### Michael Fuller, OSB No. 09357

Lead Attorney for Plaintiffs Olsen Daines PC US Bancorp Tower 111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150 Portland, Oregon 97204 michael@underdoglawyer.com Direct 503-201-4570

Mark Geragos, Pro Hac Pending Ben Meiselas, Pro Hac Pending Lori Feldman, Pro Hac Pending

Of Attorneys for Plaintiffs Geragos & Geragos Historic Engine Co. No. 28 644 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, California 90017 geragos@geragos.com Phone 213-625-3900

(additional counsel on signature page)

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

### DISTRICT OF OREGON

#### PORTLAND DIVISION

MARY MCHILL and BROOK REINHARD,

Oregon consumers, individually and on behalf of all others,

Case No. 3:17-cv-1405

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATION COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs,

Negligence

v.

28 U.S.C. § 1332

**EQUIFAX INC.**,

Demand for Jury Trial

Defendant.

### THE PARTIES

Equifax Inc. (Equifax) is a multi-billion dollar Georgia corporation that provides credit information services to millions of businesses, governmental units, and consumers across the globe. Equifax operates through various subsidiaries including Equifax Information Services, LLC, and Equifax Consumer Services, LLC aka Equifax Personal Solutions aka PSOL. Each of these entities acted as agents of Equifax or in the alternative, acted in concert with Equifax as alleged in this complaint.

2.

Mary McHill is an individual consumer residing in the Portland,
Oregon area and Brook Reinhard is an individual consumer residing in
the Eugene, Oregon area.

3.

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$68.6 billion exclusive of penalties. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because the bulk of Oregon consumers with credit and personal information stored by Equifax live in the Portland area.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiffs file this complaint as a national class action on behalf of over 140 million consumers across the Country harmed by Equifax's failure to adequately protect their credit and personal information. This complaint requests Equifax provide fair compensation in an amount that will ensure every consumer harmed by its data breach will not be out-of-pocket for the costs of independent third-party credit repair and monitoring services. This complaint's allegations are based on personal knowledge as to plaintiffs' conduct and made on information and belief as to the acts of others.

5.

Throughout the past year, Equifax collected and stored personal and credit information from Ms. McHill and Mr. Reinhard, including their social security numbers, birth dates, home addresses, driver's license information, and credit card numbers.

6.

Equifax owed a legal duty to consumers like Ms. McHill and Mr. Reinhard to use reasonable care to protect their credit and personal information from unauthorized access by third parties. Equifax knew that its failure to protect Ms. McHill and Mr. Reinhard's credit and

personal information from unauthorized access would cause serious risks of credit harm and identify theft for years to come.

7.

On September 7, 2017, Equifax announced for the first time that from May to July 2017, its database storing Ms. McHill and Mr. Reinhard's credit and personal information had been hacked by unauthorized third parties, subjecting Ms. McHill and Mr. Reinhard to credit harm and identify theft.

8.

In an attempt to increase profits, Equifax negligently failed to maintain adequate technological safeguards to protect Ms. McHill and Mr. Reinhard's information from unauthorized access by hackers. Equifax knew and should have known that failure to maintain adequate technological safeguards would eventually result in a massive data breach. Equifax could have and should have substantially increased the amount of money it spent to protect against cyber-attacks but chose not to. Consumers like Ms. McHill and Mr. Reinhard should not have to bear the expense caused by Equifax's negligent failure to safeguard their credit and personal information from cyber-attackers. As a direct result of Equifax's negligence as alleged in this complaint, Mr. Reinhard suffered injury of loss of \$19.95 to pay for third-party credit monitoring services he otherwise would not have had to pay for.

Ms. McHill and Mr. Reinhard hope Equifax will use this massive data breach, and their subsequent lawsuit, as a teachable moment to finally adopt adequate safeguards to protect against this type of cyberattack in the future.

10.

### CLASS ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiffs file this complaint as a national class action lawsuit.

The Oregon class consists of Oregon consumers who:

- a) Had personal or credit data collected and stored by Equifax in the past year, and
- b) Who were subject to risk of data loss and credit harm and identity theft or had to pay for third-party credit monitoring services as a result of Equifax's negligent data breach from May to July 2017.

11.

Excluded from the class are all attorneys for the class, officers and members of Equifax, including officers and members of any entity with an ownership interest in Equifax, any judge who sits on the case, and all jurors and alternate jurors who sit on the case.

The exact number of aggrieved consumers in Oregon can be determined based on Equifax's consumer database, estimated at 2,860,000 consumers – about half the population of Oregon.

13.

Every aggrieved Oregon consumer suffered injuries as alleged in this complaint directly and proximately caused by Equifax's negligent failure to adequately protect its database from unauthorized access by third-party hackers.

14.

The class is so numerous that joinder is impracticable. Upon information and belief, the Oregon class alone includes millions of consumers based on Equifax's estimate that its data breach affected 143 million consumers nationwide.

15.

Common questions of fact and law predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members. Common questions include whether plaintiffs and the Oregon class members are entitled to equitable relief, whether Equifax acted negligently, and whether plaintiffs and the Oregon class members are entitled to recover money damages.

Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Oregon class because each suffered risk of loss and credit harm and identity theft caused by Equifax's negligent failure to safeguard their data, the injuries suffered by plaintiffs and the Oregon class members are identical (i.e. the costs to monitor and repair their credit through a third-party service for at least 24 months), and plaintiffs' claims for relief are based upon the same legal theories as are the claims of the other class members. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect and represent the interests of the class because their claims are typical of the claims of the Oregon class, they are represented by nationally known and locally respected attorneys who have experience handling class action litigation and consumer protection cases who are qualified and competent, and who will vigorously prosecute this litigation, and their interests are not antagonistic or in conflict with the interests of the Oregon class.

17.

A class action is superior to other methods for fair and efficient adjudication of this case because common questions of law and fact predominate over other factors affecting only individual members, as far as plaintiffs know, no class action that purports to include Oregon consumers suffering the same injury has been commenced in Oregon, individual class members have little interest in controlling the litigation, due to the high cost of actions, the relatively small amounts of damages, and because plaintiffs and their attorneys will vigorously pursue the claims. The forum is desirable because the bulk of consumers in Oregon who suffered injury caused by Equifax's negligence reside in the Portland metropolitan area. A class action will be an efficient method of adjudicating the claims of the class members who have suffered relatively small damages, as a result of the same conduct by Equifax. In the aggregate, class members have claims for relief that are significant in scope relative to the expense of litigation. The availability of defendant's consumer data will facilitate proof of class claims, processing class claims, and distributions of any recoveries.

### OREGON CLASS CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### - Claim 1 -

### **NEGLIGENCE**

As alleged in this complaint, Equifax undertook care of credit and personal information belonging to plaintiffs and the Oregon putative class, then breached its legal duty by failing to maintain adequate technological safeguards, falling below the standard of care in the technological industry, directly and proximately causing foreseeable risk of data loss and credit harm and identity theft and other economic losses, in amounts to be decided by the jury.

19.

Plaintiffs and the Oregon class are entitled to equitable relief in the form of an accounting of exactly how their credit and personal information was accessed without authorization by third parties, restitution, and unless agreed upon by Equifax, an order to preserve all documents and information (and electronically stored information) pertaining to this case.

20.

Demand for jury trial.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiffs seek relief for themselves and the proposed Oregon class as follows:

- A. Unless agreed upon by Equifax, an order to preserve all documents and information (and electronically stored information) pertaining to this case,
- **B.** An order certifying this matter as a class action,
- C. Judgment against Equifax for fair compensation in an amount to be decided by the jury, and costs,
- **D.** And other relief the Court deems necessary.

September 7, 2017

## RESPECTFULLY FILED,

s/ Michael Fuller

Michael Fuller, OSB No. 09357 Lead Attorney for Plaintiffs Olsen Daines PC US Bancorp Tower 111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150 Portland, Oregon 97204 michael@underdoglawyer.com Direct 503-201-4570

(additional counsel information on next page)

### Rex Daines, OSB No. 952442

Of Attorneys for Plaintiffs Olsen Daines PC US Bancorp Tower 111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150 Portland, Oregon 97204 rdaines@olsendaines.com Phone 503-362-9393

## Robert Le, OSB No. 094167 Of Attorneys for Plaintiffs

rl@robertlelaw.com

### Justin Baxter, OSB No. 992178

Of Attorneys for Plaintiffs Baxter & Baxter LLP 8835 SW Canyon Ln Ste 130 Portland, Oregon 97225 justin@baxterlaw.com Phone 503 297-9031

## Kelly Jones, OSB No. 074217 Of Attorneys for Plaintiffs kellydonovanjones@gmail.com

# 

JS 44 (Rev. 09/11)

# **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 MARY MCHILL and BROOK REINHARD			DEFENDANTS EQUIFAX INC.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Washington (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence  NOTE:	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF IN LAND CONDEMNATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOL	CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Michael Fuller, US Banco Portland, Oregon 97204,		r) 1 Ave., Suite 3150	Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff						
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		F DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Prior of Business In This		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	▼ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh.)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2		
			Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	1	*/				
CONTRACT  ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY  □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITION  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General  535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition  560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	of Property 21 USC 881  d  LABOR To 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act  IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus -	322 Appeal 28 USC 158   423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   425 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   426 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   427 Withdrawal 28	OTHER STATUTES  □ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
V. ORIGIN  (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  I Original Proceeding  2 Removed from Appellate Court  3 Remanded from Appellate Court  4 Reinstated or Reopened  5 Transferred from another district (specify)  6 Multidistrict Litigation						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	28 H.S.C. & 133	2	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictional sta	ntutes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		N DEMAND \$	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  JURY DEMAND: ▼ Yes □ No			
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD						
09/07/2017	s/ Michael Fuller					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	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.C.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; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If 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 clerks 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 seven boxes.

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

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

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

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (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.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

- 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 dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) 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.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

	for the	
	District	ρ <sub>δ</sub> ρ <u>regon</u>
MARY MCHILL and BR	ROOK REINHARD	
Plaintif	) )	
v. EQUIFAX INC.		Civil Action No. 3:17-cv-1405
Defenda	nt )	
	SUMMONS IN A (	CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	Equifax Inc. c/o registered agent The Prent 251 Little Falls Drive Wilmington, DE 19808	ice-Hall Corporation System, Inc.
A lawsuit has been file	ed against you.	
are the United States or a Unit P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you mus	ed States agency, or an officer of t serve on the plaintiff an answe	(not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. It to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, and
If you fail to respond, You also must file your answe		ered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
		CLERK OF COURT
Data		

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk