, PLAINTIFF

V.

NO.

, DEFENDANTS

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, , a Mississippi corporation with its principal place of business in , County, Mississippi, files this its suit against Defendants, and and in support thereof states the following:

Parties and Venue

1. Plaintiff is a Mississippi corporation with its principal office in , County, Mississippi.

2. is a Mississippi corporation having its principal place of business in , Mississippi, and may be served with process by serving its agent for process, . is an adult resident citizen of , Mississippi, who may be served with process at .

3. This cause of action arises out of a contract to be performed in County, Mississippi, and a tort which occurred in said county.

FACTS

4. was the general contractor for the construction of In between , Mississippi. , a real estate developer, owned and in acres located on County, Mississippi, which required filling to a certain elevation to in and requested that be commercially developed. contacted allow it to use the property to dump construction debris, but declined, stating that the property was to be developed as a retail center, which would preclude the use of such fill materials as construction debris.

5. and executed a Letter Agreement under date of , , Exhibit attached, which provided that , in consideration of an ownership interest, would fill the property to, the agreed elevation by , with soil materials which would contain no construction debris or refuse. Subsequently, the parties entered into a Limited Partnership Agreement dated , , , a copy of which is attached as Exhibit .

6. Said Limited Partnership Agreement specified that the Partnership was organized to "own, improve, and hold for investment or development certain real property to be contributed to the partnership by the General Partner"() and that the fill material would "consist solely of native soil materials and not include any type of construction debris or refuse."

7. Shortly after the execution of said letter, commenced filling the property, but, unknown to , and caused land to be filled with construction debris, broken concrete pavement, broken asphalt pavement, steel reinforcing bars, bridge members, timbers, bricks, tree stumps, and other unsuitable material, which made the land completely unfit for economical commercial development of any kind. Said Defendants fraudulently caused said improper construction debris to be covered with soil material, thus concealing said gross, wanton, and intentional breach of contract in order fraudulently to induce to accept said performance.

land as a dump for a large amount of the 8. deliberately used performance of its contract for the construction debris generated as a result of construction of the new . Said illegal, unauthorized and Project from to property not only destroyed the ability of to develop the fraudulent misuse of property in an economically feasible manner, but, on information and belief, it also resulted in in its cost of completing said highway construction project by huge savings for eliminating the need to purchase dumping privileges for unwanted construction debris and avoiding potentially expensive longer hauls to sites where the debris from said construction project could be legally dumped.

9.andfalsely represented tothathad properly completedits duties under theLimited Partnership Agreement; and, relying on said representation,paid \$toin consideration ofrelease of its rights in the Partnership property.

10.Further relying on
had completed the performance,
entered a lease with
to the specifications of said tenant on saidassurances of performance, and believing that
acres on the
sold to
acres on the
build a building and parking lot
acre tract.

As a result of tests conducted by soil engineers employed by said tenant, 11. and first became aware of the concealed construction debris buried on the site and, accordingly, were required to completely excavate the building site at its own expense and, to date, has expended approximately \$ to do so. Additionally, said tenant has made demand for liquidated damages and substantial unspecified expenses incurred by said tenant on rectifying the problems in the fill caused by the construction debris in the tenant's parking lot area. Also, as a direct and proximate result of the actions of Defendants, the value of remaining property has been reduced by approximately). On information and (\$ belief, it would cost in excess of \$ to remove the fill placed on Plaintiff's property by Defendants and replace it with soil that met the specifications of the contract between Plaintiff

and . The curative work required to be done resulted in a delay of months in opening the store which resulted in a loss of rent and liability for liquidated damages. Said fill condition also caused substantial questions to be raised as to the suitability of the remaining site for development, thus resulting in further damages to .

personally, fraudulently and, with intent to deceive 12. , and deliberately placed, or caused to be placed, the organic material, rubble, broken concrete pavement, broken asphalt pavement, steel reinforcing bars, bridge members, timbers, bricks and other unacceptable materials on property and concealed their actions from . Said fraudulent concealment was done with the intent to defraud into believing that was properly performing its duties under the Letter Agreement and the Limited Partnership would not require Defendants to cease said flagrant destruction of Agreement, so that property values, and to believe that it had completed its contract with and thus to obtain the compensation it claimed was due under its agreement with . acting in . reliance on said fraudulent concealment, failed to stop Defendants from the continued dumping on its land and also executed a release under the terms of which paid \$ in exchange for its interest in the land. If had been aware of the condition of said soil, it would not have executed said release and paid said \$

13. Defendants knew full well that their actions in using valuable commercial property on as a dumpsite for their construction debris would substantially destroy the commercial value of said property. Not only is the soil rendered too unstable for construction, but the presence of large chunks of concrete and other debris prevent the economical construction of foundations, utility lines, streets, parking areas and other excavation required by a commercial development. Said wanton and deliberate destruction of the value of property, along with the intentional and fraudulent concealment thereof, constitutes a separate tort for which Defendants are liable in actual and punitive damages.

COUNT I

Breach of Contract

14. , under the Letter Agreement attached as Exhibit A and the Limited Partnership Agreement attached as Exhibit B, had a duty to fill land with native soil materials only and not with construction debris or refuse. deliberately and intentionally breached its agreement and did, in fact, place a substantial amount of construction debris on the said land. As a direct and proximate result of said breach of contract, has been damaged in the amount of not less than \$

Wherefore, demands judgment against of said breach of contract in the sum of at least \$, plus prejudgment interest and costs.

COUNT II

Intentional Tort

15. fraudulently, deliberately, intentionally, and with actual and land by burying and concealing large amounts of malice destroyed the value of construction debris and refuse on said land which rendered it unsuitable for commercial development without the expenditure of large sums of money for rectification. Said , fraudulently and with the intent to deceive Plaintiff then caused said and construction debris to be concealed from and its agents. Said unauthorized and concealed placing of construction debris on said property without their consent constitutes a trespass and was accompanied by such flagrant, malicious and outrageous conduct as to constitute a separate and independent tort for which said Defendants are liable for actual damages in the amount of) and punitive damages in the same amount, (\$).

(\$

ACCOUNT III

Breach of Fiduciary Duty

As a result of the execution of Exhibits A and B, and the trust and confidence 16. in the joint development of the property as partners, placed in owed a fiduciary duty to in this matter. concealed, deliberate, and malicious destruction of property for its own gain constitutes a breach of said fiduciary duty, for which value of is liable for actual and punitive damages.

COUNT IV

Damages and Indemnity for Curative Work

17. As a direct and proximate result of their wrongful actions herein, Defendants jointly and severally are liable to indemnify for its expenses to date for the curative work on said acre tract in the amount of (\$) and for any further payments it may be required to make to for curative work on said soil, which is estimated to be). In the alternative, Defendants are liable to for indemnity to (\$ for all incurred in said curative work. expenses which

Wherefore, demand judgment against , jointly and and and severally for all damages proximately caused by their said wrongful acts in an amount of not less than) plus prejudgment interest, costs and such punitive damages of not less (\$ than (\$) for a total judgment of not less than (\$).

Plaintiff also demands that the Defendants be ordered to repay to the Plaintiff the for said Release, plus interest, and that the parties be restored to the status quo sum of \$ ante.

COUNT V

DECLARATORY RELIEF

Plaintiff would show the Release referred to in Defendants' Fourth Affirmative Defense was obtained by the fraud of the Defendant, , in that it deliberately misrepresented to the Plaintiff, , that Defendant had complied with the letter agreement attached to the Complaint as Exhibit "A" and the Limited Partnership Agreement attached thereto as Exhibit MBM. Specifically, Defendant intentionally misled Plaintiff into believing that there was no construction debris or any materials other than native soils in the said fill when in fact said Defendant had caused to be placed in said fill huge amounts of said construction debris, as all has been set forth in more detail above. Because of said intentional fraud of Defendant , this Court should declare that the said Release is void and of no effect , has failed to fulfill its contract with Plaintiff and that it be and that the Defendant. paid as a result of said fraud and the parties be ordered to return to Plaintiff, . the \$ restored to the status quo ante.

Wherefore, Plaintiff demands:

Judgment against Defendants jointly and severally for all damages proximately caused by Defendants' conduct and punitive damages in the sum of \$; and

Judgment declaring that (1) the Release executed by Plaintiff and be declared void; that (2) must return the \$ paid for said Release with interest to Plaintiff; that (3) has failed to fulfill its duties under the Limited Partnership Agreement with Plaintiff; and that (4) the parties are returned to the position in which they were prior to the execution of the Release.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for

Of counsel:

Telephone: MSB # Attorney for

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, , hereby certify that I have this day mailed via United States mail, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document to , and to .

This the day of , 20 .
