С	ase 3:17-cv-01089-AJB-JMA Documer	nt 1 Filed 05/26/17 PageID.1 Page 1 of 28
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		n vm n
<ol> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ol>	DAWN COBBS, Individually and or Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, Plaintiff, v. WALGREEN CO. and WALGREENS BOOTS ALLIANCE, INC., Defendants.	<ul> <li>Case No: <u>'17CV1089 AJB JMA</u></li> <li>CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:</li> <li>(1) VIOLATIONS OF THE</li> <li>CALIFORNIA UNFAIR</li> <li>COMPETITION LAW;</li> <li>(2) VIOLATIONS OF THE</li> <li>CALIFORNIA CONSUMER LEGAL</li> <li>REMEDIES ACT;</li> <li>(3) UNJUST ENRICHMENT; AND</li> <li>(4) NEGLIGENT</li> <li>MISREPRESENTATION.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ul>		_ ) <u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u>
25 26 27		
28		

Plaintiff Dawn Cobbs ("Plaintiff"), by his undersigned attorneys, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly situated ("Class," as defined below), based on
personal knowledge as to herself and upon information and belief and the
investigation of his counsel as to all other matters, brings this class action against
Defendants Walgreen Co. and Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc. (collectively,
"Defendants" or "Walgreens"), and alleges the following:

7

#### **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

8 1. This action concerns Walgreens' deceptive and unfair pricing scheme to
9 overcharge customers with third-party health care plans on their purchases of generic
10 prescription drugs at Walgreens pharmacies.

Walgreens is the second largest pharmacy chain in the United States,
 operating more than 8,000 retail pharmacies in all 50 states, the District of Columbia,
 Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Walgreens interacts with ten million
 customers in its stores and online each day, and approximately 76% of the population
 of the United States lives within five miles of a Walgreens pharmacy.

In October 2015, Walgreens announced that it would be acquiring Rite
Aid Corp., one of its main rivals and the third largest pharmacy chain in the United
States. If that acquisition is consummated, Walgreens will become the largest
pharmacy chain in the United States with a significantly expanded geographic reach
through the operation of its over 13,000 pharmacy stores.

21 4. In fiscal year 2016, Walgreens filled over 928 million prescriptions on a 30-day adjusted basis and its United States retail pharmacy division earned 22 23 approximately \$83.8 billion in sales. Prescription drugs accounted for approximately 67% of those sales, and like other major retail pharmacies, generic drugs accounted 24 for the vast majority of the total prescriptions dispensed by Walgreens. According to 25 the Generic Pharmaceutical Association's 2016 Generic Drug Savings and Access in 26 the United States Report, generic drugs accounted for 89% of prescriptions dispensed 27 in the United States. 28

5. A generic drug is a pharmaceutical drug that is the equivalent of a brand name drug in dosage, strength, route of administration, quality, performance, and
 intended use. Generic drugs typically cost less than their brand-name counterparts
 and have saved both consumers and health care plans hundreds of billions of dollars
 over the last decade.

6 6. Approximately 90% of all United States citizens are enrolled in a private
7 or public health care plan that covers some or all medical and pharmaceutical
8 expenses. In almost every one of these plans, the cost of prescription drugs is shared
9 between the third-party payor (*i.e.*, the health insurance plan) and the actual user of
10 the drug (*i.e.*, the plan participant).

7. When a plan participant fills a prescription at a pharmacy under a third-11 party health care plan, the plan pays a portion of the cost, and the plan participant 12 pays the remaining portion of the cost directly to the pharmacy, either as a 13 copayment, coinsurance, or contracted rate towards the plan's deductible 14 15 ("copayment"). Because of the potential cost savings associated with the purchase of generic drugs, third-party payors incentivize plan participants to purchase generic 16 drugs (if available) instead of their brand-name drug equivalents by offering a lower 17 price, which in turn, results in a lower copayment. 18

8. Walgreens pharmacies collect the copayment from the plan participant at
the time the prescription is filled at a pharmacy. Importantly, by law, Walgreens
cannot charge a copayment that exceeds its "usual and customary" price, which is
generally defined within the pharmaceuticals industry as the cash price offered to the
general public by the pharmacy for the same drug.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff alleges, however, that
Walgreens engages in a false, deceptive, and unfair pricing scheme that does exactly

The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals recently affirmed this definition in the case of *United States ex rel Garbe v. Kmart Corp.*, 824 F.3d 632, 643 (7th Cir. 2016) ("*Kmart*").

1 what the law prohibits.

9. At bottom, this action concerns Walgreens' illegal practice of
overcharging customers enrolled in public or private health care plans for generic
prescription drugs by submitting to third-party payors claims for payment at prices
that Walgreens has knowingly and intentionally inflated above its "usual and
customary" prices. As a result, customers who purchase generic prescription drugs
through third-party plans pay copayments that are significantly more than Walgreens'
"usual and customary" prices for those same drugs.

10. The lynchpin of Walgreens' scheme is its Prescription Savings Club 9 ("PSC"), a prescription savings program that allows cash-paying customers – those 10 who pay for drugs without using insurance – to purchase certain prescription generic 11 drugs at discounted prices. Specifically, the PSC allows cash-paying customers to 12 purchase 500 of the most commonly prescribed generic drugs listed on Walgreens' 13 special formulary (attached hereto as Exhibit A) at tiered prices levels of \$5, \$10, and 14 \$15 for 30-day prescriptions and \$10, \$20, and \$30 for 90-day prescriptions (the 15 "PSC Prices"). The PSC Prices, however, are often significantly lower than the 16 "usual and customary" prices that Walgreens reports to health insurance companies, 17 and thus, the amounts that individuals using insurance must pay for the drugs in the 18 form of a copayment. 19

Any customer of Walgreens pharmacies, except for Medicare or 20 11. Medicaid beneficiaries, are eligible to participate in the PSC. Walgreens does not 21 otherwise limit eligibility for, or duration of the availability of, the PSC Prices for the 22 prescription generic drugs at issue - other than prohibiting PSC participants from 23 using insurance when purchasing the drugs. The Seventh Circuit's decision in 24 Kmart makes clear that under these circumstances the PSC Prices fit squarely within 25 the accepted industry meaning of usual and customary prices, and thus, represent 26 Walgreens' actual usual and customary prices for the drugs. See id. at 645. 27

12. Accordingly, Walgreens was required to report to third-party payors the 1 2 PSC Prices as Walgreens' usual and customary prices for the prescription generic drugs. However, since the PSC was created in 2007, Walgreens has purposefully 3 disregarded the PSC Prices in setting its "usual and customary" prices for the drugs 4 when they are sold to customers using insurance for their purchase. Instead. 5 Walgreens has submitted falsely inflated "usual and customary" prices for the drugs 6 to third-party payors, and in the process, overcharged customers paying for the drugs 7 8 with insurance by collecting falsely inflated copayments.

9 13. Thus, using the PSC as its vehicle, Walgreens has effectively created a
discriminatory pricing scheme, whereby customers enrolled in the PSC who are not
using insurance when purchasing a prescription generic drug are able to pay the lower
PSC Price, while those customers using insurance must pay the higher and artificially
inflated "usual and customary" price.

14 14. Therefore, the PSC not only allows Walgreens to maintain and increase 15 its market share by fending off discounted prices from its competitors, but more 16 importantly, it provides a mechanism for Walgreens to hide its actual "usual and 17 customary" prices from third-party payors so that it can continue to collect higher 18 reimbursement payments from third-party payors and higher copayments from plan 19 participants who fill their prescription at Walgreens pharmacies.

15. By charging amounts for prescription generic drugs that are above the
PSC Prices for those same drugs, Walgreens is unlawfully overcharging plan
participants and third-party payors – in many cases by *more than three or four times*the actual "usual and customary" prices. Accordingly, Walgreens' misconduct has
caused Plaintiff and the other Class members to suffer significant monetary damages.

25

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

16. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the
Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2), because at least one Class
member is of diverse citizenship from one Defendant, there are more than 100

putative Class members, and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds
 \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs. The Court also has subject matter
 jurisdiction over Plaintiff and the proposed Class' claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
 \$1367(a).

5 17. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b)-(d)
6 because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff and the
7 proposed Class claims occurred in this District, Plaintiff is a residents of this District,
8 and Defendants are otherwise subject to personal jurisdiction in this District given
9 their significant contacts to this District.

10

#### THE PARTIES

18. Plaintiff Dawn Cobbs is, and at all times relevant hereto has been, a 11 citizen of and domiciled in San Diego, California. Ms. Cobbs purchased prescription 12 generic drugs from Walgreens pharmacies located in California. Ms. Cobbs carried 13 private health insurance at the times that she purchased the prescription generic drugs 14 from the Walgreens pharmacies at issue. The prescription generic drugs that Ms. 15 Cobbs purchased are contained on the PSC formulary attached as Exhibit A. Ms. 16 Cobbs purchased drugs contained under Tiers 1, 2, and 3 of the PSC formulary. 17 Walgreens charged its cash-paying customers its "usual and customary" prices of \$5 18 (Tier 1), \$10 (Tier 2), and \$15 (Tier 3) for a 30-day supply of the same prescriptions 19 that Ms. Cobbs purchased. However, because Walgreens submitted to Ms. Cobbs' 20 insurance a purported "usual and customary" price fraudulently inflated above its true 21 "usual and customary" price—the price Walgreens offers under the PSC – Ms. Cobbs 22 23 paid copayments that were substantially higher than the \$5 for a Tier 1 30-day supply, and significantly more than the copayment would have been had Walgreens 24 reported the true "usual and customary" price for all the drugs to Ms. Cobbs' 25 insurance. As a result, Ms. Cobbs has been injured. Ms. Cobbs anticipates filling 26 future prescriptions for these generic drugs at a Walgreens pharmacy, and thus, faces 27 28 the prospect of paying additional inflated copayments in the future if Walgreens 1 continues its wrongful conduct.

19. Ms. Cobbs paid the above amounts on the reasonable assumption that
the "usual and customary" prices reported by Walgreens were the actual "usual and
customary" prices paid by customers that do not have any form of prescription drug
coverage from a third-party payor, and would not have paid those inflated amounts
but for Walgreen's wrongful conduct.

Defendant Walgreen Co. ("Walgreen Co.") is an Illinois corporation 20. 7 with its headquarters located at 200 Wilmot Road, Deerfield, Illinois. 8 Until December 31, 2014, Walgreen Co. had no corporate parent; however, on December 9 31, 2014, Walgreen Co. became a wholly owned subsidiary of Walgreens Boots 10 Alliance, Inc. ("WBA") pursuant to a reorganization merger agreement 11 ("Reorganization"). 12

13 21. Defendant Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc. is a Delaware corporation
14 with its headquarters located at 108 Wilmot Road, Deerfield, Illinois. On December
15 31, 2014, WBA became the successor of Defendant Walgreen Co., pursuant to the
16 Reorganization, whereby WBA became the direct parent holding company of
17 Walgreen Co., which, in turn, became a wholly owned subsidiary of WBA.

22. WBA exercises complete control over Walgreen Co. and its business 18 operations. Immediately prior to the Reorganization, Walgreen Co. stockholders 19 became stockholders of WBA, through the automatic conversion of shares of 20 Walgreen Co. common stock into shares of WBA common stock on a one-for-one 21 basis. WBA's public filings report the financial and operational positions Walgreen 22 23 Co. and its subsidiaries for periods prior to December 31, 2014, and of WBA and its subsidiaries, including Walgreen Co., for periods from and after the effective time of 24 the Reorganization on December 31, 2014. All WBA profits are derived from its 25 wholly owned operating subsidiaries, such as Walgreen Co., whose financial results 26 are reported in the Retail Pharmacy USA section of WBA's public filings. WBA's 27 Co-Chief Operating Officer ("COO"), Alexander W. Gourlay, is also the President of 28

- 6 -

Walgreen Co., and as WBA's COO, Mr. Gourlay is responsible for the day-to-day
 operation and oversight of Walgreen Co.

### **BACKGROUND**

#### 4 The Process for Paying for Prescription Drugs

5 23. The majority of patients in the United States have a health care plan 6 (either private or public) that covers all or a portion of their medical and 7 pharmaceutical expenses, known as a third-party payor. Most plans require plan 8 participants to pay a portion of their drug costs out-of-pocket. These out-of-pocket 9 expenses include copayments, co-insurance, and/or deductibles.

