1	KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC	BLC LAW CENTER, APC							
2	Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. [SBN: 249203] ak@kazlg.com	ahren.tiller@blc-sd.com							
3	245 Fischer Avenue, Unit D1 Costa Mesa, CA 92626	1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101							
5	Telephone: (800) 400-6808 Facsimile: (800) 520-5523	Telephone: (800) 492-4033 Facsimile: (866) 444-7026							
6		1 acsimic. (000) 444-7020							
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff and all those similarly situated								
8									
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
10	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
11		Case No.: '22CV0050 BAS JLB							
12	JESUS ALVARADO, on behalf of himself and all those similarly	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR:							
13	situated,	1. WILLFUL FAILURE TO							
14	Plaintiff,	EMPLOY REASONABLE PROCEDURES TO ENSURE							
15	V.	MAXIMUM ACCURACY OF CREDIT REPORT							
16	LEVICNEVIC DICK DATA	2. NEGLIGENT FAILURE TO							
17	LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA MANAGEMENT, INC.; and EXPERIAN INFORMATION	EMPLOY REASONABLE PROCEDURES TO ENSURE							
18	SOLUTIONS, INC.;	MAXIMUM ACCURACY OF CREDIT REPORT							
19	Defendants.	3. WILLFUL FAILURE TO							
20		REASONABLY REINVESTIGATE							
21		4. NEGLIGENT FAILURE TO							
22		REASONABLY REINVESTIGATE							
23		5. FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE							
24									
25		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED							
26									
27									
28									

**INTRODUCTION** 

- 1. The United States Congress has found the banking system is dependent upon fair and accurate credit reporting. Inaccurate credit reports directly impair the efficiency of the banking system, and unfair credit reporting methods undermine the public confidence, which is essential to the continued functioning of the banking system. Congress enacted the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq. ("FCRA"), to insure fair and accurate reporting, promote efficiency in the banking system, and protect consumer privacy. The FCRA seeks to ensure consumer reporting agencies exercise their grave responsibilities with fairness, impartiality, and a respect for the consumer's right to privacy because consumer reporting agencies have assumed such a vital role in assembling and evaluating consumer credit and other information on consumers. The FCRA also imposes duties on the sources that provide credit information to credit reporting agencies, called "furnishers."
- 2. Plaintiff brings this action against defendants LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA MANAGEMENT, INC. ("LexisNexis"), and EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC. ("Experian") (collectively the "Defendants"), as to erroneous furnishing and reporting of inaccurate and derogatory credit information made by Defendants; failure of Defendants to maintain reasonable procedures in accurately reporting credit information; and failure of Defendants to properly investigate credit information. This conduct or omissions by Defendants caused Plaintiff and the proposed Class members damages.
- 3. Plaintiff makes these allegations on information and belief, with the exception of those allegations that pertain to the named Plaintiff, or to Plaintiff's counsel, which the named Plaintiff alleges on personal knowledge.
- 4. While many violations are described below with specificity, this Complaint alleges violations of the statute cited in its entirety.

- 5. Unless otherwise stated, the conduct engaged in by Defendants took place in the County of San Diego, State of California.
- 6. Any violations by Defendants were knowing, willful, and intentional, and Defendants did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such violation.
- 7. Unless otherwise indicated, the use of Defendants' name in this Complaint includes all agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers of Defendants' named.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 8. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 9. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as Plaintiff brings claims for violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681 et. seq.
- 10. This Court further has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's California causes of action, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), as Plaintiff's California state law claims are so related to Plaintiff's federal FCRA claims in this action, that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.
- 11. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2) and (3) because: (i) a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in this District; (ii) Defendants are all subject to the Court's personal jurisdiction with respect to this action because Defendants all conduct business in this judicial district; and (iii) Mr. Alvarado resides in this judicial district.

#### **PARTIES**

12.Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

- 13.Plaintiff, JESUS ALVARADO is, and all times mentioned herein was, an individual citizen and resident of the County of San Diego, State of California.
- 14.Plaintiff is a natural person residing in the County of San Diego, State of California. In addition, Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(c).
- 15.Defendant LexisNexis is a Florida Corporation headquartered in Alpharetta, Georgia.
- 16.Defendant LexisNexis regularly and in the ordinary course of business furnishes information to consumer credit reporting agencies. Defendant LexisNexis is therefore a furnisher of information to major Credit Reporting Agencies, as contemplated by 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-2(b),
- 17. Defendant Experian is a national Credit Reporting Agency.
- 18. Defendant Experian is a Delaware Corporation headquartered in Costa Mesa, California.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 19. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 20. On or about April 30, 2015, Plaintiff filed for a Chapter 13 Bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of California, to obtain a fresh start and rebuild his credit. Plaintiff's case was assigned Case Number 15-02922-MM13 ("Bankruptcy Case").
- 21. The initial filing in the Bankruptcy Case was filed on the docket and publicly available via the Public Access to Court Electronic Records ("PACER") system.
- 22. On information and belief, as part of its routine business operations, Defendant LexisNexis continuously searches PACER and other publicly available court records to track when individuals file for bankruptcy and when they receive a discharge.
- 23. On information and belief, as part of its routine business operations, Defendant

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

- 27. On information and belief, Defendants have failed to use available services within PACER to determine the accuracy of the reporting of the status of bankruptcy cases.
- 28. At a specific time, unknown to Plaintiff, but after the entry of the Order for Discharge, LexisNexis furnished to Defendant Experian information that Plaintiff had filed a bankruptcy that never received a Discharge.
- 29. Defendant Experian subsequently reported that Plaintiff had filed a bankruptcy, 22 yet never received a discharge.
  - 30. On Defendant LexisNexis's website, they state that they are the provider of bankruptcy information to Defendant Experian.
  - 31. Defendant LexisNexis should not have furnished that Plaintiff had filed a bankruptcy but had not received an order for Discharge, as Plaintiff had in fact received a discharge.
  - 32. On or about mid-August 2021, Plaintiff applied for an auto loan through San

Diego County Credit Union and was denied credit.

- 33. In response and denying the extension of credit, an e-mail provided by San Diego County Credit Union specifically cited the Plaintiff's bankruptcy as a reason for the credit denial.
- 34. On or about mid-November 2021, Plaintiff applied for a credit card through Capital One Bank (USA), N.A. and was denied credit. The denial letter provided by Capital One Bank (USA), N.A. specifically stated:

Based on your credit report from one or more of the agencies on the back of this letter, the presence of a non-discharged bankruptcy.

- 35. At a specific time, unknown to Plaintiff, but after the entry of the Order for Discharge, Defendant Experian, as well as the credit agencies Equifax and TransUnion, all reported that Plaintiff had filed a bankruptcy that never received a Discharge.
- 36. On or about December 1, 2021, Plaintiff specifically disputed with Defendant Experian that his credit report showed a non-discharged bankruptcy case.
- 37. On or about December 3, 2021, Plaintiff once again specifically disputed with Defendant Experian that his credit report showed a non-discharged bankruptcy case.
- 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that during the investigation of Plaintiff's dispute, prior to Defendant LexisNexis responding and verifying the incorrect information to Experian, LexisNexis failed to check Plaintiff's bankruptcy filing to verify that he had in fact received a discharge.
- 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and here upon alleges, that during the investigation of Plaintiff's dispute, prior to responding and verifying the incorrect information to Plaintiff, Experian failed to check Plaintiff's bankruptcy filing to verify that he had in fact received a discharge.
- 40. Defendants further failed to contact Plaintiff and request additional information

from Plaintiff that would aid in reporting the correct status of the bankruptcy case.

41. On or about December 15, 2021, Defendant Experian sent Plaintiff results of its two (2) investigations into Plaintiff's two separate disputes. In both results, Defendant Experian stated:

The dispute for the bankruptcy named US BKPT CT CA SAN DIEGO was not changed as a result of our processing of your dispute. The company that reported the information has certified to Experian that the information is accurate.

- 42. After receiving notice of Plaintiff's dispute, Defendants knowingly and willfully republished the inaccurate and derogatory information on the Plaintiff's accounts.
- 43. Subsequent to Plaintiff's dispute, by furnishing and reporting the bankruptcy as not having been discharged, Defendants have intentionally furnishing and republishing inaccurate post-bankruptcy discharge information.
- 44. Plaintiff is informed and believes that his credit score is taking a "double-hit" as a result of such conduct by Defendants. Once for his bankruptcy. And once more for the incorrect status stating that Plaintiff did not receive a bankruptcy discharge, which is inaccurate and therefore caused Plaintiff damages.

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

- 45. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation contained in all foregoing paragraphs, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 46. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered injury in fact because of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.
- 47. The "Class Period" means 24 months prior to the filing of the Complaint in this action.
- 48. Plaintiff bring this lawsuit on behalf of himself, and other bankruptcy debtors similarly situated nationwide under Rule 23(b)(2) and/or (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures. Subject to additional information obtained through

further investigation and/or discovery, the proposed "Class" consists of:

49. "National Reasonable Procedures Class" consisting of:

"All persons within the United States who filed a Chapter 13 or Chapter 7 bankruptcy case where one or more of the named Defendants furnished or reported that the bankruptcy case was not discharged when in fact it was discharged, within two years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

50. "National Failure to Investigate and Re-investigate Class" consisting of:

"All persons within the United States who filed a Chapter 13 or Chapter 7 bankruptcy case where the individual disputed inaccurate reporting of a bankruptcy discharge, and one or more of the named Defendants concluded after an investigation or re-investigation that the bankruptcy case was not discharged when in fact it was discharged, within two years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

51. "California CCRAA Reasonable Procedures Sub-Class" consisting of:

All persons within California who filed a Chapter 13 or Chapter 7 bankruptcy case where one or more of the named Defendants furnished or reported that the bankruptcy case was not discharged when in fact it was discharged, within two years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

52. "California Failure to Investigate and Re-investigate Sub-Class" consisting of:

"All persons within California who filed a Chapter 13 or Chapter 7 bankruptcy case from where the individual disputed inaccurate reporting of a bankruptcy discharge, and one or more of the named Defendants concluded after an investigation or re-investigation that the bankruptcy case was not discharged when in fact it was discharged, within two years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

- 53. Excluded from the Class are the named Defendants, and any of their respective officers, directors, employees, or agents. Plaintiffs reserve the right to modify or amend the Class definition before the Court determines whether certification is appropriate.
  - Defendants' records and/or Defendants' agents' records regarding bankruptcy cases within the Class Period where Defendants have furnished or reported a bankruptcy filing. Alternatively, the members of the Class are

a. Ascertainability. The members of the Class are readily ascertainable from

readily ascertainable by searching and reviewing publicly-available data

from the PACER system during the class period.

- b. *Numerosity*. The members of the Class are so numerous that their individual joinder is impracticable. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the proposed class consists of hundreds of thousands of members.
- c. Existence and Predominance of Common Questions of Law and Fact.

20 21 Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class members.

22

All members of the Class have been subject to the same conduct and their claims are based on the widespread failure of Defendants to have reasonable

2324

procedures in place to furnish or report bankruptcy discharge information.

25

The common legal and factual questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

2627

i. Whether Plaintiff and the proposed class members had a bankruptcy case that was discharged;

- ii. Whether Defendants have reasonable procedures in place for furnishing publicly-available bankruptcy information;
- iii. Whether Defendants have reasonable procedures in place for reporting publicly-available bankruptcy information.;
- iv. Whether Defendants regularly conduct actual investigations into the status of bankruptcy cases when a consumer disputes that information;
- v. Whether Plaintiff and the proposed members of the Class are entitled to actual damages;
- vi. Whether Plaintiff and the proposed members of the Class are entitled to equitable relief; and
- vii. Whether Plaintiff and the proposed members of the Class are entitled to injunctive relief sought herein.
- d. *Typicality*. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class in that Plaintiff is a member of the Class that Plaintiff seeks to represent. Plaintiff, like members of the proposed Class, filed bankruptcy cases and although they received a discharge, Defendants failed to accurately furnish and/or report that information. Plaintiff is advancing the same or substantially the same claims and legal theories on behalf of themselves and all absent members of the Class. Defendants have no defenses unique to the named Plaintiff.
- e. Adequacy of Representation. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in bankruptcy law and consumer protection law, including class actions. Plaintiff has no adverse or antagonistic interests to those of the Class and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's attorneys are aware of no interests adverse or antagonistic to those of Plaintiff and proposed Class.
- f. Superiority. A class action is superior to all other available means for the

