	Case 3:19-cv-02009-LAB-BGS Document	1 Filed 10/18/19 PageID.1 Page 1 of 30
1 2	CARLSON LYNCH, LLP Edwin J. Kipela (Pro Hac Vice Pending) ekilpela@carlsonlynch.com (Eddie) Jae K. Kim (CA Bar #236805)	
3 4	ekim@carlsonlynch.com	
4 5	Eric D. Zard (Ca Bar # 323320) ezard@carlsonlynch.com 1350 Columbia Street, Suite 603	
6	San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619-762-1903	
7	Facsimile: 619-756-6991	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed	Class
9	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
10	SOUTHERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
11		
12	WILLIAM MONDIGO and	Case No. <u>'19CV2009 BEN BGS</u>
13	RICHARD FAMIGLIETTI,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
14	<i>individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated</i> ,	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
15	Dlaintiffa	
16	Plaintiffs, v.	
17		
	EDSON AMEDICA INC	
18	EPSON AMERICA, INC.	
18 19	EPSON AMERICA, INC. Defendant.	

Plaintiffs William Mondigo and Richard Famiglietti, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, bring this Complaint against Epson America, Inc., ("Epson" or "Defendant") and allege as follows:

I.

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. This is a class action brought to seek redress on behalf of all persons
 and entities who purchased an Epson Printer and suffered harm as result of Epson's
 anti-competitive, unfair, fraudulent and oppressive and illegal conduct.

2. Specifically, Epson engaged, and continues to engage, in a systematic 1 campaign of disabling Epson printers when the owner attempts to use non-Epson ink 2 3 cartridges in an effort to improperly and illegally quash competition from third-party manufacturers. To carry out this scheme, Epson designed and delivered software 4 and/or firmware Updates to Epson printers that purposely disabled those printers 5 with non-Epson printer cartridges installed. For many users, these software updates 6 effectively ruined their printers. For others, the updates forced them to purchase 7 Epson ink cartridges, which are significantly more expensive than third-party 8 cartridges. 9

3. There is nothing inherently wrong with the third-party ink cartridges
that causes them to fail or that precludes their use in Epson printers. Indeed, these
cartridges function without issue on Epson printers that do not have the Updates
installed.

4. Epson never informed Epson printer owners that the Updates would
prevent their printers from working if they had third-party ink cartridges installed.
To the contrary, the Epson Software License informs consumers that the software
and/or firmware Updates will improve the printers and fix known issues.

5. Epson's actions violate the federal Computer Fraud and Abuse Act
("CFAA"), 18 U.S. C. § 1030, the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act
("CUTA"), the California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code
§§ 17200, *et seq.*, the California False Advertising Law ("FAL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof.
Code §§ 17500, *et seq.* and California Computer Penal Code § 502 (Unauthorized
access to computers, computer systems and computer data).

II. PARTIES

24

25

Plaintiffs

6. Plaintiffs William Mondigo purchased and owns an Epson WorkForce
WF-3640 All-in-One Printer. He is a resident of San Diego, California. Plaintiffs
Mondigo carefully reviewed the printer specifications before he chose to purchase

the Epson WorkForce WF-3640 All-in-One Printer. The specifications did not
 disclose that Epson would disable the printer if he used third-party ink cartridges.

7. Plaintiffs Richard Famiglietti purchased and owns an Epson XP-830
Small-in-One® printer. He is a resident of Waterbury, Connecticut. Plaintiffs
carefully reviewed the printer specifications before he chose to purchase the Epson
XP-830 Small-in-One® printer. The specifications did not disclose that Epson
would disable the printer if he used third-party ink cartridges.

Defendant

8. Defendant Epson America, Inc. is headquartered in Long Beach,
California. Epson is the American subsidiary of Seiko Epson Corporation, a
Japanese corporation. Epson America, Inc. is incorporated in the State of California.
Epson America, Inc. is responsible for selling and marketing Epson printers in the
United States.

9. information and belief, Epson's conduct emanated from its
headquarters in Long Beach, California and the Epson employees/personnel
responsible for this conduct are located at Epson's California headquarters.

17

III.

8

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

18 10. This Court has federal question subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to
19 18 U.S.C. § 1331 because Plaintiffs alleges that Epson violated the Computer Fraud
20 and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030 *et seq*.

11. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to the Class Action
Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) in that the matter in controversy exceeds the sum
or value of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, there are at least 100 members
of the proposed class, and at least one member of the class is a citizen of a different
state than Defendant. Further, greater than two-thirds of the members of the Classes
resides in states other than the state in which Defendant is a citizen.

12. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims
pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because all the claims alleged form part of the same

1 case or controversy.

13. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S. C. §§ 1391(b)(2) and
1391(d) because a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to the
claims emanated from activities within this District.

5

22

23

24

25

26

27

IV.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

6 14. Epson markets and sells printers and Epson ink cartridges in the United
7 States. Consumers can purchase printers directly from Epson or directly from
8 retailers such as Staples, Best Buy, Walmart, Amazon and others.

9 15. The printers, usually, come with ink cartridges but those ink cartridges
will eventually need to be replaced as the printer is used. The sale of replacement
ink cartridges is an important source of revenue and profit for Epson as Epson ink
cartridges range in price from approximately \$10 to \$150 or more for high-end
printers. In many cases, the cost of replacement cartridges over the life of a printer
is significantly larger than the cost of the printer itself.

15 16. Original Equipment Manufacturer ("OEM") ink cartridges for the Epson XP-830, ink code 410, cost approximately \$12.99 for a single black, cyan, 16 magenta or yellow ink cartridge. A set of four standard ink cartridges typically costs 17 approximately \$48.29.¹ A 410XL capacity ink cartridge for the XP-830 costs 18 between \$18.99 and \$24.99. As shown in the graphic below, a set of four XL 19 cartridges costs between \$75.96 (four (4) cartridges at \$18.99 each) to \$82.96 (three 20 21 (3) cartridges at \$18.99 and one (10 cartridge at \$24.99):

28 ¹ Epson, Epson Expression Premium XP-830 Small-in-One All-in-One Printer Ink, <u>https://epson.com/InkFinder/i/C11CE78201</u> (last accessed Oct. 14, 2019).