10 24. Even though plan participants cannot and do not negotiate the price 11 charged by pharmacies such as Walgreens for prescription drugs, and further, do not 12 negotiate the copayment price for the drug in any given transaction, they are required 13 to pay to Walgreens a copayment amount in order to receive the prescription.

14 25. The National Council for Prescription Drug Programs ("NCPDP")<sup>2</sup> sets
15 the industry standards for the electronic transmission of pharmacy claims to third16 party payors.<sup>3</sup> Walgreens follows this uniform process at their pharmacies for each
17 prescription drug transaction.

18

3

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> <sup>2</sup> NCPDP is a non-profit organization that develops industry standards for electronic
 <sup>19</sup> healthcare transactions used in prescribing, dispensing, monitoring, managing, and
 <sup>21</sup> paying for medications and pharmacy services. Its membership is made up of
 <sup>21</sup> approximately 1,500 stakeholders from across the pharmaceutical industry, including
 <sup>22</sup> pharmacies, pharmacists, health plans, and government agencies.

Congress has codified and adopted the NCPDP standards through federal 23 legislation. including Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act 24 ("HIPAA"), Medicare Modernization Act, Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health, and Meaningful Use. For example, HIPAA requires 25 uniform methods and codes for exchanging electronic information with health 26 insurance plans. These standards are referred to as the NCPDP Telecommunications Standard. HIPAA also requires prescribers follow the NCPDP SCRIPT Standards 27 when prescribing drugs under Medicare Part D.

26. When a customer fills a prescription at a Walgreens pharmacy, anywhere 1 in the United States, the pharmacist or pharmacy technician enters the prescription 2 information and any applicable insurance or benefit information into Walgreens' 3 computerized claims. The pharmacist or pharmacy technician also enters in key 4 information about the customer, such as his/her name. This information is then sent 5 to the customer's third-party payor (or an agent of the third-party payor). Walgreens 6 charges the customer the copayment at the time the customer makes the purchase and 7 the third-party payor covers the remaining cost of the prescription. 8

27. NCPDP provides a standardized form for Walgreens pharmacies to fill 9 out and send to third-party payors when filing prescriptions. The form includes Field 10 No. 426-DQ, where Walgreens is required to report its "usual and customary" price of 11 the prescription being filled. NCPDP defines the term "usual and customary" as the 12 "[a]mount charged cash customers for the prescription exclusive of sales tax or other 13 amounts claimed." California Welfare and Institutions Code 14105.455 similarly 14 defines "usual and customary" as the lesser of either the lowest price reimbursed to 15 the pharmacy by other third-party payors in California or the lowest price routinely 16 offered to any segment of the general public. 17

28. Based on the data reported by Walgreens on NCPDP's standard forms, 18 third-party payors identify the copayment amount that the customer must pay to 19 Walgreens in a specific prescription transaction. The copayment amount is a portion 20 of the total drug price and cannot exceed the drug price. In addition, the copayment 21 cannot exceed Walgreens' "usual and customary" price of the drug. After the 22 23 copayment amount is paid by the customer, the remainder of the drug price is reimbursed to the Walgreens by the third-party payor. 24

25 29. In some situations, however, the copayment may only be charged as a
26 percentage of the "usual and customary" price. For instance, if a third-party payor's
27 negotiated price for a specific drug is \$40 with the customer responsible for 25% of
28 the drug as his or her copayment, but the "usual and customary" price of the drug is

only \$20, the \$20 price would take the place of the negotiated rate and the customer 1 2 would only pay a copayment of \$5 (25% of \$20).

3

Walgreens is well aware of both the definition of usual and customary, 30. and how the "usual and customary" price of a particular prescription drug is 4 Indeed, as late as 2011, Walgreen Co. owned Walgreens Health ascertained. 5 Initiative Inc. ("WHI"), a pharmacy benefits manager ("PBM"),<sup>4</sup> which defined 6 "usual and customary" in its manual as the "cash price [for the prescription drug] 7 8 including all applicable customer discounts, coupons or sale price which a cashpaying customer would pay at the pharmacy." In addition, WHI directed the 9 pharmacies in its network to use the standard NCPDP form containing the "usual and 10 customary" field discussed above. 11

#### **Big Box Retailers Exert Substantial Price Pressure on Generic Drugs** 12

In 2006, large "big box" retailers with pharmacy departments began 13 31. offering hundreds of generic prescription drugs at significantly reduced prices. For 14 example, in September 2006, Wal-Mart began charging \$4 for a 30-day supply and 15 \$10 for a 90-day supply of the most commonly prescribed generic drugs. 16 In November of that same year, Target began charging \$4 for a 30-day supply and \$10 17 for a 90-day supply of such prescription generic drugs. Other retailers with pharmacy 18 departments soon followed suit. 19

32. Notably, in the wake of Wal-Mart's decision to substantially reduce the 20 prices of its prescription generic drugs, the Center for Medicaid & Medicare Services 21 ("CMMS") specifically stated that it would treat Wal-Mart's new lower prices as the 22 23 "usual and customary" prices for those drugs and use the prices as the basis for paying claims for prescription drug benefits. Wal-Mart and Target properly reported 24 to third-party payors these reduced prices as their "usual and customary" prices for 25

<sup>27</sup> <sup>4</sup> PBMs are basically middle men that go between the payors and everyone else in the healthcare industry. 28

1 the prescription generic drugs.

2 33. On information and belief, in 2007, in response to the big box retailers' 3 decision to reduce the prices of many prescription generic drugs, Walgreens started the PSC discount drug program. Walgreens charges individuals \$20 and families \$35 4 per year to join the PSC. In exchange, Walgreens, through the PSC, allows cash-5 paying customers to purchase prescription generic drugs on their formulary list for 6 \$5, \$10, and \$15 for 30-day prescriptions and \$10, \$20, and \$30 for 90-day 7 8 prescriptions, depending on the drug's tier classification. There are over 500 generic drugs on the formulary list and the list encompasses a number of the most widely 9 prescribed generic drugs. 10

34. The PSC is not a special, limited, or one-time offer. It is also not a thirdparty plan, insurance, or a substitute for insurance. Rather, Walgreens has
continuously offered the PSC for multiple benefit years. Importantly, *any* cash
paying customer that is not on Medicare or Medicaid can join the PSC and avail
themselves of the discounted prices.