24

25

26

27

28

fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individualized litigation would create the danger of inconsistent and/or contradictory judgments arising from the same set of facts. Individualized litigation would also increase the delay and expense to all parties and the courts and the issues raised by this action. The damages or other financial detriment suffered by individual Class members may be relatively small compared to the burden and expense that would be entailed by individual litigation of the claims against the Defendants. The injury suffered by each individual member of the proposed class is relatively small in comparison to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex and extensive litigation necessitated by Defendants' conduct. It would be impractical for members of the proposed Class to individually redress effectively the wrongs to them. Even if the members of the proposed Class could afford such litigation, the Court system could not. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties, and to the court system, presented by the complex legal and factual issues of the case. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties, and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Therefore, a class action is maintainable pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3).

- 54. Unless the Class is certified, Defendants will continue to harm Plaintiff and the members of the proposed Class by failing to ensure accurate procedures in furnishing and reporting of bankruptcy information. Unless a class-wide injunction is issued, Defendants will also likely continue to fail to accurately furnish and report information about bankruptcy cases, in violation of the law.
- 55. Further, Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds that are generally applicable to the Class so that declaratory and injunctive relief is appropriate to the Class as a whole, making class certification appropriate pursuant to Fed R.

Civ. P. 23(b)(2).

#### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

# WILLFUL FAILURE TO EMPLOY REASONABLE PROCEDURES TO ENSURE MAXIMUM ACCURACY OF CREDIT REPORT

15 U.S.C. § 1681, et. seq. and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.1, et. seq.

(15 U.S.C. § 1681, et. seq. claims as to Defendant Experian only;

Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.1, et. seq. as to all Defendants)

- 56. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 57. Plaintiff and the proposed members of the Class are "consumers" as that term is defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.3(b).
- 58. Defendants are also each a "person" as that term is defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.3(j).
- 59. Experian is regularly engaged in practice of assembling and evaluating consumer credit information for the purpose of preparing consumer reports, as that term is defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(d) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.3(c), commonly referred to as Credit Reports, and Furnishing these Credit Reports to third parties.
- 60. Experian uses means and facilities of interstate commerce for the purpose of preparing and furnishing Credit Reports and, hence, is a "consumer reporting agency" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(f). Experian is likewise a "consumer reporting agency" within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.3(d).
- 61. In preparing Credit Reports, Experian has failed to use reasonable procedures to, as required by law, "assure maximum possible accuracy" of information relating to the status of bankruptcy cases of Plaintiff and the Class, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.14(b).
- 62. In the regular course of its business operations, LexisNexis routinely furnishes information to credit reporting agencies (including Experian) regarding publicly

- available information about bankruptcy filings, which in turn has bearing on credit worthiness, credit standing and credit capacity, as this information was then reported to the "consumer credit reports" of Plaintiff and the Classes. *See* Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.3(c).
- 63. In furnishing this information about bankruptcy filings, LexisNexis has failed to maintain reasonable procedures, as required by law, to ensure the "completeness or accuracy of [the] information" relating to the status of bankruptcy cases of Plaintiff and the Classes, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25(g).
- 64. Reasonable means were readily available to Defendants to be able to confirm the fact that the bankruptcy case for Plaintiff and the proposed Class members were in fact discharged, yet upon information and belief, Defendants knowingly and intentionally chose as a business decision not to incur the time and cost of checking public information on PACER to confirm whether or not the bankruptcy cases were discharged.
- 65. As a result of LexisNexis' failure to use reasonable procedures in accordance with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25(g), LexisNexis has erroneously furnished information concerning bankruptcy cases as not being discharged when in fact they were, for Plaintiff and all members of the Classes.
- 66. LexisNexis' failure to comply with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25 is willful within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31(a)(2).
- 67. As a result of LexisNexis' willful noncompliance with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25, Plaintiff and class and sub-class members are entitled to punitive damages under Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31(a)(2).
- 68. As a further result of LexisNexis' willful noncompliance with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25, Plaintiffs and the Classes have suffered damage to their credit rating and other actual damages, including, but no limited to, denial of credit, denial of access to consumer services, losses from difficulty in obtaining credit, losses resulting from imposition of higher interest rates when

- they have been able to obtain credit, lost opportunities to obtain mortgages, rental properties, automobiles and other goods or services.
- 69. As a result of Experian's failure to use reasonable procedures in accordance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.14(b), Experian has erroneously reported bankruptcy cases as not being discharged when in fact they were, for Plaintiff and all members of the Class.
- 70. Experian's failure to comply with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.14(b) is willful within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31(a)(2), respectively.
- 71. As a result of Experian's willful noncompliance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code. § 1785.14(b), Plaintiff and class and subclass members are entitled to statutory and punitive damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1) and (a)(2) and punitive damages under Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31(a)(1) and (a)(2), respectively.
- 72. As a further result of Experian's willful noncompliance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code. § 1785.14(b), Plaintiffs and the Class have suffered damage to their credit rating and other actual damages, including, but no limited to, denial of credit, denial of access to consumer services, losses from difficulty in obtaining credit, losses resulting from imposition of higher interest rates when they have been able to obtain credit, lost opportunities to obtain mortgages, rental properties, automobiles and other goods or services.
- 73. The foregoing acts and omissions of Experian constitutes numerous and multiple willful, reckless or negligent violations of the FCRA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of the FCRA, 15 U.S.C § 1681.
- 74. As a result of each and every willful violation of the FCRA, Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages as the Court may allow pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1); statutory damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1); punitive damages as the Court may allow pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(2); and reasonable attorney's

## 9

10 11

12

13

14 15

17

16

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(3) from Experian.

75. As a result of each and every negligent noncompliance of the FCRA, Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages as the Court may allow pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681o(a)(1); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681o(a)(2) from Experian.

### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

## NEGLIGENT FAILURE TO EMPLOY REASONABLE PROCEDURES TO **ENSURE MAXIMUM ACCURACY OF CREDIT REPORTS**

15 U.S.C. § 1681, et. seq. and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.1, et. seq.

(15 U.S.C. § 1681, et. seq. claims as to Defendant Experian only;

Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.1, et. seq. as to all Defendants)

- 76. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 77. In preparing credit reports relating to Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members, Experian has failed to follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum accuracy of information it puts in Credit Reports of 15 U.S.C § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.14(b).
- 78. Similarly, LexisNexis has failed to use reasonable procedures, in accordance with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25(g), by erroneously furnishing information concerning bankruptcy cases as not being discharged when in fact they were, for Plaintiff and the proposed Class members.
- 79. Reasonable means were readily available to Defendants to be able to confirm the fact that the bankruptcy case for Plaintiff and the proposed Class members were in fact discharged by searching public records on PACER, yet upon information and belief, Defendants were negligent in not adopting procedures to check public information on PACER to confirm whether the bankruptcy cases were discharged or not.

- 80. As a result of LexisNexis' failure to use reasonable procedures in accordance with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25(g), LexisNexis has erroneously furnished information concerning bankruptcy cases as not being discharged when in fact they were, for Plaintiff and all members of the Classes.
- 81. LexisNexis' failure to comply with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25 is negligent within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31(a)(1).
- 82. As a result of LexisNexis' negligent violation with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25, Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members have suffered damage to their credit ratings and other actual damages, including, but not limited to, denial of credit, denial of access to consumer services, losses from difficulty in obtaining credit, losses resulting from imposition of higher interest rates when they have been able to obtain credit, lost opportunities to obtain mortgages, rental properties, automobiles and other goods or services.
- 83. As a result of Experian's failure to follow reasonable procedures in accordance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.14(b), Experian has erroneously reported the status of Plaintiff and the class and subclass members' bankruptcy cases as not being discharged, when in fact they were.
- 84. Experian's failure to comply with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.14(b) is negligent within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1681o(a) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31 (a)(1), respectively.
- 85. As a result of Experian's negligent violation with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.14(b), Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members have suffered damage to their credit ratings and other actual damages, including, but not limited to, denial of credit, denial of access to consumer services, losses from difficulty in obtaining credit, losses resulting from imposition of higher interest rates when they have been able to obtain credit, lost opportunities to obtain mortgages, rental properties, automobiles and other goods or services.

#### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

## WILLFUL FAILURE TO REASONABLY REINVESTIGATE

15 U.S.C. § 1681, et. seq. and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.1, et. seq.

(As to Defendant Experian Only)

- 86. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 87. Experian has knowingly and intentionally failed to follow reasonable reinvestigation procedures for ascertaining the accuracy of information relating to the bankruptcy cases of Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members that Experian has erroneously reported bankruptcy cases as not discharged when in fact they were discharged.
- 88. Reasonable means were readily available to Experian to be able to confirm the fact that the bankruptcy case for Plaintiff and the proposed Class members were in fact discharged, yet upon information and belief, Experian knowingly and intentionally chose as a business decision not to incur the time and cost of checking public information on PACER to confirm whether the bankruptcy cases were discharged or not.
- 89. As a result of Experian's intentional failure to conduct reasonable reinvestigations in accordance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.16, Experian has continued to erroneously report the bankruptcy case status of Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members as not being discharged, when in fact they were, in its credit reports for Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members, after having been notified that they were disputing that information.
- 90. Experian's failure to comply with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1) and Cal Civ. Code § 1785.16 is willful within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31(a)(2), respectively.

4

5 6

8

7

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

- 91. As a result of Experian's willful noncompliance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1) and Cal. Civ. Code §1785.16, Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members are entitled to statutory and punitive damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1) and (a)(2) and punitive damages under Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1785.31(a)(1) and (a)(2), respectively.
- 92. As a further result of Experian's willful noncompliance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.16, Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members have suffered damage to their credit ratings and other actual damages, including, but not limited to, denial of credit, denial of access to consumer services, losses from difficulty in obtaining credit, losses resulting from imposition of higher interest rates when they have been able to obtain credit, lost opportunities to obtain mortgages, rental properties, automobiles and other goods or services.

## **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### **NEGLIGENT FAILURE TO REASONABLY REINVESTIGATE**

15 U.S.C. § 1681, et. seq. and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.1, et. seq.

(As to Defendant Experian Only)

- 93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 94. Experian has failed to follow reasonable reinvestigation procedures for ascertaining the accuracy of information relating to relating to the bankruptcy cases of Plaintiff and class and sub-class members that Experian has erroneously reported bankruptcy cases as not discharged when in fact they were discharged.
- 95. Reasonable means were readily available to Experian to be able to confirm the fact that the bankruptcy case for Plaintiff and the proposed Class members were in fact discharged by searching public records on PACER, yet upon information

	Ш	
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		

28

and belief, Experian was negligent in not checking public information on PACER to confirm whether the bankruptcy cases were discharged or not.

- 96. As a result of Experian's failure to conduct reasonable reinvestigations in accordance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.16, Experian has continued to report the bankruptcy case status of Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members as not being discharged when in fact they were in the credit reports for Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members, after having been notified that they were disputing that information.
- 97. Experian's failure to comply with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.16 is negligent within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1681o(a) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31(a)(1), respectively.
- 98. As a result of Experian's negligent noncompliance with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.16, Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members have suffered damage to their credit ratings and other actual damages, including, but not limited to, denial of credit, denial of access to consumer services, losses from difficulty in obtaining credit, losses resulting from imposition of higher interest rates when they have been able to obtain credit, lost opportunities to obtain mortgages, rental properties, automobiles and other goods or services.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## **FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE**

Cal Civ. Code § 1785.1, et. seq.

(As to Defendant LexisNexis Only)

- 99. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 100. Cal. Civ. Code §1785.25(f) provides:

Upon receiving notice of a dispute noticed pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 1785.16 with regard to the completeness or accuracy of any information provided to a consumer credit reporting agency, the person that provided the information shall (1) complete an investigation with respect to the disputed information and report to the consumer credit reporting agency the results of that investigation before the end of the 30-business-day period beginning on the date the consumer credit reporting agency receives the notice of dispute from the consumer in accordance with subdivision (a) of Section 1785.16 and (2) review relevant information submitted to it.

- 101. When Plaintiff made his Consumer Dispute Verification request, Defendant LexisNexis was required to do an investigation and review the information provided by Plaintiff.
- 102. In his disputes, Plaintiff specifically explained that his bankruptcy case had in fact been discharged, but was being furnished as having been filed but with no discharge obtained.
- 103. Defendant Experian notified Defendant LexisNexis via an Automated Credit Dispute Verification ("ACDV") form used by the credit reporting agencies to communicate consumer disputes to lenders and collection agencies, because Defendant LexisNexis was the entity who furnished the information to Defendant Experian regarding Plaintiff and the class members' bankruptcy case related information to said CRA's.
- 104. ACDVs are transmitted to furnishers via an electronic system known as the "E-OSCAR" system, which is an automated system that enables furnishers and credit reporting agencies (CRA's) to create and respond to consumer credit history disputes by sending the disputes directly to the furnisher through said system. The ACDV process tracks and manages an ACDV initiated by a credit reporting agency on behalf of a consumer and routes it to the appropriate furnisher. The furnisher is supposed to then return the ACDV to the initiating CRA with the updated information (if any) relating to the consumer's credit

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

history.

- 105. Despite being notified of Plaintiff's dispute via an ACDV, Defendant LexisNexis failed to exercise reasonable care in failing to take the remedial measures required by statute. After reviewing the dispute, whereby Plaintiff explained that his bankruptcy case had in fact been discharged, Defendant LexisNexis responded to Defendant Experian by "verifying" that the bankruptcy case status was correct, thereby confirming to Experian that Plaintiff had not in fact received a discharge order in his bankruptcy case, when in fact he had.
- 106. The conduct of Defendant LexisNexis is particularly flagrant given that Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members' bankruptcy information can be readily and easily verified as they are publicly available through PACER.
- 107. By failing to properly update the bankruptcy case status for Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members that was readily verifiable and publicly available, Defendant LexisNexis violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25(f)
- 108. By violating Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25(f), Defendant Lexis Nexis is liable to Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members for damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.31.
- 109. As a result of Defendant LexisNexis's noncompliance with the requirements of Cal. Civ. C. § 1785.25(f), Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members have suffered damages to their credit ratings and other actual damages, including, but not limited to, denial of credit, denial of access to consumer services, losses from difficulty in obtaining credit, losses resulting from imposition of higher interest rates when they have been able to obtain credit, lost opportunities to obtain mortgages, rental properties, automobiles and other goods or services.

25

26

27

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff having set forth his claims for relief against Defendants, and each of them herein, respectfully requests this Court enter a Judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. That this action be certified as a Class Action, Plaintiff be appointed as the representatives of the Class and California Sub-Class, and Plaintiff's attorneys be appointed Class Counsel;
- b. That the conduct of Defendants complained of herein be determined and adjudged to be in violation of the rights of Plaintiff under the FCRA, and the CCCRAA;
- c. An injunctive order mandating removal of all incorrect information and modifications of Plaintiff and the class and sub-class members' credit reports to reflect the correct status of their bankruptcy cases as being discharged;
- d. An award of actual damages subject to proof at trial against Defendants, each of them, jointly and severally, pursuant to 15 U.S.C §§1681n(a)(1)(A) and 1681o(a)(1) and Cal. Civ. Code §§1785.31(a)(1) and 1785.31(a)(2);
- e. An award of punitive damages subject to proof at trial against Defendants, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(2) and Cal. Civ. Code §1785.31(a)(2)(B);
- f. An award of attorney's fees and costs of suit against Defendants, pursuant to, inter alia, 15 U.S.C. §§1681n(a)(3) and 1681o(b) and Cal. Civ. Code §§1785.31(a)(1) and 1785.31(a)(2); and
- g. For all such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

#### **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demand, a trial by jury on all issues triable by a jury.

Dated: January 13, 2022 Respectfully submitted, KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC By: /s Abbas Kazerounian Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff **Additional Counsel for Plaintiff** Jason A. Ibey, Esq. (284607) Kazerouni Law Group, APC 321 N. Mall Drive, Suite R108 St. George, Utah 84790 Telephone: (800) 400-6808 Facsimile: (800) 520-5523 

## $_{ m JS~44~(Rev.~10/20)}$ case 3:22-cv-00050-BAS-JLP Toget (Rev. 10/20) 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.)

purpose of initiating the civil do	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS F	ORM.)						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDAN	TS					
JESUS ALVARADO, on behalf of himself and all those				LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA MANAGEMENT, INC.; and						
similarly situated,				EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC.;						
(b) County of Residence of		an Diego		County of Reside	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant					
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				NOTE: IN LAN		1	<i>LAINTIFF CASES O</i> ON CASES, USE TH VOLVED.	,	OF	
(a) Augus a Ti V				1 .			102125.			
	Address, and Telephone Number AW GROUP, APC; Al		Fea	Attorneys (If Kno	own)					
	Avenue Suite D1, Co			122 CV/0	0E0 I		LD			
243 1 1301101 /			020	'22CV0	บอบ เ	DAS J	LB			
Telephone: 800-400-6808  II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only)  and One Box for Defendant)										
1 U.S. Government	<b>≭</b> 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases O.	PTF	DEF	u	та Опе Бох јог	PTF	DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government N	Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State	1	1	Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		4	4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2	_ 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		5	5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	<u> </u>	3	Foreign Nation		☐ 6	<u> </u>
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box On	ly)			Cl	lick here	for: Nature of S	uit Code De	scription	<u>ıs</u> .
CONTRACT	TO	RTS	FC	ORFEITURE/PENALT	ГҮ	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	R STATUT	ES
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	Y 62	25 Drug Related Seizure			eal 28 USC 158	375 False		
120 Marine 130 Miller Act	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	H <sub>69</sub>	of Property 21 USC 8 90 Other	581	423 With 28 U	ugrawai JSC 157	376 Qui 18	am (31 US( a))	C
140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	367 Health Care/			L			400 State I	Reapportion	nment
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury				820 Copy	TY RIGHTS	410 Antitro	ust and Banki	na
151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability				830 Pate		450 Comm		пg
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	368 Asbestos Personal				_	nt - Abbreviated	460 Depor		1
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	340 Marine 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability			_ F	New 840 Trad	Drug Application emark		teer Influer ot Organiza	
153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPERT		LABOR		_	end Trade Secrets	<b>≭</b> 480 Consu	mer Credit	
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud	71	0 Fair Labor Standards Act		Act	of 2016		SC 1681 or	
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal	-	20 Labor/Management		SOCIA	L SECURITY		hone Consu ction Act	mici
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal	Property Damage		Relations		861 HIA	(1395ff)	490 Cable		
196 Franchise	Injury  362 Personal Injury -	385 Property Damage Product Liability		10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	⊢		k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	850 Securi Excha	ties/Comm	odities/
	Medical Malpractice	Floduct Liability	H'	Leave Act			O Title XVI		inge Statutory A	Actions
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION		00 Other Labor Litigation		] 865 RSI	(405(g))		ıltural Acts	
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee	⊢ <sup>79</sup>	21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	·	FEDEDA	AL TAX SUITS	_	onmental M om of Infor	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate		meome Security Act			es (U.S. Plaintiff	Act	mi oi iiioi	mation
240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/	Sentence					efendant)	896 Arbitr		
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations 530 General 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 535 Death Penalty			IMMIGRATION			—Third Party USC 7609	Н	nistrative Preview or A	
	Employment	Other:	46	52 Naturalization Applic	ation	20	050 7003		y Decision	
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Othe	ег 🔲 46	55 Other Immigration				950 Consti		of
	Other 448 Education	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition		Actions				State S	Statutes	
		560 Civil Detainee -								
		Conditions of Confinement								
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" is	n One Box Only)	Comment								
x 1 Original	noved from 3 I				ınsferre		6 Multidistri		Multidis	
Proceeding Star		Appellate Court		(spe	other D <i>ecify)</i>		Litigation Transfer	<u> </u>	Litigation Direct F	
		tute under which you ar ct ("FCRA"), 15 U.S.C. §			ıl statute	es unless div	versity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of car	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3 1001 0	004.						
		violation of FCRA and (	Cal. Civ. 0	Code § 1785.1						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	EMAND \$			HECK YES only: URY DEMAND:		n complai No				
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S)									
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE				_DOCKI	ET NUMBER			
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATT	ORNEY (	OF RECORD						
Jan 13, 2022		/s/ Abbas Kazerounia	an							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY				<del></del>						
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDG	E		MAG. JUI	OGE		

#### 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: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- 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. 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.

## **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>LexisNexis</u>, <u>Experian Included Inaccurate Bankruptcy Info in Consumer Reports</u>, <u>Class Action Says</u>