

FILED
DENTON COUNTY, TEXAS
2012 DEC 19 PM 4:17
BY SHERRI ADELSTEIN
DISTRICT CLERK
DEPUTY

PEARSON ROOFING, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

NATALIA KOT,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

DENTON COUNTY, TEXAS

367th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

DEFAULT JUDGMENT

At the hearing on this cause, Plaintiff Pearson Roofing, Inc. appeared through its attorney of record. Defendant Natalia Kot, although duly cited to appear and answer herein, failed to appear or answer within the time allowed by law.

The Court has considered the pleadings and records on file in this cause and the evidence, and is of the opinion that judgment should be rendered for Plaintiff.

It is, accordingly, ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED by the Court that Pearson Roofing, Inc., Plaintiff, recover of and from Natalia Kot, judgment for-

1. The sum of \$300,000.00, as actual damages;
2. Post-judgment interest at the rate of (5.00%) per year on the total judgment from the date of judgment until paid; and
3. All costs of court.

It is found by the Court as a fact that the following statements published by Natalia Kot are false and defamatory as to Pearson Roofing, Inc.:

- a) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “deliver(s) bad product.”
- b) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “uses CHEAP product.”
- c) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “used cheap felt which caused the roof to go in waves.”
- d) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “used cheap felt.”
- e) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “act(ed) completely unprofessional.”
- f) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “(doesn’t) care about the reputation of (its) company.”
- g) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “(doesn’t) care about (its) customers.”
- h) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff is only interested in new business and it “can care less about their prior work.”
- i) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “lied to (Defendant), (hung) up on (Defendant) and they will do the same to you if you ever have any problems.”
- j) On Yellowpages.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Defendant is “filing a law suit against (Plaintiff) for the misrepresentation of warranty.”

- k) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “deliver(s) bad product.”
- l) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “uses CHEAP product.”
- m) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “used cheap felt which caused the roof to go in waves.”
- n) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “used cheap felt.”
- o) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “act(ed) completely unprofessional.”
- p) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “(doesn’t) care about the reputation of (its) company.”
- q) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “(doesn’t) care about (its) customers.”
- r) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff is only interested in new business and it “can care less about their prior work.”
- s) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “lied to (Defendant), (hung) up on (Defendant) and they will do the same to you if you ever have any problems.”
- t) On Pissedconsumer.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Defendant is “filing a law suit against (Plaintiff) for the misrepresentation of warranty.”

- u) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “deliver(s) bad product.”
- v) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “uses CHEAP product.”
- w) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “used cheap felt which caused the roof to go in waves.”
- x) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “used cheap felt.”
- y) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “act(ed) completely unprofessional.”
- z) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “(doesn’t) care about the reputation of (its) company.”
- aa) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “(doesn’t) care about (its) customers.”
- bb) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff is only interested in new business and it “can care less about their prior work.”
- cc) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Plaintiff “lied to (Defendant), (hung) up on (Defendant) and they will do the same to you if you ever have any problems.”
- dd) On Ripoffreport.com, in a review of Pearson Roofing, Inc., that Defendant is “filing a law suit against (Plaintiff) for the misrepresentation of warranty.”

It is, furthermore, ORDERED that a permanent injunction shall issue enjoining and ordering Natalia Kot immediately cease the publication of defamatory or disparaging statements as to Pearson Roofing, Inc. and that Natalia Kot cause the removal of the statements previously published by her on websites, or otherwise, as to Pearson Roofing, Inc.

It is finally ORDERED that any requested relief in this case not granted herein is DENIED. This is a final judgment and is appealable. All writs and process necessary for the enforcement of this final judgment shall issue.

SIGNED on 12/18, 2012.

Margaret E. Barnes

JUDGE PRESIDING

APPROVED:

Steven D. Goldston

Steven D. Goldston
State Bar No. 08104050

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF