IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

LOIS PIPER and BRENDA RUARK, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Civil Action No.:

Plaintiffs,

1 Iaiiiiii

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

THE TALBOTS, INC.,

v.

Defendant.

Plaintiffs Lois Piper and Brenda Ruark ("Plaintiffs"), individually and on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, by and through their attorneys, make the following allegations pursuant to the investigation of their counsel and based upon information and belief, except as to allegations specifically pertaining to themselves and their counsel, which are based on personal knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Defendant The Talbots, Inc. ("Defendant") sold personal information about Plaintiffs to list brokers, including for example NextMark, Inc., which in turn sold their information to telemarketers and other aggressive advertisers. As a result, Plaintiffs are being inundated with a barrage of unwanted junk mail and telephone solicitations. By selling Plaintiffs' personally identifiable information ("PII"), Defendant violated Virginia's Personal Information Privacy Act, Va. Code Ann. §§ 59.1-442, et seq. (the "VPIPA").
- 2. Documented evidence confirms these facts. NextMark's website offers to provide access to the PII of 1,832,331 Talbots customers from the "Talbots Mailing List" at a base price of "\$120/M [per thousand]," (i.e., 12 cents apiece).

Talbots Mailing List

| Get Count Get Pricing | Get More Information |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
|-------------------------|----------------------|

| SEGMENTS COUNTS THRO | DUGH 01/30/2019 | POPULARITY: | ==== 100 | |
|---|-----------------|------------------------|--|-----------|
| 1,832,331 TOTAL UNIVERSE / BASE RATE | \$120.00/M | MARKET: | CONSUMER | |
| 183,034 1 MONTH | | CHANNELS: | =1 | |
| 488,493 3 MONTH | \$25.00/M | SOURCE: DIRECT MAIL SO | | IL SOLD |
| 798,743 6 MONTH | \$17.00/M | PRIVACY: | UNKNOWN | |
| 1,237,308 12 MONTH | \$12.00/M | DMA?: | NO | |
| PUBLISHING/MEMBERSHIP BASE \$65/M | \$65.00/M | STATUS: | STANDARD | PROVIDER |
| FUNDRAISING BASE \$70/M | \$70.00/M | GEO: | USA | |
| DESCRIPTION | | GENDER: | 90% FEMAL | .E |
| Celebrating our 70 th anniversary this year! | LBOTS | SELECTS | | |
| celebrating our 70 anniversary this year: | | \$100+ BUYER | S | \$42.00/M |
| | | \$150+ BUYER | S | \$52.00/M |
| Established in 1947, Talbots is a leading specialty retailer | offering | \$200+ BUYER | | \$62.00/M |
| modern classic style that's both timeless and timely, fine | quality | \$50+ BUYERS | | \$27.00/M |
| craftsmanship and gracious service. With a commitment | | \$75+ BUYERS | | \$32.00/M |
| | | | | \$30.00/M |
| modern classic style for every body, Talbots carries a full | range of | | | \$25.00/N |
| sizes, including Misses, Petite, Woman Plus and Woman P | | | \$17.00/M \$10.00/M | |
| Talbots collection includes sportswear, career separates, | | | \$10.00/M | |
| | | | YERS AT | |
| activewear, swim, special occasion dressing as well as a | | | ESS | \$12.00/M |
| complementary selection of shoes and accessories for "he | ead-to-toe" | LAST PURCHASE \$1 | | \$10.00/M |
| wardrobing. | | | MULTI/SINGLE PURCHASE \$1 BUYERS | |
| | | PRODUCT | | \$17.00/M |
| ORDERING INSTRUCTIONS | | PURCHASE | | \$10.00/M |
| To order this list, contact your List Broker and ask for NextMa | ark List ID | SCF | | \$10.00/M |
| #432921 or click here to place your request. | | SIZE | | \$10.00/M |
| Use NextMark List Order Entry Software or Bionic Media Plant | ning Software | STATE | | \$10.00/M |
| | | TALBOTS | | |
| 10,000 NAME MINIMUM ORDER \$0.00 MINIMUM PAYMENT | | ZIP | | \$10.00/M |
| 85% NET NAME AVAILABLE ON ORDERS OF 50,000 OR MORE | E (\$8.00/M RUN | ADDRESSING | i . | |
| CHARGE) | | · · | | \$3.00/M |
| PLEASE INQUIRE ABOUT EXCHANGE | | EMAIL \$60 | | |
| PLEASE INQUIRE ABOUT REUSE | | RELATED LIS | TS | |
| | | SUNDANCE | | |
| CANCELLATION FEE AT \$100.00/F | | | INORTHSTYLE WILAND CATALOG/ONLINE BUYERS | |
| | | ■ WILAND CA | ATALOG/ONLI | NE BUYERS |

See Complaint Ex. A.

3. Defendant also offer access to its "Talbots Wiland Direct Modeled Mailing List" at the same base rate of "\$120/M." The "Wiland Direct Modeled" list allows "Wiland Direct members [to] apply their models to Talbot's names to connect with their ideal customer type for the highest rate of response." Available Wiland models include, "Best Donor," "Comprehensive Response," and "Long-Term Value."