Case 3:19-cv-02009-LAB-BGS Document 1 Filed 10/18/19 PageID.5 Page 5 of 30

Color	Ink Code	Our Price	Qty	Chang
Epson 410, Black Ink Cartridge	410	\$12.99	0	+
Epson 410, Photo Black Ink Cartridge	410	\$12.99	0	+
Epson 410, Cyan Ink Cartridge	410	\$12.99	0	٠
Epson 410, Magenta Ink Cartridge	410	\$12.99	0	٠
Epson 410, Yellow Ink Cartridge	410	\$12.99	0	٠
Epson 410, Photo Black and Color Ink Cartridges, C/M/Y and Photo Black 4-Pack	410	\$48.29	0	+
Epson 410, Photo Black and Color Ink Cartridges, C/M/Y and Photo Black 4-Pack	410	\$48.29 Our Price	0 Qty	
				+ Change +
Color	Ink Code	Our Price	Qty	Change
Color Epson 410XL, Black Ink Cartridge, High Capacity Epson 410XL, Photo Black Ink Cartridge, High	Ink Code 410XL	Our Price \$24.99	Qty 0	Change +
Color Epson 410XL, Black Ink Cartridge, High Capacity Epson 410XL, Photo Black Ink Cartridge, High Capacity Epson 410XL, Cyan Ink Cartridge, High	Ink Code 410XL 410XL	Our Price \$24.99 \$18.99	Qty 0	Change +

17. Third-party ink cartridges for the Epson XP-830 cost substantially less. For instance, on Amazon, it is possible to purchase a 5-pack of 410XL Lemero remanufactured ink cartridges for only \$34.99.²

19

20

22	and the second	Lemero Remanufactured Ink Cartridge Repl	acement for Epson 410XL (Black,Cyan,Magenta,Yellow , 5-Pack)
23		\$34 ⁹⁹ vprime FREE Delivery by Sat, Nov 3	Save \$2.00 (with coupon	
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	² Amazon, <u>https://ww</u> =searchalias%3Delectronic		+xp+830+ink+cartridge+replacements& ressed Oct. 14, 2019).	<u>zurl</u>
		5		
		CLASS ACTION COM	IPLAINT	
			Case No.	

Similarly, Original Equipment Manufacturer ("OEM") ink cartridges 18. for the Epson WF-3640, ink code 252, cost approximately \$19.99 for a single black, a or \$12.99 for a singhe cyan, magenta or yellow ink cartridge. A set of four standard

Color		Ink Code	Our Price	Change Qty
♣	Epson 252, Black and Color Ink Cartridges, C/M/Y/K 4-Pack	252	\$56.15	- 0 +
	Epson 252 Black Ink Cartridges, 2 Pack	252	\$37.99	- 0 +
•	Epson 252, Black Ink Cartridge	252	\$19.99	- 0 +
0	Epson 252, Cyan Ink Cartridge	252	\$12.99	- 0 +
•	Epson 252, Magenta Ink Cartridge	252	\$12.99	- 0 +
0	Epson 252, Yellow Ink Cartridge	252	\$12.99	- 0 +
3	Epson 252, Color Ink Cartridges, C/M/Y 3- Pack	252	\$36.19	- 0 +
ink (cartridges typically costs appro	oximately \$56.1	5. ³	
	19. Third-party ink cartr	idges for the E	pson WF-3640 c	ost substantially
less.	For instance, on Amazon, it is	s possible to pur	chase a 5-pack of	remanufactured
ink (cartridges for less than \$30.4			
3	Epson, Epson WorkFor	rce WF-3640	All-in-One	Printer Ink

6 CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Case No.





20. In its 2018 Annual Report, Seiko Epson Corporation acknowledges that, "Third parties also supply ink cartridges and other printer consumables that can be used in Epson printers."⁵

21. The Epson 2018 Annual Report further acknowledges that third-party ink cartridges could cut into its bottom line and could result in its losing market share.

22. In that report, however, Epson does not discuss disabling printers to increase market share. Instead, the report suggests more benign methods for achieving that goal such as "emphasiz[ing] the quality of genuine Epson brand" ink cartridges, "enhance[ing] customer experience and develop[ing] new products like printers with "high capacity ink tanks." *Id.* Epson goes far beyond these measures. It actively interferes with the functioning of third-party ink cartridges installed in Epson printers, that it acknowledges "can be used" by installing firmware and software Updates that prevent them from working in order to quash competition.

⁵ Seiko Epson Corporation, 2018 Annual Report ("Epson 2018 Annual Report"), 18, available at <u>https://global.epson.com/IR/library/pdf/ar2018.pdf</u> (last accessed Oct. 14, 2019).

The Firmware/Software Updates

23. A printer owner must agree to Epson's software license when 2 purchasing and using and Epson printer. The second paragraph of that license states 3 that "Epson may, however, from time to time, issue updated versions of the Software 4 and the Software may automatically connect to Epson or third-party servers via the 5 Internet to check for available Updates to the Software, such as bug fixes, patches, 6 upgrades, additional or enhanced functions, plug-ins and new versions (collectively, 7 "Updates") and may either (a) automatically electronically update the version of the 8 Software that you are using on your personal device or (b) give you the option of 9 manually downloading applicable Updates."⁶ 10

11 24. The Software License covers "any related documentation, firmware, or
12 Updates."⁷

13 25. Certain updates require the user to agree to the EPSON EULA EN
14 10/30/2009 Seiko Epson Corporation Software License Agreement. That license
15 does not discuss software Updates or fixes, except to state that any license includes
16 any future Updates.

17 26. Under the terms of Epson's software licenses, Plaintiffs (and any other
18 Epson Pinter user who downloaded Epson software) authorized Epson to access their
19 printers to apply fixes and upgrades. The Software licenses do not alert owners that
20 these software Updates might freeze their machine if they have third-party ink
21 cartridges installed. Instead, they promise fixes and improvements.

22 27. Plaintiffs and other Epson printer owners *did not* authorize Epson to
23 disable their printer to prevent them from using cheaper third-party alternatives to
24 Epson's OEM ink cartridges. Instead, Epson exceeded its authority when it disabled
25 their printers (and the Class and Subclasses' printers, as defined below.)

26

1

 $28 \| \overline{7} Id.$

²⁷ ⁶ Epson, Software License Agreement, available at <u>https://epson.com/SoftwareLicenseAgreement</u> (last accessed Oct. 14, 2019).

Epson's Misrepresentations and Omissions

2 28. Epson made misrepresentations and omissions regarding Epson
3 printers and the use of third-party ink cartridges.

29. Specifically, after Updates are installed to detect and disable third-party
ink cartridges, Epson printers display a message claiming that the printer did not
"recognize" a third-party ink cartridge when installed.

30. The error message that the printers displayed after Updates were
installed, misrepresented the cause of the printer issue, suggesting that the previously
functioning third-party cartridges were broken or not installed properly when,
instead, the updated software simply disables replacement ink cartridges that would
otherwise work.

12 31. These error messages are in direct contradiction to Epson's
13 representations to Plaintiffs and class members that its software and firmware
14 Updates were intended to fix or improve printer functionality.

32. Furthermore, Epson misrepresented to Plaintiffs and class members
that third-party cartridges were incompatible, when those cartridges would have
worked in Epson printers and were compatible until Epson intentionally altered the
software that controlled Epson printers.

19 33. Epson neglected to inform Plaintiffs and others like them that accepting
20 Updates would potentially disable their machine and, at the very least, force them
21 into purchasing Epson ink cartridges.

34. Epson's decision not to inform Plaintiffs and others like them that the
Updates would disable their printers if they attempted to use third-party ink
cartridges was made and implemented from its headquarters in California.

25

1

Epson's Unfair and Oppressive Conduct

2635. Epson's actions were contrary to public policy as set forth in the federal27Computer Fraud and Abuse Act ("CFAA"), 18 U.S. C. § 1030 and the California

Penal Code § 502, which prohibit computer intrusions that damage or disable
 computer equipment including Epson printers.

3 36. Epson used its ability to access and alter their programming to disrupt
4 the functioning of the Epson Printers to suppress competition.

5 37. Epson's conduct caused harm to Plaintiffs and other Epson printer 6 owners by forcing them to buy more expensive OEM cartridges and by rendering 7 their less expensive cartridges useless as means for Epson to maintain its market 8 share and profits.

38. There were reasonable alternatives to Epson's conduct, which are listed
in the Epson 2018 Annual Report. Epson could have created reasons for Epson users
to choose its ink cartridges. It could emphasize that Epson printers are of higher
quality. Epson could have won over customers by providing superior customer
experiences or by providing alternatives to its customers rather than by secretly
causing functioning printers with functional ink cartridges installed to stop working.

15 39. Epson's conduct was intentional and designed to suppress competition,
16 and resulted in forcing Epson customers to pay for Epson's more expensive ink.

40. Epson was able to take unfair advantage of Plaintiffs and others like
them by rendering their printers non-functional and providing misleading error
messages.

41. Epson's conduct was widespread, pervasive, and well-known by 20 owners of Epson printers, as well as technology industry analysts and advocates. 21 For example, on or about October 10, 2018, a letter was sent by the Electronic 22 23 Frontier Foundation, a nonprofit public interest organization that defends the rights of technology users, to the Office of the Attorney General of Texas detailing Epson's 24 conduct, as described herein, and asking the Attorney General to investigate Epson's 25 practice of disabling printers when third-party ink cartridges are installed. A true 26 and correct copy of the October 10, 2018 letter is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. 27

Case 3:19-cv-02009-LAB-BGS Document 1 Filed 10/18/19 PageID.11 Page 11 of 30

42. Additionally, individual accounts of having been victimized by Epson's 1 2 conduct are widely available on consumer and technology websites. Some examples of these complaints are as follows: 3

4	
5	I Installed a firmware update, and now the printer can no longer "recognize" my print cartridges which had been
6	working fine until the update. Word on the Internet is that
7	Epson deliberately tries to punish people who buy
8	replacement cartridges from other vendors, so they can sell their overpriced ones, and they do that by updating
9	the firmware so that other vendor cartridges are "not
10	recognized". This is despicable. I will never buy another Epson
	product. They have even spawned a cottage industry that
11	for \$5 sells a firmware downgrade.
12	It is cheaper to buy a new printer than to buy Epson
13	replacement cartridges. Their business practices are
14	predatory and should be illegal.
	<i>By:</i> PissedConsumer1167767 <i>Source:</i> <u>https://epson.pissedconsumer.com/after-</u>
15	firmware-update-cartridges-not-recognized-
16	201801121167767.html
17	
	I am so disgusted with Epson right now. I purchased my
18	Epson 446 printer. I purchased my ink. In no way should
19	Epson be able to lock up my printer because I choose to use re-purposed ink cartridges. I bought this printer
20	because I am a Girl Scout Leader/Volunteer who wears
21	many hats. I need a printer that will hold up. I also need a
	printer for some small home jobs too. I was in the middle
22	of a print job and locked up because I decided to run the
23	firmware update and now it will not recognize my ink. I
24	wasted money buying this printer because now I cannot do anything with it. I just purchased \$50+ in ink. I will
25	not be forced to use Epson ink. I will go buy a new
	printer, and I will never recommend or buy another
26	Epson product.
27	By: ColdBlackbird305
28	Source: https://epson.pissedconsumer.com/review.html
	11
	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
	Case No.

