

**Gabriele Goldaper**  
**4342 Redwood Avenue, Ste.C309**  
**Marina Del Rey, CA. 90292**  
E-mail: [ggoldaper@verizon.net](mailto:ggoldaper@verizon.net) phone: 310-302-1077, fax: 310-305-8600

**Sampling of Expert Witness Experience      Law firms who retained me noted in parentheses.**

**1.      Reality, Inc. vs. Moretts**

Designer agreed to allow the Moretts to use her name as the brand label in their garments. (Licensing)  
Designer terminates the licensing agreement and sues the Moretts claiming the Moretts abused and used her label inappropriately and therefore, destroyed the image of her name and damaged her reputation. Designer sued for damages

(Harrington, Foxx, Dubrow and Canter. Representing the Moretts)

**2.      Hip Hop Clothing Company Sues Bank of Los Angeles.**

The Bank of Los Angeles would not agree to lend the clothing company additional monies (above their already existing loans). The clothing company sues the bank claiming they were the direct cause for the failure of the clothing company and were therefore responsible for the clothing company going out of business.

(Kramer & Kaslow. Representing Bank of Los Angeles)

**3.      Workers of the El Monte Sweatshop vs. Tomato.**

Workers claimed that Tomato (garment manufacturer) was a responsible party in allowing the “slave-like” conditions to exist in their “El Monte Sweatshop” and therefore was responsible for financial damages and emotional suffering of the Thai workers

(Littler Mendelson and Wellman & Warren. Representing Tomato)

**4.      Global Interactive Marketing LTD (Women’ Apparel Manufacturer). Vs. United Nevada Trade International. (a Factoring Company)**

Manufacturer sues Factoring Company over several issues. Breach of contract: Factoring company did not advance monies as agreed. Usury charges: Factor charging “fees above the standards in the industry and above what is allowed in California”. Plaintiff claimed Factoring Agreement was “unconscionable” Fraud: Intentional misrepresentation on behalf of Factor, Invasion of privacy: Factor instructed Post Office to forward all of manufacturer’s business and personal mail to them. There were a total 16 different issues.

(John Fuchs of Fuchs & Associates, Inc. representing Global Interactive Marketing)

**5.      Leonard Rabinowitz ( Carole Little Clothing Co.) Vs. Levine Capital Partners.**

Plaintiffs claim that they were fraudulently induced by Defendants to enter into agreements to combine their clothing company with Chorus Line, another major clothing company, which the Defendants were the primary owners, creating a new entity CL Fashions Corporation, which several months later went bankrupt. Complaint by plaintiff was for fraud, false promise, negligence, intentional misrepresentation, breach of contract and other related issues.

(Alschuler Grossman Stein & Kahan LLP representing the Defendants)

## **6. Nike, Inc. v. Adidas America, Inc and Adidas-Salomon, AG**

Complaint for declaration of non-infringement of trademark and declaration of non-dilution of trademark. Nike wants to continue to use striping on their garments. Adidas wants Nike to stop the use of stripes, claiming they own the trademark.

(Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges representing Plaintiff Nike Inc.)

## **7. Crave Apparel, Inc. vs. Joan Blank**

Designer, and one third owner, was relieved of her position by other owners of Crave Apparel. She sues the apparel company for wrongful discharge, breach of employment contract, age discrimination, breach of shareholders agreement, infliction of emotional stress and related issues. Crave Apparel files cross-complaint.

(Dapeer, Rosenblit & Litvak, William Litvak for Crave Apparel)

## **8. L.A. Printex vs. Target Corporation; Teaze of California.**

This is a copyright infringement case. L.A. Printex sues to recover damages for misappropriation of their intellectual property by Target and its manufacturer-supplier Teaze, and to restrain them from engaging in such conduct in the future.

(Preston, Gates and Ellis, LLP, Theresa Keyes, attorneys for the Defendants)

## **9. Saks-off vs. Republic Factor**

Saks-off, an out of business garment manufacturer, had been factored by Republic Factors. Several months later Saks-off started in business again. A customer from the old company wrote an order for goods to the new business but paid, the old factor. Saks-off sued Republic for payment.

(Steven Howard. Representing Saks-off)

## **10. Pattern Maker/Assistant Designer sues employer.**

When hired, pattern maker/assistant designer, was offered and accepted, a fixed weekly salary. When she was terminated 10 months later she sued her employer for hourly overtime wages, claiming she was a non-exempt employee.

(Buchalter, Nemer, Fields & Younger, Laura Worsinger. Representing the employer.)

## **11. Clothing designer, Leon Max, is sued by area rug designer.**

Rug designer claimed Leon Max had copied her rug designs and used those designs on his fabrics, and subsequently used the fabrics in his dress and sportswear collection.

(Gary Phillips, representing Leon Max)

## **12. Simo, et al. vs. Union of Needle Trades Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE)**

25 sewing operators, formerly employed by Sorrento Coats, which is now closed due to bankruptcy, sue UNITE (clothing union) claiming the actions of the union were the cause for their being without work

(Andrea Cook and Linda Klibanow. Representing Simo, et al.)

### **13. Andrade vs. Sonerensen**

One year after legal separation wife claims she has rights to husband's clothing business. At date of separation business had a negative net worth. Year later business had a large positive net worth. Husband claimed he was solely responsible for the increased value of the business.

(Trope & Trope, Steven Knowles and James Durant representing the husband)

### **14. ANC Apparel, Inc. Vs. Panrox International (USA)**

ANC agreed to a joint venture with Panrox, a California corporation. Panrox was to produce the garments in their China facilities, ANC, in El Monte, was to market, sell and distribute the goods. Disputes arose over the ambiguity and the timely performance of the agreement.

(Michael Montgomery. Representing ANC.)

### **15. Williams vs. Sunset**

Jill Williams, Designer, sues Sunset Inc. for breaking promises she claimed they made to her and for Sunset not having paid commissions due her. Williams understood that a verbal agreement was in place to support her claims. Other employment benefit issues were also involved.

(Michelle Reinglass. Representing Williams.)

### **16. Emday, Inc. vs. Kua Textiles, Inc. et al.,**

Emday Fabrics claimed that a certain fabric design pattern, previously used on an Emday fabric, and owned by Emday, was used by Kua Textiles, on one of their fabrics. Emday sued for copyright infringement.

(Sheldon & Mak, William J. Brutocao. Representing Kua Textiles)

### **17. Podell Industries Inc.adv. Durbin and Gowey**

Two pregnant employees sue their employer for wrongful termination.

(Buchalter, Nemer, Fields & Younger, Laura Worsinger, Representing Podell Industries.)

### **18 Prima-Tex vs. Tapestry**

Fabric converter sues fabric printer over the right to the ownership of the designs used in the print.

(Berger,Kahn, Shafton, Moss, Sigler, Simon & Gladstone, Craig Aronson representing converter)

### **19. Yaghoubi, et. Al. v. St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance**

Dispute concerned the fair valuation of men's clothing retailer whose inventory was damaged by water and smoke.

(Watson Law Group, Reid Smith, representing St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company)

### **20. Cali-Fame vs. Von Dutch Originals**

Cali-Fame sues Von Dutch Originals for payment for hats, specifically produced by Cali-Fame for defendant, delivered to defendant, but not paid for by defendant.

(Steven M. Garber & Associates, Geoffrey Crisp, representing Cali-Fame)