Talbots Wiland Direct Modeled Mailing List

| SEGMENTS COUNTS THROU | ,, | | | |
|---|---------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| 1,832,331 TOTAL UNIVERSE / BASE RATE | \$120.00/M | MARKET: | CONSUME | R |
| 1,832,331 UNIVERSE FOR MODELED SELECTIONS | + \$30.00/M | CHANNELS: | | |
| FUNDRAISING BASE | \$65.00/M | SOURCE: | DIRECT M | |
| FOOD MAILER RATE | \$75.00/M | PRIVACY: | UNKNOW | N |
| DESCRIPTION | | DMA?: | NO | |
| Wiland Direct members can apply their models to TAI | .BOTS | STATUS: | | D PROVIDER |
| Talbot's names to connect with their ideal customer | | GEO: GENDER: | USA 90% FEM/ | ALE. |
| | | | 90% FEFE | ALE |
| type for the highest rate of response. This opportunity is open to | any | SELECTS \$100+ BUYER | e | \$40.00/1 |
| participant in the Wiland Direct Database. | | \$150+ BUYER | | \$50.00/1 |
| | | \$200+ BUYER | | \$60.00/1 |
| | | \$50+ BUYERS | | \$25.00/N |
| Names selected from a client's model will be net of the client's h | ousefile as | \$75+ BUYERS | | \$30.00/N |
| | | 12 MONTH HO | TLINE | \$30.00/N |
| well as any other prospect names selected at Wiland, allowing fo | r incremental | з монтн нот | LINE | \$20.00/1 |
| names to be applied in the merge. | | 6 MONTH HOT | LINE | \$30.00/1 |
| | | AVERAGE PUR | CHASE | \$10.00/ |
| | | HOUSEFILE | | |
| Wiles described and letter in the Person Communication Re- | | IN HOUSE CRE | EDIT | \$10.00/ |
| Wiland models available include: Best Donor, Comprehensive Re | sponse, Long- | INTERNET | - | \$10.00/ |
| Term Value and Source Composite. | | LAST PURCHAS | SE | \$10.00/N \$10.00/N |
| | | STATE | | \$10.00/1 |
| | | TALBOTS | | \$10.00/1 |
| Color was a state of the state | | WILAND | | |
| Celebrating our 70 th anniversary this year! | | ZIP | | \$10.00/N |
| | | ADDRESSING | 1 | |
| Established in 1947, Talbots is a leading specialty retailer of | offering | KEY CODING | | \$3.00/N |
| modern classic style that's both timeless and timely, fine q | uality | EMAIL | | \$60.00/ |
| craftsmanship and gracious service. With a commitment to | offer | RELATED LIS | TS | |
| modern classic style for every body, Talbots carries a full ra | | ∃ VERMONT O | DELED FILE | TORE WILAND |
| sizes, including Misses, Petite, Woman Plus and Woman Plu | s Petite. The | TOUCH OF | CLASS WILL | AND DIRECT |
| Talbots collection includes sportswear, career separates, c | asual wear, | MODELED FILE NORTHSTYLE WILAND DIRECT MODELED FILE | | |
| activewear, swim, special occasion dressing as well as a complementary selection of shoes and accessories for "hea | id-to-toe" | ∃ PAUL FREDI | RICK WILAN | ND DIRECT |
| wardrobing. | | MASTERFIL | LAND MODI | |
| | | AICR WILA | ND DIRECT | |
| | | MODELED F | TLE | LAND DIRECT |
| All special offers/incentives should be approved in advance by Ta | lbots. | HARVARD H MODELING | MASTERFIL | E AND DIRECT |
| | | MODELED F | ILL | |
| | | | | |

¹ Wiland Direct is a data cooperative. *See* https://wiland.com/about/company-overview. The Wiland data cooperative pools "first-party, transaction-level consumer spending data" of "250,000,000 adult U.S. consumers." *Id.*

See Complaint Ex. B.

4. The VPIPA clearly prohibits what Defendant has done. The VPIPA provides:

No merchant, without giving notice to the purchaser, shall sell to any third person information which concerns the purchaser and which is gathered in connection with the sale, rental or exchange of tangible personal property to the purchaser at the merchant's place of business.

Va. Code Ann. § 59.1-442(A).

5. Accordingly, Plaintiffs bring this Class Action Complaint against Defendant for its intentional and unlawful sale of its customers' PII in violation of the VPIPA, and for unjust enrichment.

NATURE OF THE CASE

- 6. To supplement their sales revenues, Defendant sells their customers' personal information to data miners and other third parties without providing their customers any notice and without their consent.
- 7. Defendant's disclosure of PII are not only unlawful, but also dangerous because they allow for the targeting of particularly vulnerable members of society. In fact, anyone can buy a customer list from Defendant that contains a number of categories of detailed information. For example, a purchaser could buy a list with the names and addresses of all Talbots customers who are wear size 4 and made purchases over \$100. Defendant would sell such a list for approximately \$172 per thousand customers listed.
- 8. While Defendant profit handsomely from the unauthorized sale and disclosure of their customers' PII, they do so at the expense of their customers' privacy and statutory rights because Defendant do not provide their customers any notice, nor do they obtain their customers' consent, before selling their PII.

PARTIES

9. Plaintiff Lois Piper is a natural person and citizen of the State of Virginia. Plaintiff Piper has made purchases at Talbots retail stores in Virginia. Every time Plaintiff Piper made a purchase at a Talbots retail store in Virginia, the cashier requested her PII, including her name and address. Prior to and at the time she made purchases at Talbots retail stores in Virginia, Defendant did not notify Plaintiff Piper that it sells the PII of its customers, and Plaintiff Piper has never authorized Defendant to do so. Furthermore, Plaintiff Piper was never provided any written notice that Defendant sells its customers' PII, or any means of opting out. Since making purchases at Talbots, and continuing to present, Defendant sold, and continues to sell, without consent or prior notice, Plaintiff Piper's PII to data mining companies including Wiland Direct and others, who then supplement that information with data from their own files. Moreover, during that same period, Defendant sold – and continues to sell and offer for sale – mailing lists containing Plaintiff Piper's PII to third parties seeking to contact Talbots customers, without first obtaining Plaintiff Piper's consent or even giving her prior notice of the disclosure and sales. Because Defendant sold her PII, Plaintiff Piper now receives junk mail and telephone solicitations. These unwarranted offers waste Plaintiff Piper's time, money, and resources. These harassing junk mail offerings and phone call solicitations received by Plaintiff Piper are attributable to Defendant's unauthorized sale of her PII. Because Plaintiff Piper is entitled by law to privacy in her PII, and because she paid money for her purchases at Talbots, Defendant's sale of her PII deprived Plaintiff Piper of the full set of benefits to which she was entitled as a part of her Talbots purchases, thereby causing economic harm. Accordingly, what Plaintiff Piper received (a purchase without statutory privacy protections) was less valuable than what she paid for (a purchase with accompanying statutory privacy protections), and she would not have been

willing to pay as much, if at all, for her Talbots purchases had she known that Defendant would sell her PII.

10. Plaintiff Brenda Ruark is a natural person and citizen of the State of Virginia. Plaintiff Ruark has made purchases at Talbots retail stores in Virginia. Every time Plaintiff Ruark made a purchase at a Talbots retail store in Virginia, the cashier requested her PII, including her name and address. Prior to and at the time she made purchases at Talbots retail stores in Virginia, Defendant did not notify Plaintiff Ruark that it sells the PII of its customers, and Plaintiff Ruark has never authorized Defendant to do so. Furthermore, Plaintiff Ruark was never provided any written notice that Defendant sells its customers' PII, or any means of opting out. Since making purchases at Talbots, and continuing to present, Defendant sold, and continues to sell, without consent or prior notice, Plaintiff Ruark's PII to data mining companies including Wiland Direct and others, who then supplement that information with data from their own files. Moreover, during that same period, Defendant sold – and continues to sell and offer for sale – mailing lists containing Plaintiff Ruark's PII to third parties seeking to contact Talbots customers, without first obtaining Plaintiff Ruark's consent or even giving her prior notice of the disclosure and sales. Because Defendant sold her PII, Plaintiff Ruark now receives junk mail and telephone solicitations. These unwarranted offers waste Plaintiff Ruark's time, money, and resources. These harassing junk mail offerings and phone call solicitations received by Plaintiff Ruark are attributable to Defendant's unauthorized sale of her PII. Because Plaintiff Ruark is entitled by law to privacy in her PII, and because she paid money for her purchases at Talbots, Defendant's sale of her PII deprived Plaintiff Ruark of the full set of benefits to which she was entitled as a part of her Talbots purchases, thereby causing economic harm. Accordingly, what Plaintiff Ruark received (a purchase without statutory privacy protections) was less valuable than what she paid for (a purchase with accompanying statutory privacy protections), and she would not have been willing to pay as much, if at all, for her Talbots purchases had she known that Defendant would sell her PII.

11. Defendant The Talbots, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 175 Beal Street, Hingham, MA 02043. Defendant does business throughout Virginia, Massachusetts, and the entire United States.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 12. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) because there are more than 100 class members and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest, fees, and costs, and at least one Class member is a citizen of a state different from Defendant. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 13. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant conduct substantial business within Massachusetts, such that Defendant have significant, continuous, and pervasive contacts with the State of Massachusetts. Additionally, Defendant's principal place of business is in Hingham, Massachusetts.
- 14. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant does substantial business in this District, a substantial part of the events giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims took place within this judicial District, and Defendant's principal place of business is in this District.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Personal Information Market: Consumers' Personal Information Has Real Value

15. In 2001, Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") Commissioner Orson Swindle remarked that "the digital revolution . . . has given an enormous capacity to the acts of collecting

and transmitting and flowing of information, unlike anything we've ever seen in our lifetimes . . . [and] individuals are concerned about being defined by the existing data on themselves."²

- 16. More than a decade later, Commissioner Swindle's comments ring truer than ever, as consumer data feeds an information marketplace that supports a \$26 billion dollar per year online advertising industry in the United States.³
- 17. The FTC has also recognized that consumer data possesses inherent monetary value within the new information marketplace and publicly stated that:

Most consumers cannot begin to comprehend the types and amount of information collected by businesses, or why their information may be commercially valuable. Data is currency. The larger the data set, the greater potential for analysis—and profit.⁴

18. In fact, an entire industry exists where companies known as data miners purchase, trade, and collect massive databases of information about consumers. Data miners then profit by selling this "extraordinarily intrusive" information in an open and largely unregulated market.⁵

² The Information Marketplace: Merging and Exchanging Consumer Data (Mar. 13, 2001), at 8:15-11:16, *available at* https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_events/information-marketplace-merging-and-exchanging-consumer-data/transcript.pdf (last visited July 15, 2015).

³ See Web's Hot New Commodity: Privacy, WSJ.com (Feb. 28, 2011), http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703529004576160764037920274.html (last visited July 15, 2015).

⁴ Statement of FTC Commissioner Pamela Jones Harbour (Dec. 7, 2009), at 2, *available at* https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_statements/remarks-ftc-exploring-privacy-roundtable/091207privacyroundtable.pdf (last visited July 15, 2015) (emphasis added).

⁵ See Martha C. White, Big Data Knows What You're Doing Right Now, TIME.com (July 31, 2012), http://moneyland.time.com/2012/07/31/big-data-knows-what-youre-doing-right-now/ (last visited July 15, 2013).

- 19. The scope of data miners' knowledge about consumers is immense: "If you are an American adult, the odds are that [they] know[] things like your age, race, sex, weight, height, marital status, education level, politics, buying habits, household health worries, vacation dreams—and on and on."
- 20. Further, "[a]s use of the Internet has grown, the data broker industry has already evolved to take advantage of the increasingly specific pieces of information about consumers that are now available."⁷
- 21. Recognizing the serious threat the data mining industry poses to consumers' privacy, on July 25, 2012, the co-Chairmen of the Congressional Bi- Partisan Privacy Caucus sent a letter to nine major data brokerage companies seeking information on how those companies collect, store, and sell their massive collections of consumer data.⁸
 - 22. In their letter, the co-Chairmen recognized that:

By combining data from numerous offline and online sources, data brokers have developed hidden dossiers on every U.S. consumer. This large[-]scale aggregation of the personal information of hundreds of millions of American citizens raises a number of serious privacy concerns.⁹

⁶ Natasha Singer, *You for Sale: Mapping, and Sharing, the Consumer Genome*, N.Y. Times (June 16, 2012), *available at* http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/17/technology/acxiom-the-quiet-giant-of-consumer-database-marketing.html (last visited May 12, 2015).

⁷ Letter from Senator John D. Rockefeller IV, Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to Scott E. Howe, Chief Executive Officer, Acxiom (Oct. 9, 2012) *available at* http://www.commerce.senate.gov/public/?a=Files.Serve&File_id=3bb94703-5ac8-4157-a97b-a658c3c3061c (last visited July 15, 2015).

⁸ See Bipartisan Group of Lawmakers Query Data Brokers About Practices Involving Consumers' Personal Information, Website of Senator Ed Markey (July 24, 2012), http://www.markey.senate.gov/news/press-releases/bipartisan-group-of-lawmakers-query-data-brokers-about-practices-involving-consumers-personal-information (last visited July 15, 2015).