I do bookkeeping at home. I was working this weekend 1 and noticed I had a download. I have always used off 2 brand ink and have an entire box of it. As soon as I did the download my printer locked and said to replace all 3 my inks. I feel I should be able to use any ink I choose. I 4 feel like my printer is being held hostage. I feel like this is communism - you buy a product but it is really not 5 yours. Needless to say I could continue to work or do 6 payroll. I'm throwing it out the window. I will never buy another Epson product. 7 By: Peggy of Spartanburg, SC 8 Source: https://www.consumeraffairs.com/computers/epson.html 9 10 I recently purchased a new Lenovo computer and installed my Epson Stylus SX 115 software onto it. All 11 was fine until the black ink ran out. To make sure that the printer was entirely compatible with the new computer I 12 decided to upgrade the driver before I replaced the black 13 ink. I always use compatible inks, because Epson inks are 14 so extortionately expensive, and have never had any problems with them. Accordingly, after I had installed 15 the new driver, I replaced the black with a compatible in. 16 When I next went to print I received a message telling me 17 that the black I had installed was not a genuine Epson ink and, after various other caveats, it asked me if I wished to 18 continue anyway. I clicked the continue button and was 19 then taken to a screen that said that the ink cartridge 'cannot be recognised', and it showed a big cross over 20 the black cartridge symbol. Since when I have been 21 unable to print anything. There has recently been a considerable number of 22 complaints in the press about the practice of printer 23 manufacturers refusing to recognize third-party inks when the firmware is updated over the internet. Only this 24 month Which magazine has an article about it which tells 25 me that such practices are against my consumer rights because I am entitled to use whichever inks I choose with 26 my printer. 27 28 12

	Case 3:19-cv-02009-LAB-BGS Document 1 Filed 10/18/19 PageID.13 Page 13 of 30
1	I therefore request that Epson immediately tell me how to resolve this problem so that I can get my printer working
2	again with third-party inks. I am copying this to Which magazine, as they are asking to hear from people like me
4	who have had such problems.
5	<i>By:</i> Cherry Lewis from Birmingham, ENG <i>Source:</i> <u>https://www.hissingkitty.com/complaints-</u>
6	department/epson
7	Plaintiff Famiglietti's Experience
8	43. Plaintiff Famiglietti purchased an Epson XP-830 in the beginning of
9	2018 from OfficeMax.
10	44. Plaintiff Famiglietti considered several different printers but chose the
11	Epson XP-830 because it had the features he was looking for.
12	45. At the time of the purchase, Plaintiff Famiglietti understood and
13	believed that he would be able to use less expensive third-party ink cartridges. The
14	Epson material he reviewed did not cause him to believe otherwise.
15	46. Plaintiff Famiglietti's Epson XP-830 uses 410 & 410XL cartridges. A
16	couple of months after he purchased his Epson printer, Plaintiff Famiglietti
17	purchased EZink remanufactured replacement cartridges from Ebay. They cost less
18	than \$20.00 for a pack of four. Plaintiff Famiglietti purchased the non-Epson
19	cartridges because they were less expensive than the Epson OEM ink cartridges.
20	Epson cartridges would have cost significantly more.
21	47. When his printer ran out of ink, Plaintiff Famiglietti replaced the Epson
22	OEM cartridges with the EZink ink cartridges. The EZink cartridges worked for
23	several months. He was able to print using his Epson XP-830 without interruption.
24	48. In March or April, Plaintiff Famiglietti received a message from Epson
25	when he booted up his printer alerting him that there were available Updates for his
26	printer. Plaintiff Famiglietti understood that the Updates would improve his
27	printer's functionality. Plaintiffs proceeded to install the Updates.
28	

49. After he installed the Updates, Plaintiff Famiglietti's Epson printer
 stopped printing.

50. The Updates included instructions that detected that Plaintiff
Famiglietti had installed non-Epson ink cartridges in his XP-830 printer and disabled
his printer.

51. After the firmware update, Plaintiff's XP-830 printer displayed an error message:



52. Plaintiff Famiglietti was unable to print using his Epson printer after the Updates were installed. He did not know that Epson would or that it, in fact did, use the Updates to access his printer and disable the ink cartridges.

53. Based on the error message his printer displayed, Plaintiff Famiglietti replaced all four ink cartridges with new EZink replacement cartridges. The printer still did not work and continued to display the same error message: "Ink Cartridges not recognized, replace the cartridges."

54. Plaintiff Famiglietti attempted to resolve the error message by unplugging the printer for five (5) minutes and plugging it back in. When prompted to install cartridges he reinstalled them. His printer still did not work and the same message appeared on the printer display.

55. Plaintiff Famiglietti later learned that Updates caused the problem and attempted to uninstall the Updates that Epson had remotely installed in his printer.

The new software prevented him from reverting to the previous version that did not
 disable the EZink ink cartridges.

56. Epson prevents Epson printer owners to roll back the firmware once it is installed. Plaintiff Famiglietti attempted to uninstall the software. When his printer powered up again, it contacted an Epson site and re-installed the Updates and, once again, disabled his printer.

7 57. Plaintiff Famiglietti learned that Epson ink cartridges include one or
8 more sensor chips that track ink usage, report low-ink conditions, and balk at
9 wrongly installed or otherwise unacceptable cartridges. By Epson's standards,
10 "unacceptable" includes any consumables Epson itself did not manufacture.

11 58. Plaintiff Famiglietti had no reason to believe that Epson would exceed
12 his permission to access his printer to cause him harm.

13 59. Plaintiff Famiglietti reasonably relied on Epson's promise to improve
14 his printer's functioning by installing Updates.

60. Epson engaged in anti-competitive behavior, by limiting Plaintiff
Famiglietti and other Epson Printer owners' choice by forcing them to purchase
Epson OEM ink cartridges and to replace less expensive third-party ink cartridges.

61. Epson abused Plaintiff Famiglietti's permission to remotely install
Updates or upgrades. Rather than fixing bugs, providing enhanced features or
otherwise improving his printer's performance, Epson damaged his printer.

62. As a result of Epson's conduct, Plaintiff Famiglietti suffered harm.
Epson's software update rendered his EZink ink cartridges useless and required him
to replace them with more expensive ink cartridges. He has had to continue
purchasing more expensive ink cartridges.

25

28

Plaintiff Mondigo's Experience

26 63. Plaintiff Mondigo purchased an Epson WorkForce WF-3640 All-in27 One Printer in 2016 from Costco.

64. Plaintiff Mondigo considered several different printers but chose the
 Epson WorkForce WF-3640 All-in-One Printer because it had the features he was
 looking for.

65. At the time of the purchase, Plaintiff Mondigo believed that he would
be able to use less expensive third-party ink cartridges in the future. The Epson
material he reviewed did not cause him to believe otherwise.