16 35. Accordingly, the price for prescription generic drugs that those enrolled 17 in the PSC pay is the price that Walgreens offers to their customers (i.e., the general 18 public). The CMMS Manual notes that "where a pharmacy offers a lower price to its 19 customers throughout a benefit year" the lower price is considered the "usual and 20 customary" price, rather than a one time "lower case price," even when a customer 21 uses a discount card to make the purchase.<sup>5</sup>

36. Accordingly, the PSC Prices are the "usual and customary" prices for the
prescription generic drugs on Walgreens' PSC formulary. Walgreens' own
explanation of the "usual and customary" price, as adopted by WHI, mandates this

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Servs., *Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit* <sup>7</sup> *Manual*, Ch. 14-Coordination of Benefits, at19 n.1 (2006), https://perma.cc/MW6A-H4P6.

determination. So too does the NCPDP and California's Health and Welfare Code.
 And as mentioned above, the Seventh Circuit agrees, even explaining that the "'usual
 and customary' price requirement should not be frustrated by so flimsy a devise as [a
 pharmacy's] 'discount program.'" *Kmart*, 824 F. 3d at 645.

- 5
- 6

#### WALGREENS ILLEGALLY INFLATES ITS <u>''USUAL AND CUSTOMARY'' PRICE</u>

7 37. Although Walgreens sought to retain and attract cash-paying customers
8 by offering discounted prices on prescription generic drugs through the
9 implementation of the PSC program, it did not want to lose revenues by offering
10 those same discounted prices to customers using insurance to make their prescription
11 drug purchases.

12 38. Thus, under the guise that its PSC program was not available to the 13 general public, Walgreens unlawfully continued to report their previous higher "usual 14 and customary" prices to third-party payors. By reporting the artificially inflated 15 "usual and customary" prices to third-party payors, Walgreens was able to collect 16 artificially inflated copayments from consumers, as well as artificially inflated 17 residual amounts from third-party payors.

18 39. Walgreens knew that third-party payors calculate the price for 19 prescription drugs to be paid to the pharmacy based on whether the "usual and 20 customary" price submitted is less than or greater than the negotiated price between 21 Walgreens and the third-party payor. Walgreens also knew that if the "usual and 22 customary" price for a particular prescription drug is less than the negotiated price, 23 Walgreens could not charge third-party payors a drug price that was greater than the 24 "usual and customary" price. Walgreens' knowledge of these facts cannot be denied 25 given its prior ownership of WHI, who dealt extensively with this issue as Walgreens' 26 PBM.

40. Notwithstanding the knowledge garnered through its relationship with
WHI, Walgreens knew the prices it could charge to customers using insurance to

prescription medications from its dealings 1 purchase their and contractual 2 relationships with the third-party payors themselves. Indeed, third-party payors' pharmacy agreements and manuals state, in detail, how a plan participant's 3 copayment is determined. These agreements and manuals specifically contemplate a 4 situation where the "usual and customary" price is less than the negotiated amount, 5 and explicitly forbid Walgreens from charging a copayment in excess of the "usual 6 and customary" price under such circumstances. Walgreens is in possession of these 7 documents and is aware of their contents. Further, Walgreens' own transaction data 8 contain reimbursements adjudicated under the above formula and other rules imposed 9 by the third-party payors, all which reflect general industry standards. 10

41. Moreover, Walgreens need look no further than to its direct competitors,
such as Wal-Mart, Target, and Costco, who all, on information and belief, correctly
report the discounted prices offered through their respective prescription drug savings
programs as their "usual and customary" prices.

15 42. Walgreens tried to avoid their contractual obligations and accepted industry standards (not to mention federal and state law as they concern Medicare and 16 Medicaid and their state equivalents) by implementing the PSC program, and instead 17 of reporting the lower PSC Prices to third-party payors, knowingly and intentionally 18 reported false and inflated "usual and customary" prices. In doing so, Walgreens 19 created a new category of cash-paying customers—those purchasing prescription 20 generic medications through the PSC—while avoiding the lowering of drug prices 21 charged to third-party payors and their plan participants. 22

43. As previously explained, however, the PSC Prices for the cash-paying
customers are the actual "usual and customary" prices charged by Walgreens for the
prescription generic drugs on the PSC formulary. Nonetheless, Walgreens conceals
the PSC Prices from third-party payors, and instead of submitting the PSC Prices as
its "usual and customary," continues to submit the higher prices as its purported
"usual and customary" price to third-party payors.

44. Walgreens' scheme is made possible because third-party payors are not 1 2 privy to the prices Walgreens charges their cash-paying customers, including those 3 using the PSC program to purchase their prescription generic drugs. Thus, third-party payors have no way of determining on their own whether the price Walgreens 4 submits as its "usual and customary" price is actually the price offered to cash-paying 5 members of the general public, and therefore, are unaware that the price being 6 submitted by Walgreens is not the actual "usual and customary" price, but rather an 7 artificially inflated amount. 8

9 45. On information and belief, the majority of customers who purchase the
10 prescription generic drugs that are contained on the PSC formulary do so using the
11 PSC program, and thus, the majority of Walgreens' cash-paying customers pay the
12 PSC Prices for such drugs.

46. In failing to report the more common PSC Prices as its "usual and
customary" prices, Walgreens continues to report prices that are significantly higher
than the prices it offers to the general public.

47. Beginning in 2007, and continuing through the present, Walgreens has
reported to third-party payors artificially inflated "usual and customary" prices for the
same prescription generic drugs that Walgreens offers for lower prices under the PSC
program. Walgreens has thereby caused (and continues to cause) plan participants
(including Plaintiff and other Class members) to pay false and inflated copayments
for prescription generic drugs.

48. Importantly, the inflated "usual and customary" prices that Walgreens
reports to third-party payors do not vary based on any particular third-party plan. In
fact, for the same strength and quantity of a given drug, Walgreens reports the same
"usual and customary" prices to all third-party payors, despite any variations in their
respective plans.

49. As part of its scheme, Walgreens has reported "usual and customary"
prices for generic prescription drugs that more than double the "usual and customary"

prices reported by some of its most significant competitors and its own PSC Prices.
 The table below shows "usual and customary" prices submitted to California's
 Medicaid program for the purposes of claims adjudication.

4		Discounted Prices Near 92101 Zip Code (Downtown San Diego, CA) <sup>1</sup>					
	Drug	Vons	Walmart	Costco	Target	Walgreens	Walgreens (PSC) <sup>2</sup>
5	Carvedilol 6.25 mg 60 Tablets	\$10.40	\$11.37	\$12.50	\$14.38	\$28.55	\$10.00
6	Lisinopril 20 mg	\$7.94	\$6.84	\$7.92	\$8.58	\$14.00	\$5.00
7	30 Tablets	·····	<i>•</i>		7		
8	Lisinopril/HCTZ 20, 12.5 mg 30 Tablets	\$8.41	\$7.54	\$8.63	\$9.48	\$14.25	\$10.00
9	MetforminHCL 1,000 mg 60 Tablets	\$11.18	\$8.63	\$9.73	\$10.88	\$24.53	\$5.00
10 11	Metoprolol Tartrate 50 mg 60 Tablets	\$8.72	\$9.04	\$7.96	\$8.63	\$13.65	\$10.00
12 13	Warfarin Sodium 5 mg 30 Tablets	\$9.19	\$9.70	\$9.96	\$9.45	\$14.56	\$10.00
14	Fluoxetine HCL 20 mg 30 Capsules	\$11.52	\$9.69	\$11.74	\$13.09	\$23.50	\$5.00
15							

16 50. As demonstrated above, the "usual and customary" prices submitted by
17 Walgreens to third-party payors are undeniably and unlawfully inflated.

In fact, Walgreens highlights on its website the significant savings that
 members of PSC program receive – savings that are not available to those customers
 using insurance to purchase their prescription generic drugs.

Guaranteed savings. Risk-free membership.

If you don't save at least the cost of your prescription card membership fee in one year, we'll give you the difference.<sup>1</sup>

4				
5	Average Savings <sup>2</sup>	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
	Average Savings	(\$10)	(\$20)	(\$30)
6	90 day supply of a	222 22		
7	value-priced generic	\$50.41	\$52.54	\$118.08
8				
9				
10	Sample Savings	Without	With	Annual
10	Sample Savings	Membership	Membership	Savings
11	ELUTICA SONE Nacal Spray	\$42.00	\$15.00	\$324.00
12	FLUTICASONE Nasal Spray	\$42.00	\$15.00	\$324.00
14		¢ 47.00	C10.00	6440.00
13	LISINOPRIL Tablet	\$47.99	\$12.00	\$143.96

14 15

1

2

3

 $\Lambda$ 

52. But, since the PSC Prices are, in fact, the "usual and customary" prices
Walgreens charges, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class should have also
received these reduced prices when purchasing the prescription generic drugs at issue.

53. Walgreens does not inform customers who use their insurance benefits
to purchase generic prescription drugs (including Plaintiff and the other members of
the Class) that, for the drugs, the PSC Prices Walgreens charges cash-paying
customers, are lower than the copayments Walgreens charges. Walgreens either
wrongly conceals or omits such information by failing to tell customers using
insurance about the PSC program, or by misrepresenting to those customers that the
PSC program would not apply to their purchases.

54. On information and belief, there have been millions of instances where
Walgreens intentionally submitted fraudulently inflated "usual and customary"
pricing information to third-party payors in connection with prescription generic drug

purchases made by Plaintiff and other members of the Class during the class period, 1 including the specific transactions by Plaintiff described herein. 2

3

7

#### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 55. 4 23(b)(3), on behalf of himself and the following national Class and California state 5 Subclass: 6

<u>CLASS</u>

8 All persons or entities in the United States and its territories who, between January 2007 and the present ("Class Period"), paid for, in full or in part, 9 a prescription generic drug included on the PSC formulary and were insured for the purchase through a third-party payor. 10

- **SUBCLASS** 11
- All persons or entities in the state of California who, during the Class 12 Period, paid for, in full or in part, a prescription generic drug included on 13 the PSC formulary and were insured for the purchase through a third-party payor. 14
- The national Class and California state Subclass are collectively referred to 15 as the "Classes." 16
- 17

Excluded from the Classes are Walgreens, its officers, and directors. 56.

The Classes consist of at least hundreds of thousands, and likely 57. 18 millions, of individual Walgreens customers, making joinder impractical, in 19 satisfaction of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). The exact size of the Classes, and the 20 21 identities of the individual members thereof, are ascertainable through Walgreens' records, including, but not limited to, its billing and collection records. 22

23

58. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the Classes. The claims of Plaintiff and the Classes are based on the same legal theories and arise from the same unlawful 24 and willful conduct, resulting in the same injury to the Plaintiff and the Classes. 25

26 59. The Classes have a well-defined community of interest. Walgreens has acted and failed to act on grounds generally applicable to the Plaintiff and the 27 Classes, thus requiring the Court's imposition of uniform relief to ensure compatible 28

1 standards of conduct toward the Classes.

60. There are many questions of law and fact common to the claims of
Plaintiff and the Classes, and those questions predominate over any questions that
may affect only individual Class members within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P.
23(a)(2) and 23(b)(2).

6 61. Common questions of fact and law affecting members of the Classes
7 include, but are not limited to, the following:

8 (a) whether Walgreens artificially inflated the "usual and customary"
9 prices that it reported to third-party payors pursuant to the NCPDP reporting
10 standard;

(b) whether Walgreens omitted and concealed material facts from
their communications and disclosures with third-party payors and plan participants
regarding its pricing scheme;

(c) whether Walgreens has wrongfully overcharged and continues to
overcharge copayments to hundreds of thousands, and likely millions, of plan
participants (including Plaintiff and the Classes) who purchased a prescription
generic drug listed on Walgreens' PSC formulary at its pharmacies around the
country;

(d) whether Walgreens has engaged in, unfair methods of
competition, unconscionable acts or practices, and unfair or deceptive acts and/or
practices in connection with the pricing and sale of prescription generic drugs;

(e) whether, as a result of Walgreens' misconduct, Plaintiff and the
Classes have suffered damages, and, if so, the appropriate measure of damages to
which they are entitled; and

(f) whether, as a result of Walgreens' misconduct, Plaintiff and the
Classes are entitled to injunctive, equitable, and/or other relief, and, if so, the nature
of such relief.

