ER

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS.	SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT C. A. No.
JOY JONES, Plaintiff)))
V.))
KING STREET PROPERTIES, LLC; LINCOLN PROPERTY COMPANY; PPF OFF 125 CAMBRIDGE PARK DRIVE, LLC; LONGFELLOW REAL ESTATE PARTNERS, LLC; REGUS MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC; PIDC CONSTRUCTION, LLC; P. H. MECHANICAL CORP.; SPX COOLING TECH, LLC, Defendants	COMPLAINT FOR DISCOVERY COMPLAINT FOR DISCOVERY COMPLAINT FOR DISCOVERY COMPLAINT FOR DISCOVERY

INTRODUCTION

This is an action for discovery against the owners, managers, and their contractors and service providers, of the building at 125 Cambridgepark Drive, Cambridge ("the OFFICE BLDG"), where the plaintiff was a sub-tenant and she was brutally raped while she was at work there, because the building access and security systems, which were supposed to be in place, failed to function properly.

PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff is an individual residing in Middlesex County, who is using the name JOY JONES ("JOY"), in order to protect the identities and safety of herself and her minor child, and who is identified in a separate Affidavit which will be served upon the defendants.
- 3. Defendant KING STREET PROPERTIES, LLC ("KSP"), is a limited liability

- company, organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with an usual place of business at 800 Boylston Street, Boston, Suffolk County, Massachusetts.
- 4. Defendant LINCOLN PROPERTY COMPANY("LINCOLN"), is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Texas, with an usual place of business at 150 Cambridgepark Drive, Cambridge, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.
- Defendant PPF OFF 125 CAMBRIDGE PARK DRIVE, LLC ("OFF 125"), is a limited liability company, organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, with an usual place of business at 150 Cambridgepark Drive, Cambridge, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.
- Defendant LONGFELLOW REAL ESTATE PARTNERS, LLC ("LONGFELLOW"),
 is a limited liability company, organized under the laws of the State of Delaware,
 with an usual place of business at 60 State Street, Boston, Suffolk County,
 Massachusetts.
- 7. Defendant REGUS MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC ("Regus") is a limited liability company, organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a Massachusetts Resident Agent, Corporation Service Company, at 84 State Street, Boston, Suffolk County, Massachusetts.
- 8. Defendant PIDC CONSTRUCTION, LLC ("PIDC"), is a limited liability company, organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with an usual place of business at 35 Parkwood Drive, Hopkinton, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.
- 9. Defendant P. H. MECHANICAL CORP ("P.H."), is a corporation duly organized

- under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with an usual place of business at 251 Revere Street, Canton, Norfolk County, Massachusetts.
- 10. Defendant SPX COOLING TECH, LLC ("SPX"), is a limited liability company, organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a Massachusetts Resident Agent, C T Corporation System, at 155 Federal Street, Boston, Suffolk County, Massachusetts.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. Plaintiff JOY is the 46 year old mother of a 7 year old child.
- 12. Plaintiff JOY contracted with REGUS, a tenant in the OFFICE BLDG, to use an office on the 3rd floor of the OFFICE BLDG from September 7, 2023 until May, 2024.
- 13. At about 9:00 p.m., on the evening of May 17, 2024, the date of "the ATTACK", while working in her office, JOY went to use the 3rd floor bathroom.
- 14. While she was in the bathroom, a tall white male, wearing a face mask and a vest/ jacket with reflective markings, carrying a knife, entered the bathroom, forcibly stripped her of all her clothing, and brutally raped her.
- 15. When she was able to move, JOY crawled, naked, to the 3rd floor elevator, pushed a button and was taken to the 4th floor where a security guard heard her calls for help and, after covering her with a coat, called for an ambulance.
- 16. The plaintiff does not know the identity of her attacker.
- 17. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that access to the OFFICE BLDG in the evening hours was limited to persons allowed to enter by security officers or those who had electronic keys.
- 18. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that access to elevators in the OFFICE

- BLDG in the evening hours was limited to persons who had electronic keys.
- 19. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that for a period of time before, and continuing to, the day of the ATTACK, there was ongoing construction in the OFFICE BLDG.
- 20. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that because of the construction in the OFFICE BLDG, the usual access procedures for the elevators were altered.
- 21. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that because of the construction in the OFFICE BLDG, it was possible to access the upper floors of the OFFICE BLDG without an electronic key.
- 22. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that because of the construction in the OFFICE BLDG, security cameras, which might have captured information relevant to the ATTACK, were inoperative.
- 23. The Cambridge Police Department was immediately notified of the ATTACK, and responded to the 911 call at 9:18 p.m.
- 24. To date, the Cambridge Police Department has not identified a person of interest in the ATTACK.
- 25. Defendant OFF 125 is the title owner of the OFFICE BLDG.
- 26. Defendant LONGFELLOW states in pubic records that it is an owner of the OFFICE BLDG.
- 27. Defendant KSP states on its website that the OFFICE BLDG is one of its properties.
- 28. Defendant LINCOLN states that it is the property manager of the OFFICE BLDG.
- 29. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that defendants OFF 125, LONGFELLOW, KSP and LINCOLN, either directly or indirectly, each have or had

- an ownership interest and/or managerial control over the OFFICE BLDG during the relevant times at which the events related in this Complaint occurred.
- 30. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that defendant REGUS is a tenant of one or more of the other named defendants which have an ownership or management interest in the OFFICE BLDG.
- 31. Plaintiff seeks to determine whether there is a sufficient factual basis for a claim based upon failures of the security systems in the OFFICE BLDG.
- 32. Plaintiff has no means to determine the respective roles of each defendant in the operation and control of the OFFICE BLDG.
- 33. Plaintiff has limited access to the factual information which is required to be alleged under current pleading standards to make out a claim of negligent security.
- 34. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that there were two different security companies employed at the OFFICE BLDG.
- 35. There are no records available to the plaintiff to determine which security company was providing security services during the relevant time periods.
- 36. There are no records available to the plaintiff to determine which defendant hired the security company that was providing security services during the relevant time periods.
- 37. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believe that the defendants will not voluntarily make available to her the information which is under their exclusive control, and which plaintiff needs in order to assert a claim.
- 38. Plaintiff's attacker was wearing clothing which was consistent with similar items usually worn by construction workers or other service personnel.

- 39. Plaintiff has identified at least three construction companies which were contracted to perform work at the OFFICE BLDG in 2024, defendants PIDC, P.H., and SPX.
- 40. Plaintiff has no reasonable means to determine the identity of the construction workers, and the dates and the hours during which they worked at the OFFICE BLDG.
- 41. Plaintiff has not identified the other service companies hired by defendant owners/mangers to clean and provide other building services.
- 42. Plaintiff has no reasonable means to determine the identity of the building services workers, and the dates and the hours during which they worked at the OFFICE BLDG.
- 43. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that the Cambridge Police Department will not release any investigatory material while their investigation continues.
- 44. Plaintiff is informed and reasonably believes that there is no grand jury presently investigating this matter, and no present plans to make a presentation to one.
- 45. There are no adequate alternative methods of obtaining discovery as to the basic ownership, management, construction, service and security facts at the OFFICE BLDG, at the time of the ATTACK.
- 46. Discovery is necessary to ensure that the rights of the plaintiff are protected.

DEMAND FOR RELIEF

47. Plaintiff requests the Court to permit her to conduct discovery by inspecting documents relating to the ownership, management and operations of the named defendants, and their respective security, construction, maintenance and service agents, obtaining information through interrogatories, and requests for documents,

and conducting depositions of witnesses pursuant to the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure.

- 48. Plaintiff further requests the Court to order the defendants, including all persons having care, custody or control of relevant documents, and/or electronic communications, and their agents, servants and employees, not to destroy, alter, change, or modify any documents, and/or electronic communications, relating in any way to the security and service operations, and the construction, at the OFFICE BLDG, for the period from January 1, 2024 to the present date.
- 49. Plaintiff further requests the Court to grant her such other and further relief as the Court may determine is just and appropriate.

By her Attorneys,

December 2, 2024

/s/ Carmen L. Durso
CARMEN L. DURSO, ESQUIRE
BBO # 139340
Law Office of Carmen L. Durso
276 Union Avenue
Framingham, MA 01702
617-728-9123 / carmen@dursolaw.com

/s/ Michael J. Heineman
MICHAEL J. HEINEMAN, BBO # 556841
mheineman@HBMHlaw.com
AMANDA BRYANT, BBO #703258
abryant@HBMHlaw.com
Heinlein Beeler Mingace & Heineman, PC
276 Union Avenue
Framingham, MA 01702
(508) 626-8500