⁹ *Id*.

- 23. Data mining is especially troublesome when consumer information is sold to direct-mail advertisers. In addition to causing waste and inconvenience, direct-mail advertisers often use consumer information to lure unsuspecting consumers into various scams, ¹⁰ including fraudulent sweepstakes, charities, and buying clubs. Thus, when companies like Defendant share information with data miners and direct-mail advertisers, they contribute to the "[v]ast databases of names and personal information" that are often "sold to thieves by large publicly traded companies," which "put[s] almost anyone within the reach of fraudulent telemarketers" and other criminals.¹¹
- 24. Information disclosures like Defendant's are particularly dangerous to the elderly. "Older Americans are perfect telemarketing customers, analysts say, because they are often at home, rely on delivery services, and are lonely for the companionship that telephone callers provide." The FTC notes that "[t]he elderly often are the deliberate targets of fraudulent telemarketers who take advantage of the fact that many older people have cash reserves or other assets to spend on seemingly attractive offers." 13

¹⁰ See Prize Scams, Federal Trade Commission, http://www.consumer.ftc.gov/articles/0199-prize-scams (last visited July 15, 2015).

¹¹ Charles Duhigg, *Bilking the Elderly, With a Corporate Assist*, N.Y. Times, May 20, 2007, *available at* http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/20/business/20tele.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 (last visited July15, 2015).

¹² *Id*.

¹³ Fraud Against Seniors: Hearing before the Senate Special Committee on Aging (August 10, 2000) (prepared statement of the FTC), available at https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_statements/prepared-statement-federal-trade-commission-fraud-against-seniors/agingtestimony.pdf (last visited July 15, 2015).

- 25. Indeed, an entire black market exists where the personal information of vulnerable elderly Americans is exchanged. Thus, information disclosures like Defendant's are particularly troublesome because of their cascading nature: "Once marked as receptive to [a specific] type of spam, a consumer is often bombarded with similar fraudulent offers from a host of scam artists." ¹⁴
- 26. Thus, as consumer data has become an ever-more valuable commodity, the data mining industry has experienced rapid and massive growth. Unfortunately for consumers, this growth has come at the expense of their most basic privacy rights.

Consumers Place Monetary Value on their Privacy and Consider Privacy Practices When Making Purchases

- 27. As the data mining industry has grown, so too have consumer concerns regarding the privacy of their personal information.
- 28. A recent survey conducted by Harris Interactive on behalf of TRUSTe, Inc. showed that 89 percent of consumers polled avoid doing business with companies who they believe do not protect their privacy online. ¹⁵ As a result, 81 percent of smartphone users polled said that they avoid using smartphone apps that they don't believe protect their privacy online. ¹⁶
- 29. Thus, as consumer privacy concerns grow, consumers are increasingly incorporating privacy concerns and values into their purchasing decisions and companies viewed as having weaker privacy protections are forced to offer greater value elsewhere (through better quality and/or lower prices) than their privacy- protective competitors.

¹⁴ See id.

¹⁵ See 2013 TRUSTe US Consumer Confidence Index, TRUSTe, http://www.truste.com/us-consumer-confidence-index-2013/(last visited July 15, 2015).

¹⁶ *Id*.

- 30. In fact, consumers' personal information has become such a valuable commodity that companies are beginning to offer individuals the opportunity to sell their personal information themselves.¹⁷
- 31. These companies' business models capitalize on a fundamental tenet underlying the personal information marketplace: consumers recognize the economic value of their private data. Research shows that consumers are willing to pay a premium to purchase services from companies that adhere to more stringent policies of protecting their personal data.¹⁸
- 32. Thus, in today's economy, individuals and businesses alike place a real, quantifiable value on consumer data and corresponding privacy rights. ¹⁹ As such, where a business offers customers a service that includes statutorily guaranteed privacy protections, yet fails to honor these guarantees, the customer receives a service of less value than the service paid for.

Defendant Unlawfully Sells Its Customers' PII

33. Every time a customer makes a purchase at a Talbots retail store in Virginia, the cashier requests that the customer provide her PII, including her name and address.

¹⁷ See Joshua Brustein, Start-Ups Seek to Help Users Put a Price on Their Personal Data, N.Y. Times (Feb. 12, 2012), available at http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/13/technology/start-ups-aim-to-help-users-put-a-price-on-their-personal-data.html (last visited July 15, 2015).

¹⁸ See Tsai, Cranor, Acquisti, and Egelman, *The Effect of Online Privacy Information on Purchasing Behavior*, 22(2) Information Systems Research 254, 254 (2011); see also European Network and Information Security Agency, *Study on monetising privacy* (Feb. 27, 2012), available at https://www.enisa.europa.eu/activities/identity-and-trust/library/deliverables/monetising-privacy (last visited July 15, 2015).

¹⁹ See Hann, et al., The Value of Online Information Privacy: An Empirical Investigation (Oct. 2003) at 2, available at http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.321.6125&rep=rep1&type=pdf (last visited July 15, 2015) ("The real policy issue is not whether consumers value online privacy. It is obvious that people value online privacy.")

- 34. Using that information, Defendant maintains a vast digital database comprised of their customers' PII. Defendant sells their customers' PII to data mining companies including Wiland and others, who then supplement that information with additional sensitive personal information about each Talbots customer, including gender, purchasing habits, and charitable donations. (*See, e.g.*, **Exhibits A-B**).
- 35. Defendant then sells their mailing lists—which include customers' PII, and can include the sensitive information obtained from data miners—to data miners, other consumerfacing businesses, non-profit organizations seeking to raise awareness and solicit donations, and to political organizations soliciting donations, votes, and volunteer efforts. (*See* Exhibits A–B).
- 36. As a result of Defendant's data compiling and sharing practices, companies can purchase mailing lists from Defendant that identify Talbots customers by their most intimate details: income, political affiliation, religious practice, and charitable donations. Defendant's sale of such sensitive and personal information puts consumers, especially the more vulnerable members of society, at risk of serious harm from scammers. For example, Talbots will sell—to anyone willing to pay for it— list with the names and addresses of all Talbots customers who are wear size 4, made purchases over \$100, and have a history of charitable donations.
- 37. Defendant does not seek its customers' prior consent to any of these sales, nor does it notify its customers about these sales. Thus, its customers remain unaware that their PII and other sensitive personal information is being bought and sold on the open market.
- 38. As a result, Defendant sold and continues to sell their customers' PII including their purchasing habits and preferences to anybody willing to pay for it.

39. By and through these actions, Defendant has intentionally sold to third parties their Virginia customers' PII without consent or notice, in direct violation of the VPIPA with respect to Plaintiffs and other members of the Class.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 40. Plaintiffs seek to represent a class defined as all Virginia residents who had their PII sold to third parties by Defendant without consent (the "Class"). Excluded from the Class is any entity in which Defendant have a controlling interest, and officers or directors of Defendant.
- 41. Members of the Class are so numerous that their individual joinder herein is impracticable. On information and belief, members of the Class number in the thousands. The precise number of Class members and their identities are unknown to Plaintiffs at this time but may be determined through discovery. Class members may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail and/or publication through the distribution records of Defendant.
- 42. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all Class members and predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members. Common legal and factual questions include, but are not limited to: (a) whether Defendant obtained consent before selling to third parties Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII; (b) whether Defendant provided notice before selling to third parties Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII; (c) whether Defendant's sale of Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII violated the Personal Information Privacy Act, Va. Code §§ 59.1-442, et seq.; and (d) whether Defendant's sale of Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII constitutes unjust enrichment.
- 43. The claims of the named Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class in that the named Plaintiffs and the Class sustained damages as a result of Defendant's uniform wrongful conduct, based upon Defendant's sale of Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII.

- 44. Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class because their interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class members they seek to represent, they have retained competent counsel experienced in prosecuting class actions, and they intend to prosecute this action vigorously. The interests of Class members will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiffs and their counsel.
- 45. The class mechanism is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of Class members. Each individual Class member may lack the resources to undergo the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex and extensive litigation necessary to establish Defendant's liability. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties and multiplies the burden on the judicial system presented by the complex legal and factual issues of this case. Individualized litigation also presents a potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments. In contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court on the issue of Defendant's liability. Class treatment of the liability issues will ensure that all claims and claimants are before this Court for consistent adjudication of the liability issues.

COUNT I Violation of the Personal Information Privacy Act (Va. Code §§ 59.1-442, et seq.)

- 46. Plaintiffs repeat the allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 47. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of members of the Class against Defendant.

- 48. Defendant is a "merchant" as that term is defined in the VPIPA. *See* Va. Code § 59.1-442(A)-(B).
 - 49. Plaintiffs made purchases at Talbots retail stores in Virginia.
- 50. At all times relevant, and beginning on the dates Plaintiffs made their purchases at Talbots retail stores in Virginia, Defendant sold Plaintiffs' PII, which identified them as Talbots customers, in at least two ways.
- 51. First, Defendant sold mailing lists containing Plaintiffs' PII to data mining companies including Wiland, and others, who then supplemented the mailing lists with additional sensitive information from their own databases, before sending the mailing lists back to Defendant.
- 52. Second, Defendant sold its mailing lists containing Plaintiffs' PII—enhanced with additional information from data miners—to third parties, including other consumer-facing companies, direct-mail advertisers, and organizations soliciting monetary contributions, volunteer work, and votes.
- 53. Because the mailing lists included the additional information from the data miners, the lists were more valuable, and Defendant was able to increase their profits gained from the mailing list sales.
- 54. By selling their customer lists, Defendant sold to third persons information which concerns the purchaser and which was gathered in connection with the sale, rental or exchange of tangible personal property to the purchaser the merchant's place of business. *See* Va. Code § 59.1-442(A).

- 55. The information Defendant sold indicates Plaintiffs' names and address, as well as the fact that they made purchases at Talbots retail stores. Accordingly, the records or information sold by Defendant indicate Plaintiffs' identity. *See* Va. Code § 59.1-442(A).
- 56. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class never consented to Defendant selling their PII to anyone.
- 57. Worse yet, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class did not receive notice before Defendant sold their PII to third parties.
- 58. The information sold by Defendant was not gathered for purposes of extending credit and was not gathered for the purposes of the recording and sale, rental, exchange or disclosure to others of information obtained from any public body as defined in the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, Va. Code §§ 2-2-3700, et seq.
- 59. Defendant's sales of Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII were not made pursuant incidental to the sale or other disposition of accounts receivable.
- 60. Defendant's sales of Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII were not made in conjunction with check validation transactions.
- 61. Defendant's sales of Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII were not made in connection with any sale by Defendant of their retail operations at one or more locations.
- 62. Defendant's sales of Plaintiffs' PII were made to data miners, direct-mail advertisers, and organizations soliciting monetary contributions, volunteer work, and votes—all in order to increase Defendant's revenue.
- 63. By selling Plaintiffs' PII, Defendant violated Plaintiffs' and the Class's statutorily-protected right to privacy under the VPIPA. *See* Va. Code §§ 59.1-442, *et seq*.

- 64. Additionally, because Plaintiffs and the members of the Class paid for their Talbots purchases, and Defendant was obligated to comply with the VPIPA, Defendant's unlawful sale of Plaintiffs' and the other Class members' PII deprived Plaintiffs and the Class members of the full value of their paid-for Talbots purchases. Because Plaintiffs and the other Class members ascribe monetary value to the privacy of their PII, Defendant's unlawful sale of their PII caused them to receive less value than they paid for, thereby causing them economic harm.
- 65. Likewise, because Plaintiffs and the other Class members ascribe monetary value to the privacy of their PII, a Talbots purchase that keeps their PII private is more valuable than one that does not.
- 66. Accordingly, had Plaintiffs been adequately informed of Defendant's data sales practices, they would not have been willing to make their Talbots purchases at the price charged, if at all. Thus, Defendant's unlawful sales caused Plaintiffs economic harm.
- 67. Defendant's sale of Plaintiffs' PII to third parties has also caused an influx of third-party print advertisements and marketing calls to their cellular phones.
- 68. As a result of Defendant's unlawful and continued disclosure of their PII, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have suffered privacy and economic injuries. On behalf of themselves and the Class, Plaintiffs seek: (1) an injunction requiring Defendant to provide notice and/or obtain consent from Virginia customers prior to the disclosure of their PII as required by the VPIPA; (2) damages in the amount of \$100 per violation, per Class member pursuant to Va. Code § 59.1-444; and (3) costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Va. Code § 59.1-444.

COUNT II Unjust Enrichment

- 69. Plaintiffs repeat the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
- 70. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the Class against Defendant.
- 71. Plaintiffs and the Class members conferred benefits on Defendant by providing Defendant with their PII and paying Defendant for their Talbots purchases. Defendant received and retained the information and money belonging to Plaintiffs and the Class when Plaintiffs and the Class made their Talbots purchases.
- 72. Because Defendant received and processed Plaintiffs' and the Class's payments and PII, and because Defendant has employees handling customer accounts and billing as well as customer data, Defendant appreciates or has knowledge of such benefits.
- 73. Under the VPIPA, Plaintiffs and the Class members were entitled to confidentiality in their PII as part of their Talbots purchases.
- 74. Under principles of equity and good conscience, because Defendant failed to comply with the VPIPA, Defendant should not be allowed to retain the full amount of money Plaintiffs and the Class paid for their Talbots purchases or the money they received by selling Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII.
- 75. Plaintiffs and the other Class members have suffered actual damages as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct in the form of the value Plaintiffs and the other Class members paid for and ascribed to the confidentiality of their PII. This amount is tangible and will be calculated at trial.

- 76. Additionally, Plaintiffs and the Class members have suffered actual damages inasmuch as Defendant's failure to inform them that they would sell their PII caused them to make purchases at Talbots retail stores in Virginia when they otherwise would not have.
- 77. Further, a portion of the purchase price of each Talbots product sold to Plaintiffs and the other Class members was intended to ensure the confidentiality of Plaintiffs' and the other Class members' PII, as required by the VPIPA. Because Plaintiffs and the other Class members were denied services that they paid for and were entitled to receive—i.e., confidentiality of their PII—and because Plaintiffs and the Class would have commanded a discount to voluntarily forego those benefits, they incurred actual monetary damages.
- 78. To prevent inequity, Defendant should return to Plaintiffs and the Class the value they ascribe to confidentiality of their PII and all money derived from Defendant's sale of Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII.
- 79. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Class members seek an order declaring that Defendant's conduct constitutes unjust enrichment, and awarding Plaintiffs and the Class restitution in an amount to be calculated at trial equal to the amount of money obtained by Defendant through their sale and disclosure of Plaintiffs' and the Class's PII.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- 80. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, seek a judgment against Defendant as follows:
 - A. For an order certifying the Class under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and naming Plaintiffs as representatives of the Class and Plaintiffs' attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the Class.
 - B. For an order declaring that Defendant's conduct as described herein violates the Personal Information Privacy Act, Va. Code § 59.1-442;

- C. For an order finding in favor of Plaintiffs and the Class on all counts asserted herein;
- D. For an award of damages, in the amount of \$100 per violation, to Plaintiffs and each Class member, as provided by the Personal Information Privacy Act, Va. Code § 59.1-444;
- E. For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded;
- F. For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;
- G. For injunctive relief as pleaded or as the Court may deem proper; and:
- H. For an order awarding Plaintiffs and the Class their reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses and costs of suit.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all causes of action and issues so triable.

Dated: February 14, 2020 Respectfully submitted,

PLAINTIFFS LOIS PIPER, BRENDA RUARK and THE PUTATIVE CLASS, By their attorneys,

/s/ David S. Godkin

David S. Godkin (BBO #196530)
James E. Kruzer (BBO #670827)
BIRNBAUM & GODKIN, LLP
280 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02210
Telephone: (617) 307-6110
godkin@birnbaumgodkin.com
kruzer@birnbaumgodkin.com

Joshua D. Arisohn*
Philip L. Fraietta* **BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**888 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
jarisohn@bursor.com
pfraietta@bursor.com

^{*}Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming



Talbots Mailing List

Get Pricing Get More Information Get Count

| SEGMENTS | COUNTS THE | ROUGH 01/30/2019 | POPULARITY: | 100 | |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| 1,832,331 TOTAL UNIVERSE / BA | ASE RATE | \$120.00/M | MARKET: | CONSUMER | |
| 183,034 1 MONTH | | \$30.00/M | CHANNELS: | = | |
| 488,493 3 MONTH | | \$25.00/M | SOURCE: | DIRECT MAI | L SOLD |
| 798,743 6 MONTH | | \$17.00/M | PRIVACY: | UNKNOWN | |
| 1,237,308 12 MONTH | | \$12.00/M | DMA?: | NO | |
| PUBLISHING/MEMBER | RSHIP BASE \$65/M | \$65.00/M | STATUS: | STANDARD F | PROVIDER |
| FUNDRAISING BASE | \$70/M | \$70.00/M | GEO: | USA | |
| DESCRIPTION | | | GENDER: | 90% FEMALI | E |
| Celebrating our 70 th anniversa | T, this year! | ALBOTS | SELECTS | | |
| Cetebrating our 70 anniversal | y this year! | ILDOID | \$100+ BUYER | .S | \$42.00/M |
| | | | \$150+ BUYER | .S | \$52.00/M |
| Established in 1947, Talbots is | a leading specialty retail | er offering | \$200+ BUYER | .S | \$62.00/M |
| modern classic style that's both | n timeless and timely. fir | ne quality | \$50+ BUYERS | | \$27.00/M |
| craftsmanship and gracious ser | • | | \$75+ BUYERS | | \$32.00/M |
| · - | | | 1 MONTH HOT | | \$30.00/M |
| modern classic style for every | body, Talbots carries a fu | ıll range of | | | \$25.00/M \$17.00/M |
| sizes, including Misses, Petite, Woman Plus and Woman Plus Petite. The | | | | 6 MONTH HOTLINE | |
| | | | | AVERAGE PURCHASE \$10 IN HOUSE CREDIT \$12 | |
| Talbots collection includes sportswear, career separates, casual wear, | | | | YERS AT | \$12.00/M |
| activewear, swim, special occasion dressing as well as a | | | | RESS | \$12.00/M |
| complementary selection of shoes and accessories for "head-to-toe" | | | LAST PURCHA | | \$10.00/M |
| wardrobing. | | | BUYERS | | \$12.00/M |
| | | | PRODUCT | | \$17.00/M |
| ORDERING INSTRUCTIONS | | | PURCHASE | | \$10.00/M |
| To order this list, contact your | List Broker and ask for Next | Mark List ID | SCF | | \$10.00/M |
| #432921 or click here to place | e your request. | | SIZE | | \$10.00/M |
| Use NextMark List Order Entry | / Software or Bionic Media Pla | anning Software | STATE | | \$10.00/M |
| 10,000 NAME MINIMUM ORDE | D ¢0 00 MINIMIIM DAVMENT | | TALBOTS | | +40.00/14 |
| • | · | | ZIP | | \$10.00/M |
| 85% NET NAME AVAILABLE O | N ORDERS OF 50,000 OR MO | RE (\$8.00/M RUN | ADDRESSING | 3 | |
| CHARGE) | | | KEY CODING | | \$3.00/M |
| PLEASE INQUIRE ABOUT EXCH | HANGE | | EMAIL | | \$60.00/F |
| PLEASE INQUIRE ABOUT REUS | SE | | RELATED LISTS | | |
| CANCELLATION FEE AT \$100.00/F | | | | SUNDANCE CATALOG | |
| CANCELLATION TEL AT \$100.0 | 70/1 | | ■ NORTHSTY | | IE DLIVEDO |
| | | | DATABASE | ATALOG/ONLIN | IL DUTEKS |
| | | | ■ COLDWATE | R CREEK | |
| | | | ■ SIGNALS | | |
| | | | ■ PYRAMID COLLECTION (THE) ■ AS WE CHANGE | | |
| | | | | | |

Get Count | Get Pricing | Get More Information

■ FRONTGATE ■ CATALOG FAVORITES











Talbots Wiland Direct Modeled Mailing List

Get Count | Get Pricing | Get More Information

| SEGMENTS | COUNTS THR | OUGH 03/31/2019 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1,832,331 | TOTAL UNIVERSE / BASE RATE | \$120.00/M |
| 1,832,331 | UNIVERSE FOR MODELED SELECTIONS | + \$30.00/M |
| | FUNDRAISING BASE | \$65.00/M |
| | FOOD MAILER RATE | \$75.00/M |

DESCRIPTION

Wiland Direct members can apply their models to

TALBOTS

Talbot's names to connect with their ideal customer

type for the highest rate of response. This opportunity is open to any participant in the Wiland Direct Database.

Names selected from a client's model will be net of the client's housefile as well as any other prospect names selected at Wiland, allowing for incremental names to be applied in the merge.

Wiland models available include: Best Donor, Comprehensive Response, Long-Term Value and Source Composite.

Celebrating our 70th anniversary this year!

Established in 1947, Talbots is a leading specialty retailer offering modern classic style that's both timeless and timely, fine quality craftsmanship and gracious service. With a commitment to offer modern classic style for every body, Talbots carries a full range of sizes, including Misses, Petite, Woman Plus and Woman Plus Petite. The Talbots collection includes sportswear, career separates, casual wear, activewear, swim, special occasion dressing as well as a complementary selection of shoes and accessories for "head-to-toe" wardrobing.

All special offers/incentives should be approved in advance by Talbots.

Selects on Talbots include:

Accessories

Footwear

Gift card

| 22 | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| | ₹ | | | |
| = | | | | |
| DIRECT MA | AIL SOLD | | | |
| UNKNOWN | | | | |
| NO | | | | |
| STANDARD | PROVIDER | | | |
| USA | | | | |
| 90% FEMA | LE | | | |
| | | | | |
| RS | \$40.00/M | | | |
| RS | \$50.00/M | | | |
| RS | \$60.00/M | | | |
| 5 | \$25.00/M | | | |
| 5 | \$30.00/M | | | |
| OTLINE | \$30.00/M | | | |
| TLINE | \$20.00/M | | | |
| TLINE | \$30.00/M | | | |
| RCHASE | \$10.00/M | | | |
| | | | | |
| EDIT | \$10.00/M | | | |
| | \$10.00/M | | | |
| ASE | \$10.00/M | | | |
| | \$10.00/M | | | |
| | \$10.00/M | | | |
| | | | | |
| WILAND | | | | |
| | \$10.00/M | | | |
| G | | | | |
| | \$3.00/M | | | |
| | \$60.00/F | | | |
| STS | | | | |
| | ORE WILAND | | | |
| CLASS WILA | ND DIRECT | | | |
| TILE (LE MATLAND F | DIRECT | | | |
| NORTHSTYLE WILAND DIRECT | | | | |
| PAUL FREDRICK WILAND DIRECT MODELED FILE | | | | |
| FORBES WILAND MODELING MASTERFILE | | | | |
| ND DIRECT N | MASTERFILE | | | |
| BOSTON PROPER - WILAND DIRECT MODELED FILE | | | | |
| HARVARD HEALTH - WILAND DIRECT MODELING MASTERFILE | | | | |
| STITCHERY (THE) WILAND DIRECT MODELED FILE | | | | |
| I WILAND DI | | | | |
| | UNKNOWN NO STANDARE USA 90% FEMA RS RS RS G OTLINE TLINE TLINE RCHASE G G STS COUNTRY ST DDELED FILE CLASS WILA FILE VIE WILAND IN FILE ILAND MODE LE LIND DIRECT IN ROPER - WIL FILE HEALTH - WI G MASTERFILE V (THE) WILA | | | |

Case 1:20-cv-10297 Document 1-2 Filed 02/14/20 Page 3 of 3

| | Casc 1.20-6V-10231 | |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|
| Women (plus size) | | |
| Women Petite | | |
| Missy | | |
| Petite | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| ORDERING INSTRUCT | TIONS | |

- To order this list, contact your List Broker and ask for NextMark List ID #433701 or click here to place your request.
- Use NextMark List Order Entry Software or Bionic Media Planning Software
- 10,000 NAME MINIMUM ORDER \$0.00 MINIMUM PAYMENT
- 85% NET NAME AVAILABLE ON ORDERS OF 50,000 OR MORE (\$8.00/M RUN CHARGE)
- PLEASE INQUIRE ABOUT EXCHANGE
- PLEASE INQUIRE ABOUT REUSE
- CANCELLATION FEE AT \$100.00/F

Get Count | Get Pricing | Get More Information

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

| Col. Stripper and BRENDA RUARK, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated (b). County of Residence of Time Lisaed Policitude (b). County of | provided by local rules of cour purpose of initiating the civil d | t. This form, approved by the ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC | he Judicial Conference of th TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THE | he United States in September 1 HIS FORM.) | .974, is required for the use of | the Clerk of Court for the |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| there is similarly situated (b) County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IXCLEF IN U.S. PLANIFF CASIS) (c) Attenays (Firm Rams, Address, and Filephone Anumber) David S, Godkin, BIRNBAMIM & GODKIN, LLP, 28D Surmere Street, BOSTON, MA 02210 (617) 307-6100 1 U.S. Government 3 Federal Question (IX.S. Government by a Property of Planif Casis of Anumber) Planif (IX.S. Government by a Property of Planif Casis of Anumber) (IX.S. Government by a Property of Planif Casis of Anumber) (IX.S. Government by a Property of Planif Casis of Anumber) (IX.S. Government by Casis of Anumber) (IX.S. Governme | I. (a) PLAINTIFFS | | | DEFENDANTS | | |
| David S. Godkin, BIRNBAUM & GODKIN, LLP, 280 Summer Street. | others similarly situated (b) County of Residence of | of First Listed Plaintiff | | County of Residence | of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES CONDEMNATION CASES, USE T. | · · |
| The continuence 1 | David S. Godkin, BIRNB Boston, MA 02210 | Address, and Telephone Numbe AUM & GODKIN, LLP | r) , 280 Summer Street, | Attorneys (If Known) | | |
| 1 S. Government 3 Federal Question Citizen of This State 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 1 2 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 1 2 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 1 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of a State of This State 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of State 2 Incorporated 2 Incorporated or Principal Place of State 2 Incorporated 2 | II. BASIS OF JURISDI | ICTION (Place an "X" in C | ne Box Only) | | RINCIPAL PARTIES | - |
| Defendant Chalciene Citizenskip of Parties in Bent III | | - | Not a Party) | P | 1 | PTF DEF incipal Place |
| V. NATURE OF SUIT Place on "X" in One Box Obly Color Descriptions | | | ip of Parties in Item III) | Citizen of Another State | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| CONTRACT FOREITY REPRONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 0.3 Foreign lating to 10 flowers and the product of th | | | | | 3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation | □ 6 □ 6 |
| 19 District | | | | | | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Class action under 28 U.S.C. Section 1332(d) DEMAND \$ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. UDGE DOCKET NUMBER | □ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits ▼ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property | PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education | PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of | □ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 □ 690 Other LABOR □ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act □ 720 Labor/Management Relations □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act □ 790 Other Labor Litigation □ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION □ 462 Naturalization Application □ 465 Other Immigration | □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U S Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 | □ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 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 |
| DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD 02/14/2020 /s/ David S. Godkin | VI. CAUSE OF ACTION VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASI | Cite the U.S. Civil State 28 U.S.C. Section Brief description of car Class action under CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2 | Appellate Court atute under which you are fin 1332(d) ause: er 28 U.S.C. Section 1 IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P. | Reopened Anothe (specify, illing (Do not cite jurisdictional state) 332(d) for unlawful sale of | er District Litigation Transfer tutes unless diversity): of personally identifiable CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND: | information if demanded in complaint: |
| RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG JUDGE | 02/14/2020 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY | | signature of attor /s/ David S. Godk | in | | |

Print Save As... Reset

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

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

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Case 1:20-cv-10297 Document 1-4 Filed 02/14/20 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

| 1. | Title of case (nam | e of first party on each side only) LOIS PIPER V. THE TALBOTS, INC. |
|------------|--|--|
| 2. | | the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See local |
| | rule 40.1(a)(1)). | |
| | <u></u> і. | 160, 400, 410, 441, 535, 830*, 835*, 850, 891, 893, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT. |
| | √ II. | 110, 130, 190, 196, 370, 375, 376, 440, 442, 443, 445, 446, 448, 470, 751, 820*, 840*, 895, 896, 899. |
| | III. | 120, 140, 150, 151, 152, 153, 195, 210, 220, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 367, 368, 371, 380, 385, 422, 423, 430, 450, 460, 462, 463, 465, 480, 490, 510, 530, 540, 550, 555, 560, 625, 690, 710, 720, 740, 790, 791, 861-865, 870, 871, 890, 950. |
| | | *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121. for patent, trademark or copyright cases. |
| 3. | | if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in this icate the title and number of the first filed case in this court. |
| | N/A | |
| 4. | Has a prior action | between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court? |
| | | YES NO |
| 5 . | Does the complai §2403) | nt in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See 28 USC |
| | If an in the U.S.A. | or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party? |
| | ii so, is the o.s.A. | YES NO |
| 6. | Is this case requi | red to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284? YES NO |
| 7. | | es in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the United States and the Commonwealth of governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)). YES NO |
| | A. | If yes, in which divisi <u>on d</u> o <u>all</u> of the non-governmental <u>parti</u> es reside? |
| | Λ. | Eastern Division Central Division Western Division |
| | В. | If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? |
| | | Eastern Division Central Division Western Division |
| 8. | | f Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, |
| | submit a separate | sheet identifying the motions) YES NO |
| (DI | | INT) |
| • | EASE TYPE OR PR FORNEY'S NAME <u></u> | · |
| | | k Godkin, LLP, 280 Summer Street, Boston, MA 02210 |
| | EPHONE NO. 617 | |
| IEL | FEHONE NO ALL | ·007 -0100 |

(CategoryForm1-2019.wpd)

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Class Action Claims Talbots Sells Customers' Private Information Without Consent</u>