66. Plaintiff Mondigo's Epson WorkForce WF-3640 All-in-One Printer
uses 252XL cartridges. After his purchase, Plaintiff Mondigo replaced the printer's
empty ink cartridges with new Epson cartridges and also with refilled Epson
cartridges. Plaintiff Mondigo switched from these Epson products in 2018 when he
purchased FreeSub replacement cartridges. Plaintiff Mondigo purchased the nonEpson cartridges because they were less expensive than the Epson ink cartridges.
Epson cartridges would have cost significantly more.

67. To this end, when his printer ran out of ink in 2018, Plaintiff Mondigo
replaced the Epson cartridges with the FreeSub ink cartridges. The FreeSub
cartridges worked for multiple months. He was able to print using his Epson
WorkForce WF-3640 All-in-One Printer without interruption.

18 68. At some point, Updates were installed on Plaintiff Mondigo's printer19 without his knowledge or consent.

20 69. The Updates included instructions that detected that Plaintiff Mondingo
21 had installed non-Epson ink cartridges in his printer and disabled his printer.

70. After the Updates were installed, Plaintiff Mondigo received a message
from Epson after turning on his Epson WorkForce WF-3640 All-in-One Printer. The
error message instructed Plaintiff Mondigo to restart his printer. After he did so, the
printer printed a test page but would not print any other job Plaintiff Mondigo sent
it.

27 71. Plaintiff Mondigo attempted to fix his Epson WorkForce WF-3640 All28 in-One Printer by restarting it, reinstalling the ink cartridges, and replacing the ink

cartridges. When these efforts failed, Plaintiff Mondigo purchased a replacement
 printer.

3

V.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

4 72. Plaintiffs bring this action, on behalf of themselves and all others
5 similarly situated, as a class action under Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules
6 of Civil Procedure.

7 73. Plaintiffs bring this action and seek to certify and maintain it as a class
8 action on behalf of themselves and a Nationwide Class, as defined below, or in the
9 alternative, on behalf of State Subclasses, as defined below.

10

11

A. <u>The Nationwide Class</u>

74. The Nationwide Class (the "Class") is initially defined as follows:

All United States residents who, within the applicable limitations period,
owned or purchased an Epson Printer.

Excluded from the Nationwide Class are Defendants, their employees, coconspirators, officers, directors, legal representatives, heirs, successors and wholly or partly owned subsidiaries or affiliated companies; class counsel and their employees; and the judicial officers or their immediate family members and associated court staff assigned to this case.

19

20

21

22

B. <u>The State Subclasses</u>

75. In the alternative to the Nationwide Class, Plaintiffs alleges claims on behalf of a state-wide class for certain states (the "Subclasses"). The Subclasses are defined as follows:

23

The Connecticut Subclass

All Connecticut residents who, within the applicable limitations period,
owned or purchased an Epson Printer.

Excluded from the Connecticut Subclass are Defendants, their employees, coconspirators, officers, directors, legal representatives, heirs, successors and wholly or partly owned subsidiaries or affiliated companies; class counsel and their

¹⁷

employees; and the judicial officers or their immediate family members and
 associated court staff assigned to this case.

The California Subclass

All California residents who, within the applicable limitations period, owned or purchased an Epson Printer.

Excluded from the California Subclass are Defendants, their employees, coconspirators, officers, directors, legal representatives, heirs, successors and wholly
or partly owned subsidiaries or affiliated companies; class counsel and their
employees; and the judicial officers or their immediate family members and
associated court staff assigned to this case.

76. Plaintiffs reserve the right to re-define the Class and Subclasses prior
to class certification, and thereafter, as necessary.

77. The members of the Class and Subclasses are so numerous that
individual joinder is impracticable. Upon information and belief the Class and
Subclasses include thousands of owners of Epson printers. Plaintiffs do not know
the precise number of Class and Subclasses members, but they may be ascertained
from Defendant's books and records.

78. There are numerous questions of law and fact common to Plaintiffs and
the Class and Subclasses. Questions common to the Class and Subclasses
predominate over any questions that may affect individual Class or Subclass
members, including, but not limited to:

22 23

24

25

26

27

- a. Whether Epson violated the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act 18
 U.S.C.§ 1030;
- b. Whether Epson violated the California Computer Data Access
 And Fraud Act, Cal. Penal Code § 502;

1	c. Whether Epson violated the California Unfair Competition Law,
2	Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq., and the California False
3	Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq.;
4	
5	d. Whether Epson violated the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices
6	Act, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42-110a et seq.;
7	e. Whether Epson made material misrepresentations and omissions
8	
9	regarding Plaintiff's and the Class and Subclasses' Epson
10	printers;
11	
12	f. Whether Epson's disablement of consumers Epson printers
13	constituted unfair or fraudulent practices under California law;
14	g. Whether Epson's practices harmed Plaintiffs and Class and
15	
16	Subclass members;
17	h. Whether Plaintiffs' and the Class and Subclass members' Epson
18	printers are electronic or high speed data processing devices as
19	defined in the Commeter Frend and Alares Acts
20	defined in the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act;
21	i. Whether Epson knowingly accessed Plaintiffs' and Class and
22	Subclass members' Epson's printers;
23	
24	j. Whether Plaintiffs' and Class and Subclass members authorized
25	Epson to access their Epson printers;
26	k. Whether Epson exceeded its authority when it accessed
27	
28	Plaintiffs' and Class and Subclass members' Epson printers;
	19
	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Case No.

1	1. Whether Epson knowingly transmitted a program information,
2	code, or command that damaged Plaintiffs' and Class and
3	Subclass members' Epson printers;
4	m. Whether Epson knowingly added, altered, deleted, or destroyed
5	in: Whether Epson knowingly added, altered, deleted, of destroyed
6	any data, computer software or program related to Plaintiffs' and
7 8	Class and Subclass members' printers;
9	n. Whether Epson knowingly disrupted the Plaintiffs' and Class
10	and Subclass members' printers;
11	o. Whether Plaintiffs' and Class and Subclass members are entitled
12	0. Whether Flammins and class and Subclass members are entitled
13	to equitable relief;
14	p. The proper measure of damages; and
15	q. Whether Plaintiffs' and Class and Subclass are entitled to
16	
17	restitution, and if so, in what amount.
18	79. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class and Subclasses
19	he seeks to represent under FED. R. CIV. P. 23(a)(3) because Plaintiffs and members
20	of the Class and Subclasses purchased and/or owned an Epson printer and have been
21	subject to the same wrongful practices and have been harmed thereby in the same
22	
23	manner.
24	80. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests
25	of the Class and Subclasses as required by FED. R. CIV. P. 23(a)(4). Plaintiffs are
26	adequate representatives of the Class and Subclasses because they have no interests
	that are adverse to the interests of the Class and/or Subclasses. Plaintiffs and their
27	counsel are committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action and have the
28	

financial resources to do so. Plaintiffs have retained counsel who are competent and
 experienced in handling class action litigation on behalf of consumers and who do
 not have any interest adverse or antagonistic to those of the Class and Subclasses.

81. A class action is superior to any other available means for the fair and 4 efficient adjudication of this controversy, and no unusual difficulties are likely to be 5 encountered in the management of this class action. The damages or other financial 6 detriment suffered by Plaintiffs and each Class and Subclass member are relatively 7 8 small compared to the burden and expense that would be required to individually litigate their claims against Defendant, so it would be impracticable for each Class 9 and/or Subclass member to individually seek redress for Defendant's wrongful 10 conduct. Even if Class and Subclass members could afford individual litigation, 11 individualized litigation creates a potential for inconsistent or contradictory 12 13 judgments, and increases the delay and expense to all parties and the court system. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties, and 14 provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive 15 supervision by a single court. 16

17

18 19

20

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF THE COMPUTER FRAUD AND ABUSE ACT

18 U.S.C. § 1030

(ON BEHALF OF THE CLASS)

21 82. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege the allegations contained in the foregoing
22 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

83. The CFAA is a federal criminal statute that prohibits computer crimes,
including unauthorized access to a computer, or access that exceeds any
authorization and allows persons who have been damaged thereby to bring claims
under the CFAA.

84. The CFAA permits "any person who suffers damages or loss by reason
of a violation of this section and may maintain a civil action against the violator to

obtain compensatory damages and injunctive relief or other equitable relief." 18
 U.S.C. § 1030 (g).

85. Plaintiffs and Class and Subclass members are "persons" under the
4 CFAA, 18 U.S.C. § 1030(e)(12).

5 86. Plaintiffs' and Class and Subclass members' Epson printers are 6 "computers" under the CFAA. Under the CFAA "the term 'computer' means an 7 electronic, magnetic, optical, electrochemical, or other high speed data processing 8 device performing logical, arithmetic, or storage functions, and includes any data 9 storage facility or communications facility directly related to or operating in 10 conjunction with such device." 18 U.S.C. § 1030(e)(1). Epson printers are data 11 processing devices and perform storage functions.

12 87. Plaintiffs' and Class and Subclass members' Epson printers are
13 "protected computers" under the CFAA. They are "used in or affecting interstate or
14 foreign commerce or communication." 18 U.S.C. § 1030(e)(2)(B).

15 88. Under the CFAA, "the term 'damage' means any impairment to the
16 integrity or availability of data, a program, a system, or information."

89. The CFAA establishes liability against anyone who "knowingly causes the transmission of a program, information, code, or command, and as a result of such conduct, intentionally causes damage without authorization, to a protected computer." 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(5)(A).

90. "[T]he term "exceeds authorized access" means to access a computer
with authorization and to use such access to obtain or alter information in the
computer that the accesser is not entitled so to obtain or alter."

24 91. Epson knowingly and with authorization exceeded its authorized access
25 to Plaintiffs and Class and Subclass members' printers and caused damage.

92. Epson took advantage of its ability to access Epson printers and caused
the Epson printers to stop working. Epson used its software and/or firmware
Updates to "knowingly" transmit "a program, information, code, or command, and

as a result of such conduct" intentionally damaged Plaintiffs' Epson printers as well
 as the Class and Subclasses' Epson printers. 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(5)(A).

93. Epson's knowing intrusions into the Plaintiffs' and the Class and
Subclasses' Epson printers resulted in damage to Plaintiffs and Class members, by
using its Updates to disable Plaintiffs' and Class member's printers and by forcing
them to purchase more expensive third-party ink cartridges and preventing Plaintiffs
and Class members from using cheaper third-party ink cartridges.

8 94. Plaintiffs and Class members seek recovery of damages and all other
9 relief allowed under 18 U.S.C. § 1030(g).

10

11

12

13

14

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF THE CONNECTICUT UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES ACT

CONN. GEN. STAT. § 42-110A ET SEQ.

(ON BEHALF OF THE CONNECTICUT SUBCLASS)

15 95. Plaintiff Famiglietti repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in
16 paragraphs 1-113 above, as if fully set forth herein.

17 96. CUPTA prohibits "unfair methods of competition and unfair or
18 deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any trade or commerce." Conn. Gen
19 Stat. § 42-110b.

97. Plaintiff Famiglietti has suffered an ascertainable loss of money or
property as a result of Epson's unfair methods of competition and unfair and
deceptive acts.

98. Epson's acts offends public policy that prohibits knowing and or
unauthorized access to computers and printers, or access that exceeds any
authorization given to disable those devices in order to retain market share and
profits.

27 99. Epson's practice of accessing Plaintiff's and other Connecticut
28 Subclass' to knowingly disable functioning third-party ink cartridges to force the

23

Plaintiff Famiglietti and the Connecticut Subclass to purchase Epson's more
 expensive OEM ink cartridges and to eliminate competition from third-party ink
 cartridge vendors is immoral, unethical, oppressive and unscrupulous.

4 100. Epson had reasonable alternatives to ensure its market share and
5 maintain or increase profits.

6 101. Epson engaged in deceptive business practices by misrepresenting the
7 functionality of third-party ink cartridges and the purpose of its Updates.

8 102. Epson mislead Plaintiff Famiglietti and the Connecticut Subclass by
9 leading its members to believe that third-party ink cartridges would damage their
10 printers and could not function when, in truth, those ink cartridges would not harm
11 their printers and did function until Epson disabled them. Epson intentionally caused
12 the third-party ink cartridges to malfunction.

13 103. Plaintiff Famiglietti and the Connecticut Subclass relied on Epson's
14 false and misleading statements and were harmed thereby.

15 104. The Connecticut Subclass is entitled to relief under CUPTA, including
16 damages, punitive damages, equitable and injunctive relief and attorneys' fees and
17 costs to the extent allowed.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW ("UCL")

(CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17200, *ET SEQ*.) (ON BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA CLASS)

105. Plaintiffs repeat and re-alleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-123 above, as if fully set forth herein.

25 106. Epson's headquarters are located in California and Epson regularly
26 conducts business throughout the State of California.

27 107. The conduct described herein emanated from Epson's California28 headquarters

108. Epson must adhere to the requirements of the UCL.

2 109. The UCL prohibits acts of unfair competition, including unlawful,
3 unfair or fraudulent business acts or practices.

110. Epson has engaged in unfair, unlawful or fraudulent business acts and
practices in violation of the UCL, in that: (a) Epson's practices and conduct are
immoral, unethical, oppressive and substantially harmful to Plaintiffs and the
members of the California Subclass; (b) the justification for Epson's practices and
conduct is outweighed by the gravity of the injury to Plaintiffs and the California
Subclass; and (c) Epson's practices constitute unfair, fraudulent, untrue or
misleading actions that exploit and mislead members of the public.

111. Epson's practices were unfair because it is unethical, immoral, 11 oppressive, and substantially injurious to consumers for Epson to knowingly and 12 intentionally disable functioning third-party ink cartridges to force Plaintiffs and the 13 California Subclass members to purchase Epson's more expensive OEM ink 14 cartridges and to eliminate competition from third-party ink cartridge vendors and 15 to use Updates that were characterized as providing improvements and fixes to 16 damage and disable Plaintiffs' and the California Subclass's Epson printers to force 17 them to use Epson OEM ink cartridges. 18

19 112. The gravity of the harm resulting from Epson's conduct outweighs any
20 possible utility of the conduct. Epson had reasonable alternatives to ensure its
21 market share and maintain or increase profits.

113. Epson's practices were fraudulent because Plaintiffs and the California
Subclass were deceived and likely to be deceived by Epson's misrepresentation
regarding its Updates and the functionality of third-party ink cartridges.

114. The harm caused by these practices outweighs any possible utility such
business practices could have.

28

27

1 115. Epson engaged in fraudulent business practices by misrepresenting the
 2 functionality of third-party ink cartridges and the purpose of its software and
 3 firmware Updates.

116. Epson's statements and representations would mislead a reasonable 4 consumer into believing that it is not possible to use third-party ink in an Epson 5 Epson further mislead consumers by leading them to believe that its printer. 6 software and/or firmware Updates would improve their Epson printers' 7 Instead they disabled the printers. Plaintiffs and the California 8 functionality. Subclass reasonably relied on Epson's statements and purchased ink cartridges that 9 Epson disabled or purchased more expensive Epson brand cartridges believing that 10 the third-party ink cartridges were defective. 11

12 117. Epson's practices were unlawful because they violated the CFAA and
13 the California Penal Code § 502.

14 118. Epson's conduct caused the California Subclass to suffer an injury in15 fact.

16 119. The California Subclass is entitled to relief under the UCL, including
17 restitution, declaratory relief as well as attorneys' fees and costs to the extent
18 allowed.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION 19 VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FALSE ADVERTISING LAW 20 ("FAL") 21 (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17500, ET SEQ.) 22 (ON BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA CLASS) 23 120. Plaintiffs repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 24 1-138 above, as if fully set forth herein. 25 121. Epson violated the FAL by using false and misleading advertising and 26 statements and omitting material information. 27 28 26

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1 122. Epson misled Plaintiffs and the California Subclass by leading its
 2 members to believe that third-party ink cartridges would damage their printers and
 3 could not function when, in truth, those ink cartridges would not harm their printers.
 4 Epson intentionally caused the third-party ink cartridges to malfunction.

123. As a direct and proximate result of Epson's false and misleading
statements and advertising, the California Subclass suffered an injury in fact and lost
money and property.

8 124. The California Subclass relied on Epson's false and misleading
9 statements and were harmed thereby.

10 125. The California Subclass brings this action seeking to enjoin Epson from
11 continuing to engage in its false and misleading statements and to require Epson to
12 provide truthful and non-misleading information to consumers. The California
13 Subclass seeks restitution of the monies Epson obtained as a result of its false and
14 misleading advertising, with interest and an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and
15 costs, under the applicable law.

16

17

18

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF CAL. PENAL CODE § 502 (ON BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA CLASS)

19 126. Plaintiffs repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in paragraphs
20 1-144 above, as if fully set forth herein.

21 127. Cal. Penal Code § 502 prohibits knowing access to computers,
22 computer systems and networks.

128. The California Penal Code authorizes Epson printer owners to bring a
civil action "against the violator for compensatory damages and injunctive relief or
other equitable relief. Compensatory damages shall include any expenditure
reasonably and necessarily incurred by the owner or lessee to verify that a computer
system, computer network, computer program, or data was or was not altered,
damaged, or deleted by the access." Cal. Penal Code § 502(d)(1).

1 129. Cal. Penal Code § 502(c)(1) makes it an offense to "[k]nowingly
2 access[] and without permission alter[], damage[], delete[], destroy[], or otherwise
3 uses any data, computer, computer system, or computer network in order to either
4 (A) devise or execute any scheme or artifice to defraud, deceive, or extort, or (B)
5 wrongfully control or obtain money, property, or data."

130. Cal. Penal Code § 502(c)(4) makes it an offense to, "[k]nowingly
access[] and without permission add[], alter[], damage[], delete[], or destroy[] any
data, computer software, or computer programs which reside or exist internal or
external to a computer, computer system, or computer network."

10 131. Epson accessed the California Subclass's printers, in that Epson was
able "to gain entry to, instruct, cause input to, cause output from, cause data
processing with, or communicate with, the logical, arithmetical, or memory function
resources of a computer, computer system, or computer network." Cal. Penal Code
§ 502(b)(1).

15 132. Epson violated the Cal. Penal Code when it executed a scheme or
artifice and knowingly accessed the California Subclass's printers and damaged and
interfered with them to "wrongfully control or obtain money, property or data" from
members of the California Subclass.

19 133. As a proximate result of Epson's violation of Cal. Penal Code § 502,
20 the California Subclass were damaged and are entitled to compensatory damages,
21 equitable relief and reasonable attorneys' fees.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated, respectfully request this Court enter a judgment against Defendant
in favor of Plaintiffs and grant the following relief:

A. Enter an Order certifying the proposed Class and Subclasses and
appointing Plaintiffs as Class Representatives;

28

22

B. Enter an Order issuing appropriate notice to the Class and Subclasses

²⁸

1 at Defendant's expense;

2

C. Declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated the CFAA;

3 D. Declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated Cal. Penal Code §
4 502.

E. Declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant's conduct as alleged herein
is unlawful, unfair and/or deceptive;

F. Declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant engaged in unfair methods
of competition and unfair and deceptive acts;

9 G. Declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant's advertising and 10 statements were false and misleading;

H. Award Plaintiffs and the members of the Class and Subclasses
compensatory and statutorily enhanced damages or compensation as provided for
under law for each of the causes of action set forth above;

I. Award restitution and disgorgement of Defendant's revenues or profits
from its illegal behavior described herein to Plaintiffs and members of the Class and
Subclasses;

J. Award declaratory and injunctive relief as permitted by law or equity,
including: enjoining Defendants from continuing the unlawful practices as set forth
herein, and directing Defendants to identify, with Court supervision, victims of its
conduct and to disgorge to them all monies acquired by Defendants by means of any
act or practice declared by this Court to be wrongful or pay them restitution and
change their business practices.

K. Award Plaintiffs and the Class and Subclasses reasonable attorneys'
fees, costs and pre-and post-judgment interest; and

25

26

27

28

L. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

29

1	Date: October 18, 2019	Respectfully submitted,
2		CARLSON LYNCH LLP
3		By: <u>/s/ Eric D. Zard</u>
4 5		(Eddie) Jae K. Kim Eric D. Zard
6		1350 Columbia Street, Suite 603 San Diego, CA 92101
7		Telephone: (619) 762-1903 Facsimile: (619) 756-6991
8		Email: ekim@carlsonlynch.com
9 10		Edwin J. Kilpela (pro hac vice) 1133 Penn Ave, 5th Floor
11		Pittsburgh, PA 15222
12		Telephone: 412-322-9243 Facsimile: 412-231-0246
12		Email: ekilpela@carlsonlynch.com
14		James P. McGraw, III 1133 Penn Ave, 5th Floor
15		Pittsburgh, PA 15222
16 17		Telephone: 412-322-9243 Facsimile: 412-231-0246
		Email: jmcgraw@carlsonlynch.com
18		KEHOE I AW FIDM DC
19		KEHOE LAW FIRM, P.C.
20		Michael K. Yarnoff
21		Two Penn Center Plaza 1500 JFK Blvd. Ste. 1020
22		Philadelphia, PA 19102
23		Telephone: 215-792-6676
24		Email: myarnoff@kehoelawfirm.com
25		
26		
27		
28		
20		30
		ON COMPLAINT Case No.

JS 44 (Rev. 06/1) Case 3:19-cv-02009-LAB-BGS Decument 1 Filed 10/18/19 PageID.31 Page 1 of 2

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS WILLIAM MONDIGO and RICHARD				DEFENDANTS EPSON AMERICA, INC.					
FAMIGLIETTI, individual	ly and on behalf of all	others similarly situ	iated,		21 00117				
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff			County of Residence	e of First List	ed Defendant			
(E.	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ISES)				LAINTIFF CASES	· ·		
				NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATI I OF LAND IN	ON CASES, USE T WOLVED.	HE LOCATION	OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Carlson Lynch, LLP, 135 92101 (619) 762-1900	Address, and Telephone Numbe 0 Columbia Street, Su	^{r)} ite 603, San Diego	, CA	Attorneys (If Known)		'19CV2009	BEN BG	iS	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)		I TIZENSHIP OF P	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES			
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)			TF DEF K 1 □ 1	Incorporated or Pr of Business In 7		for Defende PTF □ 4	ant) DEF X 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 2	Incorporated and I of Business In .		□ 5	□ 5
				en or Subject of a	3 3	Foreign Nation		G 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						here for: Nature			
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreelosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee -	Y 0 62 0 69 1 XTY 0 71 0 72 0 72 75 0 75 0 75 0 46	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 20 Other 20 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 20 Railway Labor Act 21 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act 22 Naturalization Application 25 Other Immigration Actions	 422 Appe 423 With 28 U PROPEI 820 Copy 830 Pater 835 Pater New 840 Trad 861 HIA 862 Blaci 863 DIW 864 SSIE 865 RSI 867 Taxe or D 871 IRS-26 U 	ISC 157 RTY RIGHTS rrights at t - Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	 375 False Cl 376 Qui Tar 3729(a) 400 State Re 410 Antitrus 430 Banks a 450 Comme 460 Deporta 470 Rackete Corrupt 480 Consum 490 Cable/S 850 Securiti Exchan 890 Other S 891 Agricult 895 Freedom Act 899 Adminini S99 Adminini 	n (31 USC)) capportion st ind Bankin rce tition ter Influen Organizat ter Credit at TV es/Commo ge tatutory At tural Acts mental Ma n of Inform tion strative Prr view or Ap Decision attonality of	ment ng ced and ions odities/ ctions tters nation ocedure ipeal of
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i		Conditions of Confinement							
X 1 Original □ 2 Re	moved from 3 3 the Court	Appellate Court		pened Anoth (specify	er District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	1 -	Multidis Litigatic Direct Fi	on -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	DN 18 U.S.C. § 1030 Brief description of ca	use:		Do not cite jurisdictional sta a Unfair Competition					502
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	_	IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND \$	C	THECK YES only URY DEMAND	if demanded in		int:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER			
DATE 10/17/2019		signature of at /s/ Eric D. Za		OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	MOUNT	A DDI VINICI IPP		IUDOF		MAC HT	NCE.		
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI	JGE		

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u>.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.