62. Absent a class action, most of the members of the Classes would find the
 cost of litigating their claims to be prohibitive and will have no effective remedy.
 The class treatment of common questions of law and fact is also superior to multiple
 individual actions or piecemeal litigation in that it conserves the resources of the
 courts and the litigants and promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication.

6 63. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of
7 the Classes. Plaintiff has retained counsel with substantial experience in prosecuting
8 complex litigation and class actions. Plaintiff and her counsel are committed to
9 vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the other respective members of the
10 Classes, and have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiff nor her counsel
11 have any interests adverse to those of the other members of the Classes.

12

#### **TOLLING OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS**

64. Plaintiff and the other members of the Classes had neither actual nor
constructive knowledge of the facts constituting their claims for relief until recently.

15 65. Plaintiff and the other members of the Classes did not discover, and
16 could not have discovered through the exercise of reasonable diligence, the existence
17 of the unlawful conduct alleged herein until recently.

66. Walgreens engaged in a secret scheme that did not reveal facts that
would have put Plaintiff or the other members of the Classes on inquiry notice that
Walgreens was charging inflated prices for prescription generic drugs.

67. Because Walgreens' scheme was kept secret, Plaintiff and the other
members of the Classes were unaware of Walgreens' unlawful conduct alleged herein
and did not know that they were paying artificially inflated prices for prescription
generic drugs during the Class Period.

68. Walgreens actively concealed its PSC prescription generic drug pricing
scheme from the public, including Plaintiff and the other members of the Classes (and
third-party payors), and failed to disclose the material fact that the prices Walgreens
reported to third-party payors for the prescription generic drugs included on the PSC

formulary were far higher than the PSC Prices, and thus, not the actual "usual and 1 2 customary" prices for those drugs. Walgreens charged Plaintiff and the other members of the Classes copayments for the drugs they purchased that reflected 3 Walgreens' artificially inflated "usual and customary" prices. Walgreens also failed 4 to post drug prices in a clear manner and in a way that would alert Plaintiff and the 5 other members of the Classes to the artificially inflated prices charged by Walgreens. 6 Through its actions, Walgreens misled Plaintiff and the other members of the Classes 7 and caused them to pay to Walgreens inflated copayments for some of the most 8 commonly prescribed generic drugs. 9

69. Walgreens' affirmative acts alleged herein, including acts in furtherance
of its unlawful scheme, were wrongfully concealed and carried out in a manner that
precluded detection.

70. Walgreens' unlawful pricing scheme was inherently self-concealing
because it involved misrepresenting and falsely reporting the "usual and customary"
prices for some of the most commonly prescribed generic drugs. If Walgreens had
been open and notorious about its deceptive and unfair fraudulent pricing scheme, it
would never have succeeded.

71. Plaintiff and the other members of the Classes could not have discovered
the alleged unlawful activities at an earlier date by the exercise of reasonable
diligence because Walgreens employed deceptive practices and techniques of secrecy
to avoid detection of its activities. Walgreens concealed their activities by various
means and methods, including affirmative misrepresentations regarding the actual
"usual and customary" prices it charged for prescription generic drugs.

72. Because Walgreens affirmatively concealed its scheme, Plaintiff and the
other members of the Classes had no knowledge until recently of the alleged unlawful
activities or information which would have caused a reasonably diligent person to
investigate whether Walgreens committed the actionable activities detailed herein.

73. As a result of Walgreens' active concealment, the running of any statute
 of limitations has been tolled with respect to any claims that Plaintiff and the other
 members of the Classes have as a result of the unlawful conduct alleged in this
 Complaint.

#### COUNT I

5

6

7

### Against Defendants, on Behalf of the Subclass, for Violation of California Unfair Competition Law

8 74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every
9 allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

10 75. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of
11 the Subclass.

76. Plaintiff and other members of the Subclass are "persons" within the
 meaning of Cal. Bus. Prof. Code §17204.

<sup>14</sup> 77. Walgreens has unfairly obtained monies from Plaintiff and the other
<sup>15</sup> members of the Subclass through Walgreens': (i) unlawful business acts and/or
<sup>16</sup> practices; (ii) unfair business acts and/or practices; and (iii) unfair, deceptive, untrue
<sup>17</sup> and/or misleading advertising (including violations of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code
<sup>18</sup> §17500, *et. seq.*), including, among other things:

(a) reporting to insurance companies, and state and federal health
 (a) care entities fraudulent "usual and customary" prices for hundreds of generic
 (b) prescription drugs;

(b) misrepresenting to insurance companies and state and federal
 health care entities, Plaintiff, and the Subclass that the "usual and customary" price
 was greater than their copayments;

(c) concealing from Plaintiff and the Subclass the true "usual and
 customary" prices of generic prescription drugs; and

(d) wrongfully obtaining monies from Plaintiff and the Subclass as a
 result of Walgreens' deception.

- 20 -

78. Walgreens willfully engaged in the unfair and/or deceptive acts and/or 1 practices described above and knew or should have known that those acts and/or 2 practices were unfair and/or deceptive. 3

4

79. The facts which Walgreen misrepresented and/or concealed, as alleged in the preceding paragraphs, were material to Plaintiff and the Subclass' decisions 5 about whether to purchase generic prescription drugs from Walgreens, in that 6 Plaintiff and the Subclass would not have purchased generic prescription drugs from 7 Walgreens for more than the PSC Prices but for Walgreens' unfair and/or deceptive 8 acts and/or practices. 9

80. As a direct and proximate result of Walgreens' unfair and deceptive acts 10 and/or practices, Plaintiff and the Subclass were deceived into paying falsely inflated 11 prices for generic prescription drugs and have been damaged thereby. 12

Walgreens are therefore liable to Plaintiff and the Subclass for the 13 81. damages they sustained, plus statutory damages, penalties, costs, and reasonable 14 15 attorneys' fees to the extent provided by law.

- 16
- 17

18

### Against Defendants, on Behalf of the Subclass, for Violation of California Consumer Legal Remedies Act

<u>COUNT II</u>

19 82. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every 20 allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

21 83. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of 22 the Subclass.

23

Plaintiff and other members of the Subclass are "consumers" within the 24 84. 25 meaning of Cal. Civ. Code §1761(d).

26 The generic prescription drugs that Plaintiff and other members of the 85. 27 Subclass purchased from Walgreens are "goods" within the meaning of Cal. Civ. 28 Code §1761(a).

1

86. Plaintiff and the other members of the Subclass" purchases were "transactions" within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code §1761(e).

2 3

87. Walgreens is a "person" within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code §1770(a).

88. Plaintiff and the other members of the Subclass have been damaged by
Walgreens' unfair methods of competition, and/or unfair and/or deceptive practices,
in violation of Cal. Civ. Code §1770(a), *et. seq.*, which occurred in connection with
transactions which resulted in Class members' purchase of goods. These unfair
methods of competition, and/or unfair and/or deceptive practices, included, among
other things:

(a) reporting to insurance companies and state and federal health
care entities fraudulent "usual and customary" prices for hundreds of generic
prescription drugs;

(b) misrepresenting to insurance companies, state and federal health
care entities, Plaintiff, and the Subclass that the "usual and customary" price was
greater than their copayments;

(c) concealing from Plaintiff and the Subclass the true "usual and
 customary" prices of generic prescription drugs; and

(d) wrongfully obtaining monies from Plaintiff and the Subclass as a
result of Walgreens' deception.

89. Walgreens willfully engaged in the unfair and/or deceptive acts and/or
practices described above and knew or should have known that those acts and/or
practices were unfair and/or deceptive.

90. Pursuant to §1782 of the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act, on
May 26, 2017, Plaintiff sent Walgreens in writing by certified mail notification of the
particular violations of §1770 described above and requested that Defendants rectify
their practices described above and give notice to all affected consumer of their intent
to so act.

91. The facts which Walgreens misrepresented and/or concealed, as alleged 1 in the preceding paragraphs, were material to Plaintiff and the Subclass' decisions 2 about whether to purchase generic prescription drugs from Walgreens, in that 3 Plaintiff and the Subclass would not have purchased generic prescription drugs from 4 Walgreens for more than the PSC Prices but for Walgreens' unfair and/or deceptive 5 acts and/or practices. 6

92. As a direct and proximate result of Walgreens' acts described above, 7 Plaintiff and the other members of the Subclass paid more for Walgreens' products 8 than they would have and/or purchased products they would not have purchased but 9 for Walgreens' deceptive conduct. Plaintiff and the other members of the Subclass 10 therefore seek injunctive relief pursuant to §1782(d) of the Act, to enjoin Walgreens' 11 ongoing wrongful acts described herein. 12

13

14

# **COUNT III**

Against Defendants, on Behalf of the Class and Subclass, for Unjust Enrichment 15 93. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein. 16

94. By means of Walgreens' wrongful conduct alleged herein, Walgreens 17 knowingly charge plan participants artificially high copayments for generic 18 prescription drugs included in the PSC program in a manner that is unfair and 19 unconscionable. 20

21 95. Walgreens knowingly received and retained wrongful benefits and funds from Plaintiff and the Class and Subclass. In so doing, Walgreens acted with 22 23 conscious disregard for the rights of Plaintiff and the Class and Subclass.

As a result of Walgreens wrongful conduct as alleged herein, Walgreens 96. 24 has been unjustly enriched at the expense of, and to the detriment of, Plaintiff and the 25 Class and Subclass. 26

Walgreens' unjust enrichment is traceable to, and resulted directly and 97. 27 proximately from, the conduct alleged herein. 28

98. Under the common law doctrine of unjust enrichment, it is inequitable
 for Walgreens to be permitted to retain the benefits it received, and are still receiving,
 without justification, from the imposition of artificially inflated prices on Plaintiff and
 the Class and Subclass in an unfair and unconscionable manner. Walgreens' retention
 of such funds under circumstances making it inequitable to do so constitutes unjust
 enrichment.

99. Plaintiff and the Class and Subclass did not confer these benefits
officiously or gratuitously, and it would be inequitable and unjust for Walgreens to
retain these wrongfully obtained proceeds.

100. Walgreens are therefore liable to Plaintiff and the Class and Subclass for
 restitution in the amount of Walgreens' wrongfully obtained profits.

12

13

# 14

### Against Defendants on Behalf of the Class and Subclass for Negligent Misrepresentation

**COUNT IV** 

15 101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every
 16 allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

17 102. Under the circumstances alleged, Walgreens owed a duty to Plaintiff and
18 the Class and Subclass to provide them with accurate information regarding the prices
19 of its generic prescription drugs.

103. Walgreens misrepresented and/or concealed the true "usual and
 customary" prices of generic prescription drugs that are included in the PSC program.
 Walgreens made such misrepresentations by reporting artificially inflated "usual and
 customary" prices for such drugs to third-party payors.

104. Walgreens had no reasonable grounds to believe that these
misrepresentations and/or omissions were true. The prices that Walgreens reported to
third-party payors were substantially (and unjustifiably) higher than the prices they
charged under its PSC program to cash-paying customers.

1 105. Walgreens intended to induce Plaintiff and the Class and Subclass to rely
 2 on its misrepresentations and/or omissions. Walgreens knew that Plaintiff and the
 3 Class and Subclass would rely on its misrepresentations and/or omissions regarding
 4 "usual and customary" prices and, as a result, would pay copayments higher than the
 5 actual "usual and customary" prices for those generic prescription drugs.

106. Plaintiff and the Class and Subclass justifiably relied upon Walgreens'
misrepresentations and/or omissions in that Plaintiff and the Class and Subclass
would not have purchased generic prescription drugs from Walgreens for more than
the PSC Prices but for Walgreens' misrepresentations and/or omissions. Plaintiff and
the Class and Subclass' reliance on Walgreens' misrepresentations and/or omissions
was, thus, to their detriment.

107. As a proximate result of Walgreens' negligent conduct, Plaintiff and the
Class and Subclass have been damaged because they paid copayments for generic
prescription drugs that were far higher than the prices they would have paid but for
Walgreens' misconduct.

16 108. Walgreens are therefore liable to Plaintiff and the Class and Subclass for17 the damages they sustained.

18

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Walgreens, and request asfollows:

A. That all Class members are owed at least the difference between their
paid copayments and the "usual and customary" price offered to the general public for
all prescriptions purchased during the life of the PSC program;

B. That the Court certify this action as a class action, proper and
maintainable pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and
declare that Plaintiff is a proper Class representative;

C. That the Court grant permanent injunctive relief to prohibit Walgreens
from continuing to engage in the unlawful acts, omissions, and practices described

1 herein;

D. That the Court award compensatory, consequential, and general damages
in an amount to be determined at trial;

E. That the Court order disgorgement and restitution of all earnings, profits,
compensation, and benefits received by Walgreens as a result of its unlawful acts,
omissions, and practices;

F. That the Court award statutory treble damages, and punitive or
8 exemplary damages, to the extent permitted by law;

G. That the unlawful acts alleged in this Complaint be adjudge and decreed
to be a violation of the unfair and deceptive business acts and practices in violation of
the California Unfair Competition Law, and California Consumer Legal Remedies
Act;

H. That the Court award to Plaintiff the costs and disbursements of the
action, along with reasonable attorneys' fees;

I. That the Court award pre- and post-judgment interest at the maximum
legal rate; and

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

JURY DEMAND

That the Court grant all such other relief as it deems just and proper.

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

<sup>20</sup> Dated: May 26, 2017

J.

ROBBINS ARROYO LLP GEORGE C. AGUILAR GREGORY E. DEL GAIZO STEVEN M. MCKANY

Facsimile: (619) 525-3991

- /s/George C. Aguilar GEORGE C. AGUILAR 600 B Street, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 525-3990
- 26 -

# Case 3:17-cv-01089-AJB-JMA Document 1 Filed 05/26/17 PageID.28 Page 28 of 28

1	
	E-mail: gaguilar@robbinsarroyo.com
2	gdelgaizo@robbinsarroyo.com smckany@robbinsarroyo.com
3	ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
4	& DOWD LLP
5	DAVID W. MITCHELL BRIAN O. O'MARA
6	ARTHUR L. SHINGLER III 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
7	San Diego, CA 92101
8	Telephone: (619) 231-1058 Facsimile: (619) 231-7423
9	davidm@rgrdlaw.com bomara@rgrdlaw.com
10	ashingler@rgrdlaw.com
11	ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
12	& DOWD LLP MARK J. DEARMAN
13	STUART A. DAVIDSON JASON H. ALPERSTEIN
14	120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500
15	Boca Raton, FL 33432 Telephone: (561) 750-3000
16	Facsimile: (561) 750-3364 mdearman@rgrdlaw.com
17	sdavidson@rgrdlaw.com
18	jalperstein@rgrdlaw.com
19	Attorneys for Plaintiff
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 25	
26	1149427
27	
28	
	- 27 -

#### Case 3:17-cv-01089-AJB-JMA Document 1-1 Filed 05/26/17 PageID.29 Page 1 of 2 **CIVIL COVER SHEET** JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

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 Dawn Cobbs, Individually	DEFENDANTS Walgreen Co. and Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc.					
(b) County of Residence o	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant <u>Lake County, IL</u> (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attomeys (Firm Name, Robbins Arroyo LLP 600 B Street, Suite 1900 (619) 525-3990		Attorneys (If Known)	OF LAND I		9 AJB JMA	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	1 U.S. Government			TF DEF	Incorporated or P of Business In	
2 U.S. Government Defendant				of Business In A		Another State
	<u></u>		en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	(Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	F	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<ul> <li>I10 Insurance</li> <li>I20 Marine</li> <li>I30 Miller Act</li> <li>I40 Negotiable Instrument</li> <li>I50 Recovery of Overpayment &amp; Enforcement of Judgment</li> <li>I51 Medicare Act</li> <li>I52 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)</li> <li>I53 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits</li> <li>I60 Stockholders' Suits</li> <li>I90 Other Contract</li> <li>I95 Contract Product Liability</li> <li>I96 Franchise</li> <li>Real PROPERTY</li> <li>210 Land Condemnation</li> <li>220 Foreclosure</li> <li>230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul>	PERSONAL INJURY     PERSONAL INJURY       310 Airplane     365 Personal Injun       315 Airplane Product     Product Liab       Liability     367 Health Care/       320 Assault, Libel &     Pharmaceutici	URY   62 y - lity   69 ity   69 ity   69 ity   70 PERTY   71 ing   72 l age   72 i 72   79   79   79   79   76   74   76   76	S Drug Related Seizure     of Property 21 USC 881     Other     LABOR     Fair Labor Standards     Act     Labor/Management     Relations     Railway Labor Act     Family and Medical     Leave Act     Other Labor Litigation     I Employee Retirement     Income Security Act     IMMIG RATION     Naturalization Application     S Other Immigration     Actions	□ 422 Appe □ 423 With 28 U ■ 820 Copy □ 830 Pater □ 840 Trad ■ 861 HIA □ 862 Blacl □ 863 DIW □ 864 SSIE □ 865 RSI ( ■ 870 Taxe or D ■ 871 IRS-	eal 28 USC 158 ddrawal JSC 157 <b>RTY RIGHTS</b> vrights at emark <u>SECURITY</u> (1395ff) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	<ul> <li>375 False Claims Act</li> <li>400 State Reapportionment</li> <li>410 Antitrust</li> <li>430 Banks and Banking</li> <li>450 Commerce</li> <li>460 Deportation</li> <li>470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations</li> <li>480 Consumer Credit</li> <li>490 Cable/Sat TV</li> <li>850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange</li> <li>890 Other Statutory Actions</li> <li>891 Agricultural Acts</li> <li>895 Freedom of Information Act</li> <li>896 Arbitration</li> <li>896 Arbitration</li> <li>899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision</li> <li>950 Constitutionality of State Statutes</li> </ul>
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in		<b>_</b>				<u> </u>
	noved from I 3 Remanded from te Court Appellate Court	□ 4 Reins Reop		rred from r District	6 Multidistr Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIC	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which yo Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S Brief description of cause: Consumer Class Action Complain	.C. §1332(	o not cite jurisdictional stati	utes unless div	versity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTI UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	ON DI	EMAND \$		HECK YES only URY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: X Yes D No
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 05/26/2017	SIGNATURE OF S/George C.		FRECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY       RECEIPT #   AM	IOUNT APPLYING IF	Р	JUDGE		MAG. JUI	DGE

#### 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

- 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 the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

cases.)

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. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- 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.