

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION**

**WILVIN MATEO-HERNANDEZ, on behalf of himself
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. :

POMEROY IT SOLUTIONS SALES COMPANY, INC.

Defendant

_____ /

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, WILVIN MATEO-HERNANDEZ, by and through his attorneys, and on behalf of himself, the Putative Class set forth below, and in the public interest, brings the following Class Action Complaint as of right against Defendant, POMEROY IT SOLUTIONS SALES COMPANY, INC. including, subsidiaries, divisions and affiliates (“Defendant or Pomeroy”), under the Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970, as amended (“FCRA”), 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Defendant provides businesses with IT support including integration and expertise from analyzing needs to managing IT infrastructure.

2. Defendant routinely obtains and uses information in consumer reports to conduct background checks on prospective employees and existing employees, and frequently relies on such information, in whole or in part, as a basis for adverse employment action, such as termination, reduction of hours, change in position, failure to hire, and failure to promote.

3. The FCRA, 15 U.S.C. §1681b, makes it presumptively unlawful to obtain and use a “consumer report” for an employment purpose. Such use becomes lawful if and only if the “user” – in this case Defendant – has complied with the statute’s strict disclosure and authorization requirements. 15 U.S.C. §1681(b)(2).

4. Defendant willfully violated these requirements in multiple ways, in systematic violation of Plaintiff’s rights and the rights of other putative class members.

5. Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i) by procuring consumer reports on Plaintiff and other putative class members for employment purposes, without first making proper disclosures in the format required by the statute. Under this subsection of the FCRA, Defendant is required to disclose to its applicants and employees – *in a document that consists solely of the disclosure* – that they may obtain a consumer report on them for employment purposes, prior to obtaining a copy of their consumer report. *Id.* Defendant willfully violated this requirement by failing to provide Plaintiff with a copy of a document that consists solely of the disclosure that it may obtain a consumer report on him for employment purposes, prior to obtaining a copy of his consumer report.

6. Defendant also violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(ii) by obtaining consumer reports on Plaintiff and other putative class members without proper authorization, due to the fact that its disclosure forms fail to comply with the requirements of the FCRA.

7. Based on the foregoing violations, Plaintiff asserts FCRA claims against Defendant on behalf of himself and the class consisting of Defendant’s employees, and prospective employees.

8. In Counts One and Two, Plaintiff asserts a FCRA claim under 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i)-(ii) on behalf of a “Background Check Class” consisting of:

All Pomeroy IT Solutions, Inc. employees and job applicants in the United States who were the subject of a consumer report that was procured by Pomeroy within five years of the filing of this complaint through the date of final judgment in this action as required by 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2)(A).

9. On behalf of himself and the Putative Class, Plaintiff seeks statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees, equitable relief, and other appropriate relief under the FCRA.

THE PARTIES

10. Individual and representative Plaintiff, Wilvin Mateo-Hernandez ("Plaintiff") lives in Florida, was formerly employed by Defendant and is a member of the Putative Class defined below.

11. Defendant is a corporation and user of consumer reports as contemplated by the FCRA, at 15 U.S.C. §1681b.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12. This Court has federal question jurisdiction under the FCRA, 15 U.S.C. § 1681p, and 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and venue is proper because Defendant regularly sells products and services in this District.

ALLEGATIONS REGARDING DEFENDANTS' BUSINESS PRACTICES

Background Checks

13. Defendant conducts background checks on many of its job applicants as part of a standard screening process. In addition, Defendant also conduct background checks on existing employees from time-to-time during the course of their employment.

14. Defendant does not perform these background checks in-house. Rather, Defendant relies on an outside consumer reporting firm to obtain this information and report it to the Defendant. These reports constitute "consumer reports" for purposes of the FCRA.

