other than Bird's defamatory reviews." (*Id.* at
25 1341.) The matter was remanded to the trial court to allow it to enter a new order narrowing the terms of its removal
order in order to eliminate what it described as the "overbroad unconstitutional prior restraint on speech." (*Id.*) The
offending language in the order stated that Yelp was required to remove "any subsequent comments of these
reviewers within 7 business days of the date of the court's order." (*Id.* at 1360.) Plaintiffs' proposed judgment
lodged in this case contained this exact language, apparently copied from the *Hassell v. Bird* trial court order.

1 her former client Ava Bird to have authored the review, and emailed her a request that she
2 remove the review or face a defamation lawsuit. (*Id.*)

3 After plaintiffs effected substitute service and Bird failed to appear before the court,
4 plaintiffs moved for an entry of default judgment. (*Id.* at 529.) In January 2014, the trial court
5 entered a judgment in favor of plaintiffs for \$557,918.85 in general and special damages and
6 costs. (*Id.* at 529-30.) The court's order also provided that Bird, and "her agents, officers,
7 employees or representatives, or anyone acting on her behalf, are further enjoined from
8 publishing or causing to be published any written reviews, commentary, or descriptions of
9 DAWN HASSELL or the HASSELL LAW GROUP on Yelp.com or any other internet location
10 or website." (*Id.* at 530.) Finally, the order stated that "Yelp.com is ordered to remove all
11 reviews posted by AVA BIRD under user names 'Birdzeye B.' and 'J.D.' . . . and any
12 subsequent comments of these reviewers within 7 business days of the date of the court's order."
13 (*Id.*)

14 Mr. Misleh's citation of *Hassell* implied that the Superior Court's order stands as good
15 law. To the contrary, at the time of the prove-up hearing, the Court of Appeal had already ruled
16 that the San Francisco Superior Court erred in ordering Yelp to remove any future postings by
17 defendants. (*Hassell v. Bird*, 247 Cal. App. 4th 1336, 1360 (2016).) That opinion was relevant
18 legal authority to which this court should have been directed.

19 Moreover, the procedural history has subsequently turned even further against Plaintiffs'
20 requested relief. The Supreme Court's ruling, which is now binding precedent on this court,
21 further rejects the type of relief that Plaintiffs seek against nonparty Yelp.

22 Even prior to the Supreme Court's July 2, 2018 ruling, *Hassell* had garnered widespread
23 publicity due to First Amendment issues and California's interest in internet sovereignty. Even a
24 perfunctory internet search of "Hassell v. Bird" at the time of Plaintiffs' prove-up hearing
25

1 yielded numerous results indicating the case's status in front of the Supreme Court. The
2 likelihood that Mr. Misleh was completely unaware of *Hassell*'s procedural history is doubtful.

3 Mr. Misleh's actions are an apparent violation of Rule 5-200(D) of the California Bar's
4 Rules of Professional Conduct. Rule 5-200(D) states in relevant part that "In presenting a matter
5 to a tribunal, a member . . . [s]hall not, knowing its invalidity, cite as authority a decision that has
6 been overruled[.]"

7 In this instance, Mr. Misleh provided a citation only to the Superior Court ruling in
8 *Hassell*. He failed to acknowledge *Hassell*'s subsequent procedural history—likely because such
9 history is detrimental to his case (as discussed below). Mr. Misleh, in fairness, never
10 characterized as binding precedent on this court. His representation of the *Hassell* trial court
11 opinion is nevertheless unprofessional.

12 ii. *Plaintiffs request the type of relief denied by the California Supreme Court*

13 Notwithstanding an apparent Rule 5-200 violation, Plaintiffs ask for injunctive relief that
14 has been rejected by the very case to which Plaintiffs drew this court's attention.

15 Plaintiffs, presumably replicating the *Hassell* complaint verbatim, first failed to realize
16 that injunctive relief is a remedy as opposed to a cause of action. (*City of South Pasadena v.*
17 *Dept. of Transportation*, 29 Cal. App. 4th 1280, 1293 (1994).) Plaintiffs furthermore failed to
18 realize that this overly broad "cause of action" contains precisely the type of injunctive relief that
19 the California Supreme Court struck down. Were this court even to follow the Court of Appeal's
20 ruling, it would be to the detriment of Plaintiffs. The Court of Appeal unequivocally held that "to
21 the extent the trial court additionally ordered Yelp to remove subsequent comments that Bird or
22 anyone else might post, the removal order is an overbroad prior restraint on speech." (*Hassell*,
23 *supra*, 247 Cal. App. 4th at 1360.)

24 Moreover, the California Supreme Court held that "it is clear that plaintiffs' legal
25 remedies lie solely against [defendants], and cannot extend—even through an injunction—to

1 Yelp.” (*Hassell*, supra, 5 Cal. 5th at 547.) The Supreme Court’s ruling renders invalid not only
2 any order restricting subsequent comments from defendant Bird, but also any order directing
3 Yelp to remove the defamatory posts when it is not named in an action.

4 If this order were a Yelp review rather than a court ruling, it might read as follows: “This
5 attorney tried to persuade the court to enter an injunction by citing an obviously invalid trial
6 court order – zero stars.” Since this is a court ruling, the court must simply state that the request
7 for an injunction against Yelp must be denied as it is foreclosed by controlling legal authority.

8 **IV. Conclusion**

9 Because Plaintiffs have failed to prove their case against Ms. Ybarra-Teague and Mr.
10 Johnson, the request for default judgment and damages against them is denied. The request for
11 an injunction against nonparty Yelp.com is also denied.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: August 6, 2018

14 
15 _____
16 CHRISTOPHER E. KRUEGER
17 Judge of the Superior Court
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Y

FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

JAN 14 2014

CLERK OF THE COURT
BY: *[Signature]*
Deputy Clerk

1 DAWN L. HASSELL (SBN 200080)
2 THE HASSELL LAW GROUP
3 A Professional Corporation
4 4079 19th Avenue
5 San Francisco, CA 94132
6 Telephone: (415) 334-4111
7 Fax: (415) 469-9885

8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
9 DAWN L. HASSELL and HASSELL LAW GROUP, P.C.

10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO- UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

12 DAWN HASSELL and HASSELL LAW
13 GROUP, a P.C.

Case No. CGC-13-530525

**[PROPOSED] DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN
FAVOR OF PLAINTIFFS**

14 Plaintiffs,

vs.

Date: 01/14/14
Dept.: 514
Time: 9:00 a.m.

15 AVA BIRD, and DOES 1 TO 50, inclusive,

16 Defendants.

THE HASSELL LAW GROUP
A Professional Corporation
4079 19th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

17
18 Plaintiff s' Request for Default Judgment before this Court in Department 514 on January
19 14, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. Counsel Dawn L. Hassell and Andrew Haling appeared on behalf of
20 Plaintiffs. After reviewing the Case Summary, Declarations, Exhibits, all supporting documents
21 and hearing live testimony from Plaintiff DAWN HASSELL, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

22 Plaintiffs requested Default Judgment is Granted against Defendant AVA BIRD. Judgment
23 in favor of Plaintiffs is entered in the total amount of \$ 557,919.85. This amount includes
24 judgment in the amount of \$ 54,000.00 for past special damages, \$ 3,919.85 for past case costs, \$ 500,000.00
25 for general damages, \$ for punitive damages, and \$ for interest on the award.

26 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:

27 Plaintiffs' Request for Injunctive Relief is Granted. Defendant AVA BIRD is ordered to
28 remove each and every defamatory review published or caused to be published by her about

[Proposed] Judgment

EXHIBIT A


1 plaintiffs HASSELL LAW GROUP and DAWN HASSELL from Yelp.com and from anywhere
2 else they appear on the internet within 5 business days of the date of the court's order.

3 Defendant AVA BIRD, her agents, officers, employees or representatives, or anyone acting
4 on her behalf, are further enjoined from publishing or causing to be published any written reviews,
5 commentary, or descriptions of DAWN HASSELL or the HASSELL LAW GROUP on Yelp.com
6 or any other internet location or website.

7 Yelp.com is ordered to remove all reviews posted by AVA BIRD under user names
8 "Birdzeye B." and "J.D." attached hereto as Exhibit A and any subsequent comments of these
9 reviewers within 7 business days of the date of the court's order.

10
11
12
13 THE HASSELL LAW GROUP
14 A Professional Corporation
15 4079 19th Avenue
16 San Francisco, CA 94132

17 Dated: 14 JAN 14

18 
19 Hon. Donald J. Sullivan
20 Presiding Judge

21
22
23 Case no. CSC-13-530525

24 Hassell

25 vs.

