

1 DIINELE DINAALI
2 4160 w 182ND Street, Apt. 217
3 Torrance, CA 90504
4 (310) 989-9559
deenna@my.email

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
4/29/2025 3:04 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Tarasyuk, Deputy Clerk

5 PLAINTIFF IN PRO PER

6 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
7 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

9 DIINELE DINAALI, an individual,
10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 SHEIN DISTRIBUTION CORPORATION, a
Delaware corporation;
13 SPEEDX, a New York corporation;
14 BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK,
LLP, a Colorado corporation;
15 IDENTITY DIGITAL INC., a Washington
corporation;
16 CHRIS XU, an individual;
17 RICHARD BENSON, an individual;
18 ERIC D WALTHER, an individual;
MADYSON B BATHKE; an individual;
19 JENNIFER SWALLOW, an individual;
20 AKRAM J ATALLAH, an individual;
CAMERON WALKER, an individual;
21 DAVE MCBREEN, an individual;
DOES 1-20;
22 ROE CORPORATIONS 1-10, inclusive;
23 Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV07490
Dept.: 82
[Writs and Receivers]

**PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND ORDER
TO SHOW CAUSE RE: PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Complaint Filed: March 17, 2025
Trial Date: Not Set

Hearing Date: April 30, 25
Hearing Time: 8:30 am

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 30, 2025 at 8:30 am or as soon thereafter as the matter
3 may be heard in Department 82 of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, located at 111 North
4 Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, Plaintiff DIINELE DINAALI (“Plaintiff”) will and hereby
5 does apply for an Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause why a
6 Preliminary Injunction should not be issued as set forth in Plaintiff’s concurrently filed motion.

7 This Application is made pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 527 and 533 and California
8 Rules of Court Rule 3.1200 et seq. on the grounds that:

- 9 1. Plaintiff’s business website has been unlawfully removed by Defendants IDI, Atallah,
10 Cameron, and McBeen, acting under false pretenses advanced by co-defendants
11 Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP (“BHFS”) and its attorneys.
12 2. Plaintiff’s livelihood depends entirely on this website, and its continued suspension is
13 resulting in irreparable financial harm, loss of business opportunities, and permanent
14 reputational damage.
15 3. Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional, mental, and financial distress as a result of the
16 retaliatory conduct by Defendants, which appears to be coordinated to silence
17 constitutionally protected speech and eliminate Plaintiff’s business presence online.
18 4. Immediate relief is necessary because Plaintiff cannot survive financially while awaiting the
19 hearing on the full motion for preliminary injunction. Each passing day without income
20 results in deeper and possibly irreversible harm.
21 5. Plaintiff is unable to timely serve Defendants due to evasive tactics employed.

22 This Application is based on this Notice, the attached Memorandum of Points and
23 Authorities, the Declaration of Diinele Dinaali, the Motion for Preliminary Injunction filed
24 herewith, and all other records and documents in the Court’s file in this matter.

25 Pursuant to Rule 3.1203, Plaintiff has given notice of this application to Defendants.

26 DATE: April 30, 2025

27 /s/DIINELE DINAALI

28 _____
Plaintiff in Pro Per, DIINELE DINAALI

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF EX PARTE APPLICATION**

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 Plaintiff respectfully seeks immediate ex parte relief to prevent continued and irreparable
4 harm caused by the unlawful and retaliatory takedown of Plaintiff’s business website. The
5 removal, orchestrated by Defendants BHFS, IDI, Atallah, Cameron, and McBeen, and supported by
6 Defendants Shein Distribution Corporation (“Shein”) and its CEO CHRIS XU (“Xu”), has completely
7 cut Plaintiff off from income and the ability to conduct lawful business operations. Plaintiff faces
8 imminent financial ruin, mental distress, and loss of professional credibility if the website is not
9 restored immediately.

10 Plaintiff further seeks an order allowing service through email.

11 **II. BACKGROUND**

12 Plaintiff is the owner and operator of a business whose website was unlawfully and
13 improperly taken offline through the coordinated efforts of multiple defendants, including
14 attorneys from the law firm BHFS, the fashion company Shein, and their affiliates. This case arises
15 from a campaign of retaliation and misconduct directed at Plaintiff after Plaintiff exercised First
16 Amendment rights by publishing websites critical of BHFS and certain attorneys affiliated with the
17 firm.

18 The critical domains in question—bhfs.online, ericdwalth.com, and
19 madysonbathke.com—were lawfully created and hosted to document and criticize allegedly
20 unethical conduct by named attorneys. These sites were publicized to individuals at BHFS through
21 court filings and internal firm communications. In apparent retaliation, BHFS and its attorneys
22 allegedly misrepresented the nature of these websites to the third-party hosting provider,
23 Defendant Identity Digital Inc. (IDI), which then improperly removed not only the websites created
24 against Shein and its attorneys, but Plaintiff’s own unrelated business website—causing
25 devastating financial harm.

26 Compounding the issue, Defendant Shein and Xu are believed to have bankrolled and
27 supported this retaliatory effort.

28 Plaintiff now seeks emergency injunctive relief to restore access to the unlawfully
suspended business website, and requests that Defendants IDI, Cameron, McBeen, and Atallah be

1 ordered to immediately reinstate the site in full operational mode without any further delay.

2 Plaintiff further asks the Court to refer certain Defendants for criminal investigation and
3 sanctions, given apparent violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 and
4 17500, as well as acts that may constitute extortion under NRS 205.320 and Penal Code § 518.

5 Plaintiff also alleges that Shein is actively evading service of process by listing a false
6 business address—777 S Alameda St., 4th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90021—which has been proven
7 to be inaccessible to process servers and even law enforcement. Plaintiff has repeatedly
8 attempted personal service at this location without success.

9 Plaintiff is self-represented and continues to suffer irreparable harm, both financial and
10 reputational, due to the Defendants' coordinated campaign of suppression and interference.

11 Plaintiff further suffers financial hardship due to inability to effectively serve Defendants.

12 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

13 A party seeking ex parte relief under Code of Civil Procedure §§ 527 and 533 must show:

- 14 1. Immediate and irreparable harm will occur before a noticed hearing can be held (Cal. Rules
15 of Court, Rule 3.1202(c)),
- 16 2. The relief requested is necessary to prevent that harm, and
- 17 3. The applicant has given reasonable notice or valid reasons for not doing so.

18 **IV. ARGUMENT**

19 **A. Plaintiff Will Suffer Irreparable Harm Without Immediate Relief**

20 Plaintiff's entire source of income has been shut down by the wrongful conduct of the
21 Defendants. Plaintiff's website was not the subject of any court order, and its removal was based
22 on false and retaliatory claims by BHFS and its attorneys. Each day that the site remains offline,
23 Plaintiff loses clients, visibility, and revenue—none of which can be adequately compensated later
24 by money damages alone.

25 **B. Plaintiff Is Likely to Succeed on the Merits**

26 Plaintiff has shown a strong likelihood of success on claims for violation of Business &
27 Professions Code §§ 17200 and 17500, as well as tortious interference and constitutional
28 violations. Defendants' coordinated actions amount to a campaign of unlawful business practices,
deceit, and suppression of free speech.

- 1 4. The domain names and website links were referenced in legal pleadings and served to BHFS
2 shareholder attorneys through the Court’s e-filing system. The links were then internally
3 circulated by BHFS to other associates through email communications.
- 4 5. Shortly after this dissemination, I discovered that BHFS, acting with retaliation and malice,
5 contacted my domain hosting provider, IDI, and, using misrepresentation and fraudulent
6 claims, convinced them to remove all of my protest websites.
- 7 6. Even more egregiously, BHFS then caused IDI to take down my unrelated business website—
8 completely separate from the protest domains—as an act of retaliation, simply because it
- 9 7. I have reason to believe, and will show through evidence, that individuals affiliated with
10 IDI—specifically Atallah, Cameron, and McBeen—acted on false representations made by
11 BHFS and their attorneys, and without conducting an independent investigation, removed
12 my business website. This action has caused me direct financial losses, emotional harm, and
13 loss of business relationships.
- 14 8. Separately, Shein and Xu have advertised a fake business address—777 S Alameda Street,
15 4th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90021—as their principal place of business. I have attempted
16 numerous times to serve legal documents at this address, including through the Los Angeles
17 County Sheriff’s Department and private process servers. Every attempt has failed.
- 18 9. I have also personally attempted to visit this address. The premises are not accessible to the
19 public, and no business signage or reception indicates that Shein operates there. Repeated
20 requests to Shein to facilitate a visit or proper service have gone unanswered.
- 21 10. I believe Shein and Xu use this address to evade legal service and avoid accountability, a
22 deceptive business practice under California law.
- 23 11. I respectfully request this Court to grant a Preliminary Injunction ordering the immediate
24 restoration of my website, prohibiting Defendants from further interfering with my domains,
25 and requiring Shein to cease using the fake business address that they knowingly promote.
- 26 12. The actions taken against me have caused me severe mental, emotional, physical, and
27 financial harm. My constitutional rights to free expression and to run a lawful business have
28 been trampled on through coordinated, malicious, and deceitful conduct.
13. I further request to be allowed to serve through email as I cannot afford a process server.

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

14. If the Court does not grant this relief, I will continue to suffer irreparable harm that cannot be adequately addressed by monetary damages alone.

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

DATE: April 30, 2025

/s/DIINELE DINAALI

Plaintiff in Pro Per, DIINELE DINAALI