FCRA Violations Relating to Background Check Class

15. Defendant procured a consumer report information on Plaintiff in violation of the FCRA.

16. Under the FCRA, it is unlawful to procure a consumer report or cause a consumer report to be procured for employment purposes, unless:

- (i) a clear and conspicuous disclosure has been made in writing to the consumer at any time before the report is procured or caused to be procured, ***in a document that consists solely of the disclosure***, that a consumer report may be obtained for employment purposes; and
- (ii) the consumer has authorized in writing (which authorization may be made on the document referred to in clause (i)) the procurement of the report.

15 U.S.C. §§ 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i)-(ii) (emphasis added).

17. Defendant failed to satisfy these disclosure and authorization requirements.

18. Defendant did not have a stand-alone FCRA disclosure or authorization form. The FCRA requires that a disclosure not contain extraneous information. This is commonly referred to as the “stand alone disclosure” requirement.

19. The FCRA also contains several other notice provisions, such as 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(a) (pre-adverse action); § 1681b(4)(B)(notice of national security investigation); § 1681c(h) (notification of address discrepancy); § 1681(g) (full file disclosure to consumers); § 1681k(a)(1) (disclosure regarding use of public record information); § 1681h (form and conditions of disclosure; and §1681(m)(a) (notice of adverse action).

20. The purpose of FCRA notice provisions, including 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i), is to put consumers on notice that a consumer report may be prepared. This gives consumers the opportunity to exercise substantive rights conferred by the FCRA or other statutes, allowing consumers the opportunity to ensure accuracy, confidentiality and fairness.

21. Without clear notice that a consumer report is going to be procured, applicants and employees are deprived of the opportunity to make informed decisions or otherwise assert protected rights.

22. Using a FCRA disclosure that is not “stand alone” violates the plain language of the statute, and flies in the face of unambiguous case law and regulatory guidance from the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”). *Jones v Halstead Mgmt. Co.*, LLC, 81 F. Supp. 3d 324, 333 (S.D.N.Y. 2015)(disclosure not “stand alone” when it contains extraneous information such as state specific disclosures); *Moore v. Rite Aid Hdqtrs. Corp.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS, at *35 (E.D. Pa. May 29, 2015)(“The text of the statute and available agency guidance demonstrate that the inclusion of information on the form apart from the disclosure and related authorization violates § 1681b(b)(2)(a).”)

23. Defendant’s background *Release Authorization* form required applicants and employees to waive federal and state privacy rights. For example, information from an educational institution cannot be disclosed unless consent is received from the student. *See Family Educational Rights & Privacy Act*, 20 U.S.C. § 1232(g); 34 CFR Part 99. Similarly, covered financial institutions are required to maintain the security of banking and financial information. *See Gramm-Leach Bliley Act*, 15 U.S.C. §§ 6801-6809.

24. Along similar lines, many states have data privacy laws that restrict the disclosure of the information in their possession. *See, e.g.* Russom, Mirian B., Robert H. Sloan and Richard Warner, *Legal Concepts Meet Technology, A 50 State Survey of Data Privacy Laws* (2011) (available at <https://acsac.org/2011/workshops/gtip/p-Russo.pdf>).

25. Defendant knowingly and recklessly disregarded case law and regulatory guidance and willfully violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681b(b)(2)(A) by procuring consumer report

information on employees without complying with the disclosure and authorization requirements of the statute. Defendant's violations were willful because Defendant knew they were required to use a stand-alone disclosure form prior to obtaining and using a consumer report on the Putative Class members.

26. Defendant's conduct is also willful because:

- a. Defendant is a large and sophisticated employer with access to legal advice through its own attorneys and there is no evidence it determined its own conduct was lawful;
- b. Defendant knew or had reason to know that its conduct was inconsistent with published FCRA guidance interpreting the FCRA, case law and the plain language of the statute;
- c. Defendant voluntarily ran a risk of violating the law substantially greater than the risk associated with a reading that was merely careless;

27. Defendant acted in a deliberate or reckless disregard of its obligations and the rights of Plaintiff and other Background Check class members. Defendant knew or should have known about its legal obligations under the FCRA, as evidenced by the multiple references to the FCRA in Defendants' own documents. These obligations are well established in the plain language of the FCRA, in promulgations of the FTC and in established case law. Defendant had access to materials and resources advising them of their duties under the FCRA. Any reasonable employer of Defendants size and sophistication knows or should know about FCRA compliance requirements.

ALLEGATIONS SPECIFIC TO PLAINTIFF

28. Plaintiff applied for employment with Defendant as an IT Field Service Tech.

29. As part of the hiring process, Plaintiff was provided and executed forms titled *Release Authorization* and *Notice and Disclosure* on or around October 19, 2016.

30. The *Release Authorization* and *Notice and Disclosure* forms did not contain a clear, stand-alone FCRA disclosure.

31. Plaintiff was confused by the extraneous language contained in *Release Authorization* and *Notice and Disclosure* forms. For example, Plaintiff was confused about his rights, the identity of the organization digging into his personal, confidential private information and the nature of the information the Company or its unidentified agents planned to access.

32. Plaintiff was distracted by the extraneous language contained in the forms, which included inapplicable information about various state laws.

33. Plaintiff values and guards his right to privacy. Plaintiff would not have authorized Defendant to procure a consumer report on him for employment purposes if he was aware the *Release Authorization* and *Notice and Disclosure* forms were unlawful.

34. Subsequently, Defendant procured a consumer report on Plaintiff. It was unlawful for Defendant to procure a consumer report on Plaintiff without making the disclosures required by the FCRA. Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i) by procuring consumer reports on Plaintiff and other putative class members for employment purposes, without first making proper disclosures in the format required by the statute.

35. Defendant failed to satisfy the FCRA requirements pertaining to the disclosure and authorization when it procured Plaintiff's consumer report without making the proper disclosures. Consequently, Plaintiff's authorization was obtained unlawfully and was therefore invalid.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

36. Plaintiff asserts claims under Counts 1 and 2 of this Complaint on behalf of a Putative Background Check Class defined as follows:

All Pomeroy IT Solutions, Inc. employees and job applicants in the United States who were the subject of a consumer report that was procured by Pomeroy within five years of the filing of this complaint through the date of final judgment in this action as required by the FCRA.

37. Numerosity: The members of the Putative Class are so numerous that joinder of all Class members is impracticable. Defendant regularly obtains and uses information in consumer reports to conduct background checks on prospective employees and existing employees, and frequently relies on such information, in whole or in part, in the hiring process. Plaintiff is informed and believes that during the relevant time period, thousands of Defendant's employees and prospective employees satisfy the definition of the Putative Class.

38. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of the members of the Putative Class. Defendant typically uses consumer reports to conduct background checks on employees and prospective employees. The FCRA violations suffered by Plaintiff are typical of those suffered by other Putative Class members, and Defendant treated Plaintiff consistent with other Putative Class members in accordance with its standard policies and practices.

39. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Putative Class, and has retained counsel experienced in complex class action litigation.

40. Commonality: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Putative Class, and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual members of the Putative Class. These common questions include, but are not limited to:

- a. Whether Defendant uses consumer report information to conduct background checks on employees and prospective employees;
- b. Whether Defendant violated the FCRA by procuring consumer report information without making proper disclosures in the format required by the statute;

- c. Whether Defendant violated the FCRA by procuring consumer report information based on invalid authorizations;
- d. Whether Defendant's violation of the FCRA was willful;
- e. The proper measure of statutory damages; and
- f. The proper form of injunctive and declaratory relief.

41. This case is maintainable as a class action because prosecution of actions by or against individual members of the Putative Class would result in inconsistent or varying adjudications and create the risk of incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendant. Further, adjudication of each individual Class member's claim as separate action would potentially be dispositive of the interest of other individuals not a party to such action, thereby impeding their ability to protect their interests.

42. This case is also maintainable as a class action because Defendant acted or refused to act on grounds that apply generally to the Putative Class, so that final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief is appropriate with respect to the Class as a whole.

43. Class certification is also appropriate because questions of law and fact common to the Putative Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Putative Class, and also because a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation. Defendant's conduct, which is described in this Complaint, stems from common and uniform policies and practices, resulting in common violations of the FCRA. Members of the Putative Class do not have an interest in pursuing separate actions against the Defendant, as the amount of each Class member's individual claim for damages is small in comparison to the expense and burden of individual prosecution. Class certification will also obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation that might result in inconsistent judgments concerning Defendant's practices.

Moreover, management of this action as a class action will not present any foreseeable difficulties. In the interests of justice and judicial efficiency, it would be desirable to concentrate the litigation of all Putative Class members' claims in a single action, brought in a single forum.

44. Plaintiff intends to send notice to all members of the Putative Class to the extent required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The names and addresses of the Putative Class members are readily available from Defendant's records.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Failure to Make Proper Disclosure in Violation of FCRA
15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i)

45. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs 1-44.

46. In violation of the FCRA, the background *Release Authorization and notice and disclosure* form Defendant required the Background Check Class to complete as a condition of its employment with Defendant does not satisfy the disclosure requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i) because Defendant failed to provide a stand-alone document as to the consumer report information being obtained and utilized. Furthermore, the background check document provided by Defendant included waivers of rights afforded by state and federal statutes, which violates the FCRA.

Plaintiffs' First Concrete Injury under § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i): Informational Injury

47. Plaintiff suffered a concrete informational injury because Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with information to which he was entitled to by statute, namely a stand-alone FCRA disclosure form. Through the FCRA, Congress created a new right – the right to receive the required disclosure as set out in the FCRA – and a new injury – not receiving a stand-alone

disclosure. *Church v. Accretive Heath, Inc.*, 0216 U.S. App. Lexis 12414, *1 (11th Cir. July 6, 2016), *3, n. 2 (rejecting Defendant’s argument that a plaintiff “cannot satisfy the demands of Article III standing by alleging a bare procedural violation,” the Court stated “This statement is inapplicable to the allegations at hand, because Church has not alleged a procedural violation. Rather, Congress provided Church with a substantive right to receive certain disclosures and Church has alleged that Accretive Health violated that substantive right.”); *Graham v. Pyramid Healthcare Solutions, Inc.*, Case No.: 16-cv-01324 (M.D. Fla. October 26, 2016) (Moody, J.)(denying Defendant’s motion to dismiss on standing noting “In sum, Plaintiff’s standing was established when Plaintiff alleged Defendant procured a consumer report on her background without following the FCRA’s disclosure and authorization requirements”); *Moody v. Ascenda USA Inc.*, Case No.: 16-cv-60364 (S.D. Fla. October 5, 2016) (Dimitrouleas, W.)(denying Defendant’s motion to dismiss plaintiffs’ claims pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2) noting “Plaintiffs sufficiently alleged a concrete and particularized injury and thus have standing to sue pursuant to *Spokeo*”); *Thomas v. FTS USA*, 2016 WL 3653878, at *8 (E.D. Va. Jun. 30, 2016)(holding that “it was Congress’ judgment, as clearly expressed in §§ 1681b(b)(2) ... to afford consumers rights to information and privacy,” and thus that “the rights created by §§ 1681b(b)(2) are substantive rights.”)

48. Pursuant to § 1681(b)(2), Plaintiff was entitled to receive certain information at a specific time, namely a disclosure that a consumer report may be procured for employment purposes in a document consisting solely of the disclosure. Such a disclosure was required to be provided to Plaintiff before the consumer report was to be procured. By depriving Plaintiff of this information, in the form and at the time he was entitled to receive it, Defendant injured Plaintiff and the putative class members he seeks to represent. *Public Citizen v. U.S. Department*

of Justice, 491 U.S. 440, 449 (1989); *Federal Election Commission v. Atkins*, 524 U.S. 11 (1998).

49. Defendant violated the FCRA by procuring consumer reports on Plaintiff and other Background Check Class members without first making proper disclosures in the format required by 15 U.S.C. § 1681(b)(2)(A)(i). Namely, these disclosures had to be made: (1) before Defendant actually procured consumer reports, and (2) in a stand-alone document, clearly informing Plaintiff and other Background Check Class members that Defendant might procure a consumer report on each of them for purposes of employment. The required disclosures were not made, causing Plaintiff an informational injury. *Moody v. Ascenda USA Inc.*, Case No.: 16-cv-60364 (S.D. Fla. October 5, 2016); *Thomas v. FTS USA*, 2016 WL 3653878, at *8 (E.D. Va. Jun. 30, 2016).

50. Defendant's failure to provide Plaintiff and the Putative Class with a lawful disclosure created a risk of harm that Plaintiff and members of the Putative Class would be confused and distracted by the extraneous language.

Plaintiff's Second Concrete Injury under § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i): Invasion of Privacy

51. Defendant invaded Plaintiff's right to privacy. Under the FCRA, "a person may not procure a consumer report, or cause a consumer report to be procured, for employment purposes with respect to any consumer, unless" it complies with the statutory requirements (*i.e.*, disclosure and authorization) set forth in the following subsections: 15 U.S.C. §1681b(b)(2). As one court put it, "[t]he FCRA makes it unlawful to 'procure' a report without first providing the proper disclosure and receiving the consumer's written authorization." *Harris v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.* F. Supp. 3d 868, 869 (N.D.Cal.2015).

52. The FCRA created a statutory cause of action akin to invasions of privacy and

intrusions upon seclusion, harms recognized as providing the basis for lawsuits under English and American law. Defendant invaded Plaintiff's privacy and intruded upon Plaintiff's seclusion by procuring a consumer report on him and viewing his private and personal information without lawful authorization. *Perry v. Cable News Network, Inc.*, No-16-13031, (11th Cir., April 27, 2017)(Violation of statutory right that has a close relationship to a harm traditionally recognized in English or American law is a concrete harm for purposes of Art. III standing).

53. The forgoing violations were willful. At the time Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. §1681b(b)(2)(A)(i) Defendant knew they were required to provide a stand-alone form (separate from the employment application) prior to obtaining and then utilizing a consumer report on Plaintiff and the Putative Class. A plethora of authority, including both case law and FTC opinions, existed at the time of Defendant's violations on this very issue that held waivers cannot be included in the FCRA forms at issue. Defendant's willful conduct is also reflected by, among other things, the following facts:

- a. Defendant knew of potential FCRA liability (which is precisely why it tried to avoid it);
- b. Defendant is a large corporation with access to legal advice through its own general counsel's office and outside employment counsel, and there is not contemporaneous evidence that it determined that its conduct was lawful;
- c. Defendant knew or had reason to know that their conduct was inconsistent with published FTC guidance interpreting the FCRA and the plain language of the statute; and
- d. Defendant voluntarily ran a risk of violating the law substantially greater than the risk associated with a reading that was merely careless.

54. Plaintiff and the Background Check Class are entitled to statutory damages of not less than one hundred dollars (\$100) and not more than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each and every one of these violations under 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(1)(A), in addition to punitive

damages under 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(2).

55. Plaintiff and the Background Check Class are further entitled to recover their costs and attorneys' fees, in accordance with 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(3).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Putative Class, prays for relief as follows:

- a. Determining that this action may proceed as a class action;
- b. Designating Plaintiff as class representative and designating Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the Putative Class;
- c. Issuing proper notice to the Putative Class at Defendants' expense;
- d. Declaring that Defendant committed multiple, separate violations of the FCRA;
- e. Declaring that Defendant acted willfully in deliberate or reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and its obligations under the FCRA;
- f. Awarding statutory damages as provided by the FCRA, including punitive damages, to members of the Putative Class;
- g. Awarding reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as provided by the FCRA;
- h. Granting other and further relief, in law or equity, as this Court may deem appropriate and just.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

**Failure to Obtain Proper Authorization in Violation of FCRA
15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(ii)**

56. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs 1-44.

57. Defendant violated the FCRA by procuring consumer reports relating to Plaintiff and other Background Check Class members without proper authorization.

58. The authorization requirement under 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(ii) follows the disclosure requirement of § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(i) and presupposes that the authorization is based upon a valid disclosure. “After all, one cannot meaningfully authorize her employer to take an action if she does not grasp what that action entails.” *Burghy v. Dayton Racquet Club, Inc.*, 695 F. Supp. 2d 689, 699 (S.D. Ohio 2010); *see also United States v. DeFries*, 129 F. 3d 1293, 1307 (D.C. Cir. 1997)(“[A]uthorization secured ‘without disclosure of ...material information’ is a nullity.”)

Plaintiffs’ First Concrete Injury under § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(ii): Informational Injury

59. Plaintiff suffered a concrete informational injury because Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with information to which he was entitled to by statute, namely a stand-alone FCRA disclosure form. Thus, through the FCRA, Congress has created a new right—the right to receive the required disclosure as set out in the FCRA—and a new injury—not receiving a stand-alone disclosure. *Church v. Accretive Health, Inc.*, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 12414, *1 (11th Cir. July 6, 2016); *Moody v. Ascenda USA Inc.*, Case No.: 16-cv-60364 (S.D. Fla. October 5, 2015). *Thomas v. FTS USA*, 2016 WL 3653878, at *8 (E.D. Va. Jun. 30, 2016).

60. Pursuant to § 1681 (b)(b)(2), Plaintiff was entitled to receive certain information at a specific time, namely a disclosure that a consumer report may be procured for employment purposes in a document consisting solely of the disclosure. Such a disclosure was required to be provided to Plaintiff before the consumer report was to be procured. By depriving Plaintiff of this information, Defendant injured Plaintiff and the putative class members he seeks to represent. *Public Citizen v. U.S. Department of Justice*, 491 U.S. 440, 449 (1989); *Federal Election Commission v. Akins*, 524 U.S. 11 (1998) Then 15 U.S.C. §1681b(b)(2)(A)(ii).

61. Defendant violated the FCRA by procuring consumer reports on Plaintiff and other Background Check Class members without first making proper disclosures in the format

required by 15 U.S.C. §1681b(B)(2)(A)(i). Namely, these disclosures had to be made: (1) before Defendant actually procured consumer reports, and (2) in a stand-alone document, clearly informing Plaintiff and other Background Check Class members that Defendant might procure a consumer report on each of them for purposes of employment.

62. Plaintiff suffered an informational injury. Under the FCRA, “a person may not procure a consumer report, or cause a consumer report to be procured, for employment purposes with respect to any consumer, unless” it complies with the statutory requirements (i.e., disclosure and authorization) set forth in the following subsections: 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2). As one court put it, “[t]he FCRA makes it unlawful to ‘procure’ a report without first providing the proper disclosure and receiving the consumer’s written authorization.” *Harris v. Home Depot U.S.A. Inc.*, 114 F. Supp. 3d 868, 869 (N.D. Cal. 2015).

63. Defendant’s Failure to provide Plaintiff and the Putative Class with a lawful disclosure created a risk of harm that Plaintiff and members of the Putative Class would be confused and distracted by the extraneous language.

Plaintiffs’ Second Concrete Injury under § 1681b(b)(2)(A)(ii): Invasion of Privacy

64. Additionally, Defendant invaded Plaintiff’s right to privacy and intruded upon his seclusion. Under the FCRA, “a person may not procure a consumer report, or cause a consumer report to be procured, for employment purposes with respect to any consumer, unless” it complies with the statutory requirements (i.e., disclosure and authorization) set forth in the following subsections: 15 U.S.C. §1681b(b)(2). As one court put it, “[t]he FCRA makes it unlawful to ‘procure’ a report without first providing the proper disclosure and receiving the consumer’s written authorization.” *Harris v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.*, 114 F. Supp. 3d 868, 869 (N.D. Cal. 2015). Plaintiff’s consumer report contained a wealth of private information which Defendant had no right to access absent a specific Congressional license to do so. Defendant

invaded Plaintiff's privacy and intruded upon Plaintiff's seclusion by procuring a consumer report on him and viewing his private and personal information without lawful authorization. *Perry v. Cable News Network, Inc.*, No-16-13031, (11th Cir., April 27, 2017)(Violation of statutory right that has a close relationship to a harm traditionally recognized in English or American law is a concrete harm for purposes of Art. III standing).

65. The foregoing violations were willful. At this time Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. §1681b(b)(2)(A)(ii). Defendant knew that in order for it to have authorization to obtain consumer reports on Plaintiff and the Putative Class members it was required to provide a stand-alone form (separate from the employment application) prior to obtaining and then utilizing a consumer report on Plaintiff and the Putative Class.:

- a. Defendant is a large corporation with access to legal advice through its own general counsel's office and outside employment counsel, and there is not contemporaneous evidence that it determined that its conduct was lawful;
- b. Defendant knew or had reason to know that its conduct was inconsistent with published FTC guidance interpreting the FCRA and the plain language of the statute; and
- c. Defendant voluntarily ran a risk of violating the law substantially greater than the risk associated with a reading that was merely careless.

66. Plaintiff and the Background Check Class are entitled to statutory damages of not less than one hundred dollars (\$100) and not more than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each and every one of these violations under 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(1)(A), in addition to punitive damages under 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(2).

67. Plaintiff and the Background Check Class are further entitled to recover their costs and attorneys' fees, in accordance with 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(3).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Putative Class, prays for relief as follows:

- i. Determining that this action may proceed as a class action;
- j. Designating Plaintiff as class representative and designating Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the Putative Class;
- k. Issuing proper notice to the Putative Class at Defendants' expense;
- l. Declaring that Defendant committed multiple, separate violations of the FCRA;
- m. Declaring that Defendant acted willfully in deliberate or reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and its obligations under the FCRA;
- n. Awarding statutory damages as provided by the FCRA, including punitive damages, to members of the Putative Class;
- o. Awarding reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as provided by the FCRA;
- p. Granting other and further relief, in law or equity, as this Court may deem appropriate and just.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff and the Putative Class demand a trial by jury.

DATE: August 1, 2017

MORGAN & MORGAN

/s/ Marc R. Edelman

Marc R. Edelman, Esq.

Fla. Bar No. 0096342

201 N. Franklin Street, #700

Tampa, FL 33602

Telephone 813-223-5505

Fax: 813-257-0572

MEdelman@forthepeople.com

C. Ryan Morgan, Esq.

Fla. Bar No.0015527

P.O. Box 4979
Orlando, FL 33802
Telephone 407.420.1414
Fax: 407.245.3401
RMorgan@forthepeople.com

Andrew Frisch, Esq.
Fla. Bar No. 27777
600 North Pine Island Road, Suite 400
Plantation, Florida 33324
Telephone: (954) WORKERS
Facsimile: (954) 327-3013
AFrisch@forthepeople.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

JS 44 (Rev. 11/15)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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

WILVIN MATEO-HERNANDEZ on behalf of himself and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
Marc R. Edelman, Esq. 201 N. Franklin St.
Morgan & Morgan Tampa, FL 33602
(813)223-5505

DEFENDANTS

POMEROYIT SOLUTIONS SALES COMPANY, INC.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

| | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

| CONTRACT | TORTS | FORFEITURE/PENALTY | BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STATUTES | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise | PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice | PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability | <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions | <input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 | <input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes |
| REAL PROPERTY | CIVIL RIGHTS | PRISONER PETITIONS | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property | <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education | Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty Other: <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement | | | |

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding
- 2 Removed from State Court
- 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
- 4 Reinstated or Reopened
- 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)
- 6 Multidistrict Litigation

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT OF 1970, as amended 15 U.S.C 1681

Brief description of cause:
Unlawful Background Check

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 8-2-17 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Suit: Pomeroy IT Solutions Sales Co. Didn't Meet FCRA Disclosure Requirements](#)