26 Bird.

27
28

EXHIBIT A



The Hassell Law Group


★★★★☆ 12 reviews

Categories: Personal Injury Law, Employment Law

4079 18th Ave
(between Chester Ave & Randolph St)
San Francisco, CA 94132
Neighborhood: Ingleside Heights

(415) 334-4111
hasselllawgroup.com

Hours:
Mon-Fri 9 am - 6:30 pm



Recommended Reviews for The Hassell Law Group

Birdzeya B.'s Review



Birdzeya B.
Los Angeles, CA

★★★★☆ Updated - 4/29/2013

here is an update on this review:

dawn hassell has filed a lawsuit against me over this review i posted on yelp! she has tried to threaten, bully, intimidate, harass me into removing the review! she actually hired another bad attorney to fight this. lol well, looks like my original review has turned out to be truer than ever! avoid this business like the plague folks! and the staff at YELP has stepped up and is defending my right to post a review. once again, thanks YELP! and i have reported her actions to the Better Business Bureau as well, so they have a record of how she handles business. another good resource is the BBB, by the way.

1 Previous Review: Hide »

1/29/2013

well, here is another business that doesn't even deserve one star. basically, dawn hassell made a bad situation much worse for me. she told me she could help with my personal injury case from falling through a floor, then reneged on the case because her mom had a broken leg, or something like that, and that the insurance company was too much for her to handle. and all of this after i met with her office (not her personally, she was nowhere to be found) signed paperwork to 'hire' them and gained confidence in her office (due mostly to yelp reviews) so, in all fairness, i have to share my experience so others can be forewarned. she will probably not do anything for you, except make your situation worse. in fact, after signing all the paperwork with her office, like a broken record, they repeated 'DO NOT TALK TO THE INSURANCE COMPANY' over and over and over. and over and over. so i honored that and did not speak to them. but the hassell law group didnt ever speak with the insurance company either, neglecting their said responsibilities and not living up to their own legal contract nor did they bother to communicate with me, the client or the insurance company AT ALL. then, she dropped the case because of her mother and seeming lack of work ethic. (a good attorney wont do this, in fact, they arent supposed to) to save your case, STEER CLEAR OF THIS LAW FIRM! and research around to find a law firm with a proven track record of success, a good work ethic, competence and long term client satisfaction. there are many in the bay area and with some diligent smart interviewing, you can find a competent attorney, but this wont be one of them.

Comment from Dawn H. of The Hassell Law Group 4/29/2013

The statements in this review are simply not TRUE. My law... More »

12 reviews in English



Ari B.
San Francisco, CA

★★★★☆ 4/20/2012

There are some things in life you don't really learn about until they happen to you. Getting injured due to someone else's negligence, making it necessary for you to deal with insurance companies, claims, liability etc. is one of those things. It happened to me on a fall I took on some bad sidewalk. What I know now is this: when something like this happens pause before you make your first call; don't call your mom, don't call your significant other, don't even call the ambulance call an attorney. And my suggestion is that the Hassell Law Group should be that call. Heck if this ever happens to me again I'm calling her before I even get off the ground. Really. The thing you come to understand is that very small things, some of which make perfect common sense, can come back to bite you in the ass. Insurance companies might seem like they are pleasant and your friend, but in the end their only goal is to

People Who Viewed This Also Viewed...



Law Offices of Tanya Gorman
★★★★☆ 48 reviews
Neighborhood: Civic Center



Law Office of Arkady Ilkin
★★★★☆ 19 reviews
Neighborhood: Financial District



Fusion Law Group
★★★★☆ 12 reviews
Neighborhood: Financial District

People Viewed This After Searching For...

Personal Injury Law San Francisco

Labor Attorney San Francisco

Workers Compensation Lawyer San Francisco



« Back to The Hassell Law Group

What Are Recommended Reviews?

We get millions of reviews from our users, so we use automated software to recommend the ones that are most helpful for the Yelp community. The software looks at dozens of different signals, including various measures of quality, reliability, and activity on Yelp. The process has nothing to do with whether a business advertises on Yelp or not. The reviews that currently don't make the cut are listed below and are not factored into this business's overall star rating. Learn more here.

10 reviews for The Hassell Law Group that are not currently recommended

Note: The reviews below are not factored into the business's overall star rating.



J.D.
Alameda, CA
0 friends
1 review

☆☆☆☆☆ 2/6/2013

Did not like the fact that they charged me their client to make COPIES, send out FAXES, POSTAGE, AND FOR MAKING PHONE CALLS about my case!!! Isn't that your job. That's just ridiculous!!! They Deducted all those expenses out of my settlement.



K.S.
San Mateo, CA
0 friends
2 reviews

☆☆☆☆☆ 4/8/2013

I had a very positive experience with the Hassell Law Group. I found them via these Yelp reviews, and interviewed a number of other lawyers before engaging with them. For our first meeting, Dawn Hassell met me at a coffee shop near my home. Unlike some other lawyers that I spoke to, she did not sugar coat the process ahead. It was important that my lawyer provide me with realistic expectations, and an understanding of each step. In these regards Dawn and her team came through very well. There were some unexpected setbacks during the case, which were handled with diligence and strategic thinking. They engaged me at each step, explained our options, and followed my instructions (even when we differed on the path to take). An advantage of working with this team is that IT IS A TEAM. I worked with at least 4-separate attorneys at the firm, each responsible for making sure the different portions of the case moved forward as needed. I had 3-attorneys from the firm present at my settlement conference, to make my case and provide input on all available options. The case resolved positively before trial, and I have personally recommended the Hassell Law Group to two other people involved in personal injury matters.



Nicole M.
Daly City, CA
0 friends
2 reviews

☆☆☆☆☆ 2/20/2013

for the past 10 years the Hassell Law Group has handled several claims for me, and to start with I am a paraplegic (wheelchair bound) person, I have had a few attorneys in the past and none of them can compare to the Hassell law firm, the office is wheelchair accessible, and I was treated with great respect the office also have a accessible restroom and kitchen area, and the coffee is good first class all the way. Ms. Hassell got me a great settlement on all my claims, everytime I called the office they answered the telephone and that is an issue with most attorneys but with ms Hassell office you can always reach them and they take out the time to answer any questions about your claim that you have and believe me I worried them alot and they were always patient with me, words just cannot express how great this law firm is I would say the Hassell Law firm is in the top 5 in sanfrancisco and I mean at the top. If you really need someone to take care of you and really care about getting you the best help with your claim it is this law firm, I see you have read a couple of bad reviews, dont believe them hire the Hassell Law Group and all of your prayers will be answered. and I just want to say thank you to all the Hassell Law Attorneys for all of your help you are the best.



Rose H.
San Francisco, CA
0 friends
31 reviews

☆☆☆☆☆ 2/13/2013

Dawn Hassell and the Hassell Law Group are amazing. They took my case and handled it professionally and efficiently. For me it was less about the money and more about the principle. I have referred the Hassell group to several people and always with amazing results. They care and it shows.
RH



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Document Scanning Lead Sheet

Jan-14-2014 3:59 pm

Case Number: CGC-13-530525

Filing Date: Jan-14-2014 3:57

Filed by: YOLANDA MAZARIEGOS

Juke Box: 001 Image: 04341641

TEXT JUDGMENT

DAWN L. HASSELL et al VS. AVA BIRD et al

001C04341641

Instructions:

Please place this sheet on top of the document to be scanned.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Gordon D. Shaber Courthouse
720 – 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Case Title: In the matter of: EDWARD MISLEH and THE LAW OFFICES OF EDWARD MISLEH, APC
v. MICHAEL JOHNSON; CHARLOTTE YBARRA-TEAGUE, and DOES 1 TO 25.

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

CASE NUMBER
34-2017-00206726

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that a true copy of the attached, clerk's certificate of service by mail and *Amended Order on Motion for Default Judgment and Award of Damages*, filed August 2, 2018, was mailed following standard court practices in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepared, addressed as indicated below. The mailing and the certification occurred at Sacramento, California, on 8/6/2018

Lloyd Connelly,

Clerk of the Court, by M. Greco, 8/6/2018



, Deputy

Edward Misleh
The Law Offices of Edward Misleh, APC
615 Tenth Street
Sacramento CA 95814

Michael Johnson
3630 Kings Way Apt 11
Sacramento CA 95821

Charlotte Ybarra-Teague
5816 Laurine Way
Sacramento CA 95824

Yelp
Attention: Legal Department
140 New Montgomery St
San Francisco CA 94105

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL