

**SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)**

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

**NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):**

LYFT, INC. and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive

**YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):**

JANE ROE 1, an individual, (continued on Attachment 1 attached hereto)

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. **¡AVISO!** Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. **AVISO:** Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

CASE NUMBER
(Número del Caso): **CGC-19-581262**

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): San Francisco Superior Court
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
R Michael Bomberger, Esq., Estey & Bomberger, LLP, 2869 India St., San Diego, CA 92103 (619) 295-0035

DATE: **DEC 04 2019**
(Fecha)

CLERK OF THE COURT
Clerk by
(Secretario)

KALENE APOLONIO
Kalene Apolonio
Deputy
(Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. as an individual defendant.
2. as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3. on behalf of (specify):
under: CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.60 (minor)
 CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
 CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
 other (specify):
4. by personal delivery on (date):

SHORT TITLE:

Jane Roe 1, et al. v. Lyft, Inc., et al.

CASE NUMBER:

CGC-19-581262

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

- This form may be used as an attachment to any summons if space does not permit the listing of all parties on the summons.
- If this attachment is used, insert the following statement in the plaintiff or defendant box on the summons: "Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

List additional parties (Check only one box. Use a separate page for each type of party.):

Plaintiff Defendant Cross-Complainant Cross-Defendant

all additional JANE ROE plaintiffs, through and including JANE ROE 1,000, an individual, JOHN ROE, an individual, BRENDA CHARITY, an individual, INGRID FERREIRA, an individual, TYKAJA HALL, an individual, CAROLINE MILLER, an individual, ERIN MARSHALL, an individual, and HANNAH WELLS, an individual, Inclusive

Page _____ of _____

Page 1 of 1

1 Stephen J. Estey, Esq. (SBN # 163093)
R Michael Bomberger, Esq. (SBN # 169866)
2 Kristen K. Barton (SBN# 303228)
ESTEY BOMBERGER, LLP
3 2869 India Street
San Diego, CA 92103
4 Telephone: 619-295-0035
Facsimile: 619-295-0172
5 Email: mike@estey-bomberger.com
steve@estey-bomberger.com
6 kristen@estey-bomberger.com

7 C. Brooks Cutter (SBN # 121407)
Celine E. Cutter (SBN # 312622)
8 **CUTTER LAW P.C.**
401 Watt Avenue
9 Sacramento, CA 95864
Telephone: 916-290-9400
10 Facsimile: 916-588-9330
Email: bcutter@cutterlaw.com
11 ccutter@cutterlaw.com

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13
14 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

15 **COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

16 JANE ROE 1, an individual, all additional
17 JANE ROE plaintiffs, through and including
18 JANE ROE 1,000, an individual, JOHN
ROE, an individual, BRENDA CHARITY,
19 an individual, INGRID FERREIRA, an
individual, TYKAJA HALL, an individual,
20 CAROLINE MILLER, an individual, ERIN
MARSHALL, an individual, and HANNAH
WELLS, an individual,
21 Inclusive,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 LYFT, INC., and DOES 1 through 100,
Inclusive,

25 Defendants.

FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

DEC 04 2019

CLERK OF THE COURT

BY: *Shelene Nolin*
Deputy Clerk

Case No. **CGC-19-581262**

COMPLAINT
(MASS TORT)

26
27 Plaintiffs JANE ROE 1 through JANE ROE 1,000, JOHN ROE, BRENDA CHARITY,
28 INGRID FERREIRA, TYKAJA HALL, ERIN MARSHALL, HANNAH WELLS and CAROLINE

1 MILLER, inclusive, jointly and severally, allege the following against defendant LYFT, INC. and
2 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.

3 **PARTIES AND JURISDICTION**

4 1. The acts and omissions alleged in this complaint occurred within the State of California.
5 2. Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 is an adult and a resident of Los Angeles, California.
6 3. Plaintiff JOHN ROE is an adult and a resident of Los Angeles, California.
7 4. Plaintiff JANE ROE 2 is an adult and a resident of Worcester County, Massachusetts.
8 5. Plaintiff JANE ROE 3 is an adult and a resident of Prior Lake, Minnesota, who was in
9 Los Angeles, California at the time she was assaulted in a LYFT vehicle.

10 6. Plaintiff JANE ROE 4 is an adult and a resident of Lake Oswego, Oregon.
11 7. Plaintiff JANE ROE 5 is an adult and a resident of Old Hickory, Tennessee.
12 8. Plaintiff JANE ROE 6 is an adult and a resident of Park City, Utah.
13 9. Plaintiff JANE ROE 7 is an adult and a resident of Atlanta, Georgia.
14 10. Plaintiff JANE ROE 8 is an adult and a resident of Brooklyn, New York.
15 11. Plaintiff JANE ROE 9 is an adult and a resident of Cleveland, Ohio.
16 12. Plaintiff JANE ROE 10 is an adult and resident of Brooklyn New York.
17 13. Plaintiff JANE ROE 11 is an adult and resident of Baltimore, Maryland.
18 14. Plaintiff JANE ROE 12 is an adult and resident of Glendora, California.
19 15. Plaintiff JANE ROE 13 is an adult and resident of Stafford, Virginia.
20 16. Plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY is an adult and resident of Canton, Georgia.
21 17. Plaintiff INGRID FERREIRA is an adult and resident of Newark, New Jersey.
22 18. Plaintiff TYKAJA HALL is an adult and resident of Fridley, Minnesota.
23 19. Plaintiff CAROLINE MILLER is an adult and resident of Cartersville, Georgia.
24 20. Plaintiff ERIN MARSHALL is an adult and resident of Tucson, Arizona.
25 21. Plaintiff HANNAH WELLS is an adult and resident of Atlanta, Georgia.
26 22. Plaintiffs BRENDA CHARITY, INGRID FERREIRA, TYKAJA HALL, CAROLINE
27 MILLER, ERIN MARSHALL, HANNAH WELLS, AND JANE ROE 1, through JANE ROE 1,000,
28 ///

1 each and all, are adults and are residents of the places that may hereafter be alleged by way of
2 amendment to this complaint.

3 23. At all times relevant to this complaint, defendant LYFT, INC. (referred to in this
4 complaint as "LYFT") was a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place
5 of business located at 185 Berry Street, Suite 5000, in the City and County of San Francisco, State of
6 California. At all times relevant to this complaint, LYFT was conducting business in the City and
7 County of San Francisco, State of California, and in all other places mentioned in this complaint, both
8 as initially pleaded and as may be pleaded by way of amendment, including, but not limited to, Los
9 Angeles, California; Newark, New Jersey; Sutton, Massachusetts; Prior Lake, Minnesota; Lake
10 Oswego, Oregon; Hickory, Tennessee; Nashville, Tennessee; Park City, Utah; Atlanta, Georgia;
11 Brooklyn, New York; New York, New York; Cleveland, Ohio; Canton, Georgia; Fridley, Minnesota;
12 Cartersville, Georgia; Tucson, Arizona; Stafford, Virginia; Greenberg, Maryland; and Baltimore,
13 Maryland

14 24. Plaintiffs do not know the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES
15 1 through 100, inclusive, and, in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure Section 474,
16 plaintiffs therefore sue these defendants by the fictitious names of DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.
17 Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of the
18 fictitiously-named defendants when their true identities and capacities become known to plaintiffs.

19 25. DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are responsible in some manner—either by act or
20 omission, strict liability, fraud, negligence or otherwise—for the events and happenings alleged in this
21 complaint and thereby caused harm to plaintiffs, and each of them.

22 26. At all relevant times, each defendant—including DOES 1 through 100, inclusive—was
23 the agent, servant, representative, partner or employee of each of the co-defendants, and, in doing the
24 things alleged in this complaint, was acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agent,
25 servant, representative, partner or employee of each of co-defendant.

26 27. Wherever this complaint refers to "defendants," such reference shall mean and include
27 each expressly named defendant and all DOE defendants.

28 ///

1 28. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article 6, section 10 of the
2 California Constitution and section 410.10 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The amount in controversy
3 exceeds the jurisdictional limit of \$25,000.

4 29. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants, each of which is licensed to
5 conduct and is systematically and continuously conducting business in the State of California.

6 30. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section
7 395.5. Defendants transact business in this County, maintain their principal place of business in this
8 County, and the conduct complained of occurred in this County.

9 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10 31. Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100 offer a ridesharing service, similar to a taxi
11 service. LYFT is a transportation company headquartered in San Francisco, California and is one of the
12 fastest growing companies in the United States. LYFT is a Transportation Network Company as
13 defined by California Public Utilities Code Section 5431c.

14 32. At least as early as 2015, LYFT, including Lyft's officers, directors and/or managing
15 agents, became aware that LYFT drivers were sexually assaulting and raping female customers. Since
16 2015, sexual predators driving for LYFT have continued to assault and rape LYFT's female passengers.
17 For four years, LYFT, including Lyft's officers, directors and/or managing agents, has known of the
18 ongoing sexual assaults and rapes by LYFT drivers upon LYFT customers. Complaints to LYFT by
19 female customers who have been attacked by LYFT drivers, combined with subsequent criminal
20 investigations by law enforcement, clearly establish that LYFT, including Lyft's officers, directors
21 and/or managing agents, has been fully aware of these continuing attacks by sexual predators driving
22 for LYFT.

23 33. LYFT's response to this sexual predator crisis amongst LYFT drivers has been
24 appallingly inadequate. LYFT, at the direction of LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents,
25 continues to hire drivers without performing adequate background checks. LYFT continues to allow
26 culpable drivers who have complaints of rape and sexual assault lodged against them to keep driving for
27 LYFT. And, most importantly, LYFT, at the direction of LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing
28 agents, has failed to adopt and implement reasonable driver monitoring procedures designed to protect

1 the safety of its passengers. As a consequence, LYFT passengers continue to be victims of sexual
2 assaults and rapes by LYFT drivers.

3 34. Unfortunately, there have been many sexual assaults much worse than the ones suffered
4 by plaintiffs as alleged herein, where victims have been attacked and traumatized after they simply
5 contracted with LYFT for a safe ride home.

6 35. To utilize the service, a LYFT customer uses a smartphone application (hereinafter the
7 "LYFT Ridesharing App" or "LYFT App") to request a ride in a motor vehicle. The LYFT App
8 communicates with a LYFT driver who then picks up the customer in a vehicle that is identified as a
9 LYFT vehicle and drives the customer to the customer's destination. Passengers pay LYFT a fee in
10 exchange for safe passage to their destination. LYFT's public representations state that "safety is our
11 top priority" and "it is our goal to make every ride safe, comfortable and reliable." Sadly, LYFT's
12 priority is not passenger safety. Profits and market share are LYFT's priority. Lyft could make a few
13 simple changes to the LYFT Ridesharing App to vastly increase passenger safety, but unfortunately,
14 LYFT has chosen to not do so. As a result, the plaintiffs in this complaint, and other female passengers,
15 continue to be attacked by sexual predators and have their lives irrevocably altered by the assailants
16 driving for LYFT.

17 36. LYFT, including LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents, is also aware that
18 sexual assaults are not limited to LYFT passengers. LYFT is aware of the multitude of LYFT drivers
19 that have reported being assaulted while driving for LYFT. LYFT is also aware that many LYFT
20 drivers have installed cameras in their vehicles, at their own expense, to protect them from the incidence
21 of sexual assault.

22 37. LYFT, at the direction of LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents,
23 understands that reports of rape and sexual assault by its drivers is not good for its business. Instead of
24 taking a few basic and simple measures to prevent rapes and sexual assault of their passengers, LYFT,
25 at the direction of LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents, has chosen to hide and conceal
26 from the United States public the staggering number of reported rapes and sexual assaults that occur
27 within their vehicles. LYFT, at the direction of their officers, directors and/or managing agents, has

28 ///

1 made a concerted effort in the media, in litigation and in criminal cases to hide and conceal the true
2 extent of sexual assaults that occur in their vehicles.

3 38. Plaintiffs' counsel represents multiple women that have been sexually assaulted by
4 LYFT drivers. Despite attempting to obtain records regarding the number of reported rapes and assaults
5 that have been reported to LYFT, LYFT has attempted to conceal and block the release and disclosure
6 of any records regarding the number of reported rape and sexual assaults of LYFT passengers.

7 39. Based on information and belief, Plaintiffs confidently allege that many thousands have
8 been assaulted in LYFT vehicles in the United States and LYFT officers, directors and/or managing
9 agents are aware that several thousands of women have been assaulted in Lyft vehicles. LYFT officers,
10 directors and/or managing agents have hidden those facts and numbers from their customers and
11 passengers.

12 40. LYFT corporate management, including LYFT officers, directors and/or managing
13 agents, has failed to implement the most basic and rudimentary procedures for the proper investigation
14 of sexual assaults that are reported in their vehicles.

15 41. LYFT has continued to let sexual predators drive and interact with vulnerable members
16 of the public after they have received reports of sexual assaults by these predatory drivers. In many
17 cases, LYFT has allowed sexual predators and assailants to continue driving after LYFT learned of the
18 assaults committed by those drivers.

19 42. Corporate decision-making with respect to passenger safety issues is centered at LYFT's
20 corporate headquarters in San Francisco. Corporate decision-making with respect to policies and
21 procedures for training and supervising drivers regarding sexual assault are centered at LYFT's
22 corporate headquarters in San Francisco. Corporate decision-making with respect to how LYFT
23 responds to complaints of sexual assault is centered at LYFT's corporate headquarters in San Francisco.
24 Corporate decision-making with respect to how LYFT's choses to stonewall and fail to cooperate with
25 law enforcement investigating assaults of their drivers is centered at LYFT's corporate headquarters in
26 San Francisco. Decisions with respect to the vetting of LYFT drivers and the supervision and non-
27 supervision of LYFT drivers *vis a vis* the safety of its passengers are made and implemented in its San
28 Francisco headquarters. Corporate decision-making with respect to LYFT's decision not to report

1 assaults that they are aware of to law enforcement and other ride sharing companies that employ the
2 assailants is centered at LYFT's corporate headquarters in San Francisco. Decisions with respect to the
3 design of the LYFT App and implementation of changes with the LYFT App that effect passenger
4 safety are made and implemented in its San Francisco headquarters. Corporate decision-making with
5 respect to LYFT's policies and procedures to allow reported sexual predators to continue to drive for
6 LYFT is centered at LYFT's corporate headquarters in San Francisco. Decisions regarding LYFT's
7 contract with LYFT customers specifies that the agreement should be governed by California law. The
8 specific officers, directors and/or managing agents responsible for the policies and procedures guiding
9 LYFT are centered at LYFT's corporate headquarters in San Francisco.

10 **INADEQUATE SAFETY PRECAUTIONS AND INADEQUATE SCREENING**

11 43. The hiring of LYFT drivers occurs without any real screening. Potential drivers merely
12 fill out a form online. There is no interview either in person or through a video call, i.e. Skype or
13 FaceTime. There is no adequate background check and no biometric fingerprinting. Almost all online
14 applicants become drivers. Once a LYFT applicant becomes a driver, LYFT fails to utilize its own
15 technology, including in car cameras and GPS tracking, to ensure that drivers keep the camera running
16 during the entire ride and that the driver remains on course to the passenger's destination.

17 44. LYFT, including LYFT officers, directors and/or managing agents, does not have a zero-
18 tolerance policy for sexual misconduct and has allowed drivers who have been reported to have
19 committed rape and sexual assault to continue driving.

20 45. LYFT, including LYFT officers, directors and/or managing agents, does not require non-
21 harassment training. LYFT does not adequately investigate customer complaints of sexually
22 inappropriate behavior or serious sexual assaults. Notwithstanding LYFT's history of hiring sexual
23 predators who have assaulted LYFT passengers, and notwithstanding the obvious and open subculture
24 of LYFT drivers
25 who harbor a sexual motivation for driving female passengers, LYFT does nothing to warn its female
26 passengers about this very serious and real danger.

27 ///

28 ///

1 LYFT'S FINANCIAL MODEL

2 46. The key to LYFT's business model is getting as many new LYFT drivers on the road as
3 possible. The more LYFT drivers and LYFT rides equals more money LYFT makes. Unfortunately,
4 more careful screening and supervision would result in fewer drivers and lower profits.

5 47. LYFT also has a high turnover among its drivers because they are not well paid and
6 often move on to other jobs. As a result, and in order to keep the number of drivers on the road at a
7 maximum level, LYFT's business model is designed to accept as many new drivers as possible and to
8 keep as many existing drivers working for LYFT as possible. Unfortunately, LYFT, including LYFT
9 officers, directors and/or managing agents, prioritizes profits over passenger safety. That is why LYFT
10 corporate management has made deliberate decisions to adopt inadequate initial screening procedures,
11 inadequate safety monitoring, and has failed to warn customers of the dangers of riding with LYFT.

12 LYFT'S CONTROL OVER ITS DRIVERS

13 48. LYFT exercises significant control over its drivers. LYFT executives set all of the fare
14 rates. Drivers have no input on the fares charged and no ability to negotiate fares with customers. Fees
15 are standardized based on mileage and or ride time, similar to taxis.

16 49. LYFT collects a percentage fee for every ride. LYFT does not charge drivers a fee to
17 become a LYFT driver and LYFT does not charge drivers to use the LYFT App.

18 50. LYFT drivers are prohibited from answering passenger inquiries about booking rides
19 outside of the LYFT App.

20 51. LYFT has the power to terminate drivers with or without cause.

21 52. LYFT drivers are expected to accept all ride requests while they are logged into the App.
22 Drivers who reject or cancel too many ride requests risk facing discipline, including suspension or
23 termination.

24 53. LYFT provides its drivers with and requires them to use and display LYFT branding
25 materials in order to make their drivers easily identifiable as LYFT drivers.

26 54. LYFT also allows for passengers to provide comments to LYFT regarding their
27 experience with the LYFT driver. These comments are not shared with other passengers. Passengers are
28 not provided with any information regarding their driver other than a photograph, and other basic

1 information about the car. Passengers are not informed about prior complaints concerning particular
2 drivers.

3 55. Within the App, LYFT does not tell passengers whether their comments regarding
4 drivers are shared with drivers, resulting in a ride share culture where passengers are fearful that giving
5 honest negative feedback could negatively impact their passenger star rating or result in retaliation from
6 the driver.

7 **NO MONITORING OF RIDES**

8 56. Given LYFT's, including LYFT officers, directors and/or managing agents, knowledge
9 of the sexual assaults and rapes of its customers by LYFT drivers, the company should have
10 implemented a monitoring system in order to protect its passengers. LYFT understands that many
11 assaults occur when drivers deviate from their route and turn off the ride and App before the passenger
12 destination is reached. LYFT also knows that assaults are much less likely to occur if drivers understand
13 they are being recorded or watched. As a transportation and technology company with access to a state-
14 of-the-art in-app tracking system, as well as a camera within the required mobile device, LYFT could
15 take the following simple steps towards the elimination of the sexual assaults and protecting their
16 passengers:

- 17 • Adopt a zero-tolerance policy for improper conduct and inform all drivers of the policy;
- 18 • Implement a surveillance camera within the App that can audio and video record all rides and
19 have footage saved and accessible for up to 72 hours after each ride. Implement rules requiring
20 drivers to have this system on at all times while in their vehicles.
- 21 • Inform all drivers that if they turn off the surveillance system during a LYFT ride, they will
22 never drive for LYFT again;
- 23 • Inform drivers that they may not leave the car and accompany a passenger to their home or to
24 any other location outside the vehicle, other than to provide temporary and time-limited
25 assistance to a passenger;
- 26 • Modify the functionality of the app so that LYFT can determine immediately if a driver deviates
27 from these protocols;

28 ///

- 1 • When a driver goes off course or ends a ride before the destination, a warning alert is sent to the
2 driver that their location has been mapped and that they should report the reason for the
3 deviation;
- 4 • When a driver goes off course or ends a ride before the destination, a message should be sent to
5 the passenger checking in on them.

6 57. The ongoing sexual attacks by LYFT drivers are and have long been known to LYFT
7 and LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents. Prior to the assaults on the plaintiffs alleged
8 herein, LYFT has known that a consequence of its business model has been exposing women, who are
9 using the business for a safe ride home, to drivers that may take advantage of their vulnerable position.
10 Despite being a company that holds itself out to the public as being engaged in the safe transportation of
11 its customers from place to place for compensation, LYFT, at the direction of LYFT's officers, directors
12 and/or managing agents, has failed to take any reasonable precautions to attempt to prevent harm to its
13 passengers.

14 58. At the time of the actions alleged in this complaint LYFT, and LYFT's officers, directors
15 and/or managing agents, was aware of the established occurrence of sexual assault of its female
16 passengers by its drivers but failed to take any reasonable action to protect its passengers from these
17 assaults and violations.

18 MISREPRESENTATIONS AS TO SAFETY

19 59. In addition to inadequate background check procedures, LYFT affirmatively induces
20 passengers, particularly young, unaccompanied, intoxicated, and/or vulnerable women, to use its
21 services with the expectation of safety, while LYFT simultaneously knows that sexual abuse of its
22 passengers has been prevalent.

23 60. In February 2015, LYFT's website posted a blog post announcing it had partnered with
24 *It's On Us*, an anti-sexual assault initiative, and offered free ride credits for new Lyft passengers during
25 the Spring Break season, "making it easier to get a safe ride home even if you're in a new city." In
26 November 2016, LYFT's website posted a blog post entitled "Get Home Safely with Lyft," again
27 touting its partnership with *It's On Us* and offering college students free LYFT rides so that they "don't
28 need to worry about finding a safe ride after going out." The insinuation of these articles is that LYFT

1 prevents, and does not create, the risk of sexual assault. Nowhere on LYFT's website does LYFT
2 discuss the occurrence or risk of sexual assault by LYFT's drivers. As a result, many women, like
3 Plaintiffs, enter LYFT cars unaccompanied and often after drinking with the expectation that they will
4 not be harassed, propositioned, kidnapped, attacked, stalked, raped or worse by LYFT's drivers.

5 61. Further, LYFT does not report statistics about sexual harassment or sexual assault by its
6 drivers. LYFT does not disclose its policies or procedures on dealing with sexual assault by its drivers.
7 LYFT does not properly train its customer service representatives on how to deal with serious
8 allegations of driver misconduct. As a result, passengers who report sexual abuse by a driver have been
9 later matched with the same driver, and dangerous drivers continue to drive with LYFT and continue to
10 assault passengers while LYFT profits from their actions. At the time of the attacks on the plaintiffs as
11 alleged herein, LYFT's guidelines for their drivers made no mention of sexual harassment or assault
12 guidelines.

13 62. In short, LYFT fails to follow reasonable safety procedures and intentionally induces
14 customers to use LYFT's services while in a vulnerable state. As a result, plaintiffs, and women like
15 them are sexually harassed and sexually assaulted by LYFT's drivers. Additionally, LYFT does not
16 inform UBER or other transportation networking companies when they suspend/terminate a driver,
17 thereby allowing drivers to seamlessly shift from the LYFT App to the UBER App without any
18 repercussions.

19 LYFT'S BACKGROUND CHECKS

20 63. LYFT relies on a quick, name-based background check process to screen its applicant
21 drivers and has continuously refused to adopt an industry-standard, fingerprint-based background check
22 qualification process.

23 64. LYFT's background check process requires drivers to submit personal identifiers (driver
24 license number and Social Security Number) through an online webpage. LYFT, in turn, provides this
25 information to third-party vendors to perform a basic, name-based background check.

26 65. Neither LYFT nor the third-party vendors it uses for background checks verifies that the
27 information provided by applicants is accurate or complete. The turnaround time for a LYFT
28 background check is typically between 3-5 days.

1 66. The difference between name-based background checks and fingerprint-based
2 background checks is significant. While a name-based background check searches the applicant's
3 reported name against various databases and compares records that have the same name, a fingerprint-
4 based background check (or biometric check) uses the fingerprints of the individual to match against a
5 law enforcement database, comparing records that have the same print, even if the names are different.

6 67. For example, most prospective taxi drivers are required by the taxicab companies to
7 undergo criminal background checks that require the driver to submit fingerprints through a technology
8 called "Live Scan." The fingerprint images are used to automatically search against all other fingerprint
9 images in government criminal record databases, including databases maintained by state law
10 enforcement and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The FBI's database includes criminal
11 record information from all 50 states, including sex offender registries. If a person has a criminal history
12 anywhere in the U.S., it will register as a match.

13 68. Fingerprints are not only a highly accurate way to confirm an individual's identity, they
14 are also universally used among state and federal government agencies. This allows for the highest
15 levels of information-sharing among all relevant agencies, an element that is lacking when fingerprints
16 are not used to verify identities.

17 69. Because of the unique identifying characteristics of fingerprints, the Live Scan process
18 provides assurance that the person whose criminal history has been run is, in fact, the applicant. This
19 would ensure that a convicted rapist or sexual predator could not use a false identification to become a
20 LYFT driver.

21 70. Name-based background checks, on the other hand, are limited and not easily shared
22 among the appropriate authorities. These name-based criminal background checks are performed on
23 publicly available databases and records from county courthouses, which are not linked to each other
24 and typically do not go back past seven years. Because the FBI database is not accessed, there is no true
25 national search performed, making these searches incomplete, limited and inaccurate.

26 71. Name-based background checks present systematic, fundamental problems. First, there is
27 no way to positively identify a person via a biometric indicator, increasing the likelihood of fraud.
28 Likewise, because names, addresses and birthdays are not unique, the likelihood of false positives (a

1 person linked in error with another's record) and false negatives (someone getting cleared when they
2 should not) are greatly increased. For example, if an individual changes names, or for some other reason
3 has a criminal history under a different name, the name-based checks can miss the individual's criminal
4 history.

5 72. LYFT, at the direction of LYFT officers, directors and/or managing agents, has refused
6 to adopt fingerprint-based biometric checks and has in fact spent millions of dollars lobbying against
7 local regulations requiring these checks.

8 73. Despite advertising to passengers that "Your safety is important" and "Safety is our top
9 priority," LYFT's background check process is designed for speed, not safety. In refusing to adopt
10 reasonable safety procedures, LYFT makes clear that its priority is profit, not passenger safety.

11 74. By failing to take reasonable steps to confront the problem of multiple rapes and sexual
12 assaults of LYFT passengers by LYFT drivers, LYFT and LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing
13 agents, have acted in conscious disregard of the safety of its passengers, including plaintiffs, and has
14 breached its duty of reasonable care and has breached the implied and express covenants arising from
15 its contract with its passengers.

16 75. LYFT is legally responsible for the harm to plaintiffs under a number of legal theories
17 including vicarious liability for the intentional acts of its employees (battery and assault) basic
18 negligence for failing to act with reasonable care when faced with multiple and ongoing attacks by its
19 drivers, breach of the non-delegable duty of a transportation company to provide safe passage to its
20 passengers, punitive damages for the conscious disregard of the safety of its female passengers,
21 intentional and negligent misrepresentations and breaches of contract, and express and implied
22 covenants arising out of its commercial contracts with its passengers, including plaintiffs.

23 76. LYFT, at the direction of LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents, has
24 embraced wide ranging policies and procedures that seek to silence victims that have been sexually
25 assaulted by their drivers.

26 MANDATORY REPORTING OF SEXUAL ASSAULT

27 77. The benefits, reasoning and rationale for mandatory reporting of sexual assault is
28 undisputed and well documented. One of the most obvious reasons for the policy of mandatory

1 reporting of sexual assault is stopping sexual assault and preventing future sexual assault and the lives
2 that can be destroyed by sexual assault. A policy of mandatory reporting helps stop the predators that
3 commit sexual assault. Despite the knowledge that adopting a policy of mandatory reporting will help
4 prevent future assaults and increase passenger safety, LYFT, at the direction of LYFT's officers,
5 directors and/or managing agents, has adopted a policy that is the opposite of mandatory reporting.
6 LYFT does not report allegations of rape and brutal sexual assault to the police. Instead, LYFT makes
7 every effort to hide and conceal these sexual assault reports from law enforcement, the public, media
8 and our courts.

9 78. LYFT understands that their drivers often drive for UBER and other ridesharing
10 companies. Lyft also understands that sexual predators are likely to continue committing sexual assault.
11 Despite the knowledge of the benefits of reporting sexual assailants, LYFT does not report sexual
12 assaults and rapes to law enforcement and does not share information regarding sexual assaults and
13 rapes with other ridesharing companies despite the knowledge that these drivers are employed by other
14 ridesharing companies. LYFT, at the direction of LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents,
15 has adopted a policy which knowingly chooses to hide and conceal the identities of the drivers that rape
16 and sexually assault LYFT passengers.

17 79. Any ridesharing company such as LYFT that is concerned about public safety and has
18 more sexual assaults than almost any other company in US history would adopt a zero-tolerance policy
19 and have mandatory reporting of sexual assaults to law enforcement and other ride sharing companies.
20 Instead, LYFT' officers, directors and/or managing agents have chosen to sacrifice the lives of sexual
21 assault victims in the hope of deriving additional profits.

22 STONEWALLING LAW ENFORCEMENT

23 80. LYFT's attempts to conceal the problem of the sexual assault crisis is not limited to the
24 public and media. This effort to conceal from the public extends to LYFT's lack of cooperation with
25 law enforcement detectives that investigate these cases. LYFT has no policy to report crimes of rape
26 and other sexual assaults to law enforcement after those crimes are reported to them. Additionally,
27 LYFT has failed to provide records and documentation regarding sexual predators that have committed
28 multiple assaults that are critical for law enforcement investigations. The net effect of LYFT's attempts

1 to protect and conceal the reports of sexual predators from law enforcement is that dangerous sexual
2 predators continue to rape, sexually assault and ruin lives.

3 81. A responsible and reasonable company that is concerned about public safety cooperates
4 with law enforcement and shares the public's interest in stopping sexual predators. LYFT, at the
5 direction of LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents, has chosen another path. Lyft delays
6 and restricts their correspondence with police until a court order/search warrant is authorized. In many
7 cases, LYFT requires a subpoena or formal legal order to provide information police may need for an
8 investigation. Many of the assault victims in this complaint have been told by the detectives handling
9 their case that LYFT's Trust and Safety team are often unresponsive to the detective's requests.

10 82. LYFT often erases the victim's complaint from their App and does not send them a copy
11 of what they sent to LYFT regarding the assault. In these cases, the victim has no way to access or
12 retrieve their original complaint about the accused perpetrator which delays the police investigation.

13 83. After a victim has reported a rape or sexual assault, LYFT often disables the victim's
14 account. This restriction prohibits the victim from accessing key information about their perpetrator
15 including the name, photo, make and model of car, etc. which is needed for law enforcement
16 investigation. This further hampers law enforcement investigation.

17 84. LYFT does not provide the assaulted passenger with the driver's license plate number
18 which makes it difficult for law enforcement to identify the subject. Also, after the LYFT ride is
19 completed, the trip receipt does not list the license plate number or the make/model of the car. It only
20 has the driver's first name and photo, again making it hard for the police to identify LYFT's drivers.

21 85. LYFT is fully aware of the facts regarding their stonewalling and hampering law
22 enforcement investigations as described above. LYFT, at the direction of LYFT's officers, directors
23 and/or managing agents, knowingly protects the sexual predators that drive for them.

24 86. The LYFT ride-hailing platform is a haven for sexual predators preying on vulnerable
25 women.

26 LYFT POLICY TO SILENCE VICTIMS

27 87. Many people that are sexually assaulted do not report the incident because of the stigma
28 attached to sexual assault. Only a minority of courageous people that are sexually assaulted come

1 forward to report the assault. It is well known that sexual assault victims suffer tremendous mental and
2 psychological trauma as a result of being victimized by sexual assault. For this reason, any responsible
3 organization, corporation or entity that takes calls from sexual assault victims should have trauma
4 informed and trained persons in sexual trauma to handle those calls.

5 88. Despite the hundreds and thousands of calls reporting sexual assault to their company,
6 LYFT has untrained operators acting as first responders that take the calls from traumatized sexual
7 assault survivors. These untrained operators have no concept or understanding of how to communicate
8 with a sexual assault survivor. Oftentimes sexual assault victims get automated and recorded messages.
9 All of the above is part of LYFT's effort to silence victims.

10 89. In addition to the above allegations, LYFT incorporates other methods to silence victims
11 that come forward to report sexual assault by their drivers. Oftentimes when a victim comes forward
12 and reports a sexual assault or rape, LYFT responds by turning off or deactivating the victim's LYFT
13 App.

14 90. When a victim has the courage to come forward to report the assault, LYFT does not tell
15 the victim to the report the incident to the police or other law enforcement. Rather, LYFT tells the
16 sexual assault victim that they will investigate the incident and get back to them. Unfortunately, LYFT
17 does not get back to the victim despite their promise to do so. The victim never hears from LYFT about
18 the incident again.

19 91. LYFT often erases the victim's complaint from their App. LYFT employs all of the
20 above policies to silence victims.

21 **LYFT RESPONDS INADEQUATELY TO RIDER REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT**

22 92. LYFT riders who report sexual harassment or sexual assault to LYFT's Trust & Safety
23 Team are often left feeling no better off than had they not reported at all.

24 93. According to recent media reports, these women, who feel their reports are falling on
25 deaf ears, are turning to twitter to voice their complaints. Even these reports of sexual assault seem to
26 fall flat to LYFT who responds to each with the same response: "The safety of our community is our
27 top priority."

28 ///

1 94. Even if LYFT does respond to a woman who was reported a rape, sexual harassment, or
2 sexual assault, the response, largely, follows the same script focusing on vague rhetoric about safety
3 being a top priority. LYFT more often than not, does not tell the victim what steps LYFT conducts in
4 an investigation, does not tell the victim if there have been other allegations against the same driver, and
5 does not tell the victim whether the driver has been removed from the platform.

6 95. According to media reports, LYFT employees who work in the Trust & Safety Team
7 receive approximately two weeks of training, but none of that training dealt with how to speak with
8 victims of sexual assault or how to handle sexual harassment claims.

9 96. On information and belief, LYFT's 'investigations' into reports of rape and sexual
10 assault amount to nothing more than following up with the rider and the driver and checking to see if
11 the driver has any previous complaints against him.

12 97. The results of these 'investigations' are not shared with the reporting victim, law
13 enforcement, or other ridesharing companies which would not only aid in actual law enforcement
14 investigations, but would ensure that drivers with a history of rape and sexual assault are not allowed to
15 continue driving and assaulting additional future victims.

16
17 **LYFT'S SAFETY MEASURES CONTINUE TO BE INADEQUATE TO PROTECT AGAINST**
18 **SEXUAL ASSAULT AND RAPE IN THEIR VEHICLES**

19 98. LYFT's newly enacted safety measures continue to fall short of protecting female
20 passengers from being sexually assaulted by their LYFT driver.

21 99. In response to previous lawsuits filed against LYFT alleging rape and sexual assault,
22 LYFT's head of Trust & Safety, Mary Winfield, stated in September "as a platform committed to
23 providing safe transportation, we hold ourselves to a higher standard by designing products and policies
24 to keep out bad actors, make riders and drivers feel safe, and react quickly if and when an incident does
25 occur."

26 100. Despite LYFT's 'higher standard' women, including some Plaintiffs herein, continue to
27 be raped and sexually assaulted in LYFT vehicles by LYFT drivers.

1 101. LYFT's officers, directors and/or managing agents have still not chosen to implement
2 biometric fingerprint or Live Scan background checks.

3 102. LYFT's newly announced standardized protocol for determining whether or not to ban
4 drivers from the platform may pose a continued threat to passengers. The standardized protocol will
5 introduce a black and white decision structure reducing the ability to implement a human judgment call
6 based on a pattern of similar complaints of the same driver.

7 103. This new standardized protocol for dealing with complaints of sexual assault could, and
8 likely will result in dangerous sexual predators remaining on LYFT's platform until a more serious
9 incident, like a rape occurs.

10 **LYFT FAILS TO PARTICIPATE IN TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANY SAFETY**
11 **HEARINGS**

12 104. On October 16, 2019 at 10:00 AM, the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit of the
13 United States House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a hearing
14 entitled "Examining the Future of Transportation Network Companies: Challenges and Opportunities"
15 ("the Hearing").

16 105. The aim of the Hearing was to discuss safety challenges and opportunities to protect both
17 rideshare passengers and drivers across the country as well as to discuss legislation that has been
18 proposed to achieve greater safety and regulations of TNCs.

19 106. The Subcommittee on Highways and Transit invited both Uber and LYFT to participate
20 in the Hearing in order to answer the Subcommittee's questions, and provide the TNC perspective on
21 safety and regulations.

22 107. Despite the obvious intent of the Subcommittee to increase the safety of rideshare for its
23 passengers and customers, LYFT refused to meet before the subcommittee. As a result, the
24 Subcommittee's questions were left unanswered. LYFT refused to appear because passenger and
25 customer safety is not, and has never been, a priority or concern for LYFT.

26 108. On October 17, 2019, the Subcommittee sent to LYFT a list of questions that went
27 unanswered and requested LYFT respond, in writing, to become part of the record of the Hearing.
28 Many of the questions posed to LYFT were regarding LYFT's position of the safety of their passengers:

1 Public Safety: The hearing highlighted the growing number of news reports of alleged
2 assaults on passengers who utilize TNCs. At the hearing, Paul Miller, Legislative Counsel
3 with the Transportation Alliance, noted that when a taxi driver is involved in an accident or
4 alleged assault against a passenger, not only are local police on-site but the taxi commission
5 conducts oversight as well. For TNCs, alleged assaults or crimes are not documented as
6 TNG-related, even if reported to local authorities. The only comprehensive data source of
7 passenger-reported assaults and other incidents against Lyft drivers resides with your
8 company.

- 9
4. Do you support making the number of reported crimes perpetrated by drivers
10 against passengers you have received publicly available?
 5. Do you support local authorities tracking incidents that occur on hailed rides in
11 order to provide law enforcement with better data to inform their public safety
12 strategies?
 6. Do you track the type and frequency of passenger-reported crimes perpetrated by
13 drivers you receive? If not, please explain why.
 7. Please provide data on the total number of incidents involving alleged crimes
14 against riders by drivers you have received, to date, broken down by type.
 8. What is your specific process for reviewing alleged incidents of violence, assault, or
15 harassment reported by Lyft passengers? What is your specific process for
16 reviewing complaints and alleged incidents by Lyft drivers? What is your specific
17 protocol for when and how to refer incidents to law enforcement?

18 9. What is your specific protocol to follow up with drivers who have been accused of
19 harassment, assault, or violence? What is your specific protocol to deactivate a
20 driver?

(Oct. 17, 2019 Subcommittee on Highways and Transit Letter to Logan Green)

THE ATTACKS UPON PLAINTIFFS

JANE ROE 1

23 109. On September 26, 2019 plaintiff JANE ROE 1 used the ridesharing service offered by
24 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After a friend of JANE ROE 1 used the LYFT App to
25 summon a driver, a LYFT driver named Luiz picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 1 within Los Angeles,
26 California. While in route to JANE ROE 1's destination, plaintiff JANE ROE 1 was sexually assaulted
27 by the above-named LYFT driver who had responded to her friend's request made through the LYFT
28 App.

1 110. On the evening of September 25, Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 was out with friends after work.
2 She was with a close friend at a bar in Culver City, Los Angeles, California until approximately 1:30am
3 on September 26, 2019. Plaintiff JANE ROE 1's friend decided to call for a LYFT to pick Plaintiff
4 JANE ROE 1 from the bar and take her home. Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 was intoxicated and fell asleep in
5 the back seat of the LYFT vehicle on the way home. She woke up and recognized that she was in her
6 neighborhood. The LYFT driver started hitting on her, telling Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 that she was "so
7 pretty" and "so cute." Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 responded that she was married and showed him her
8 wedding ring. Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 fell asleep in the backseat again. She woke up and the LYFT
9 driver was on top of her, with his tongue in her mouth. She shouted "Get off of me! I have to go!" The
10 LYFT driver jumped out of the car, got back in the front seat, and started driving again. Plaintiff JANE
11 ROE 1 fell in and out of consciousness, and woke up looking out the window and not recognizing
12 where she was. She was very confused, feeling sick and threw up. About that same time, police lights
13 came on and pulled the LYFT vehicle over. The driver was arrested at approximately 3:00am. Plaintiff
14 JANE ROE 1 was still confused, and her husband appeared with the police.

15 111. Unbeknownst to Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 at the time of the assault, her husband, Plaintiff
16 JOHN ROE, was waiting for her to arrive home. He was texting with the friend who summoned the
17 LYFT vehicle that was supposed to be bringing Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 home. According to the LYFT
18 application, the ride showed that the LYFT driver had dropped Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 off at home.
19 Plaintiff JOHN ROE went downstairs to see if she had lost her keys and was unable to get in. When he
20 arrived downstairs he saw the LYFT vehicle with two people in the backseat and started walking
21 towards it. When he got close, the LYFT driver Luiz jumped into the front seat and sped off. Plaintiff
22 JOHN ROE realized that the other person in the backseat was his wife, Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 who was
23 passed out. He immediately called the police.

24 112. Both Plaintiff JOHN ROE and the police were trying to contact LYFT to get information
25 about the LYFT vehicle so that an All-Points Bulletin could be issued, and police around the city could
26 search for Plaintiff JANE ROE 1. Despite repeated requests from John Roe and the police, LYFT failed
27 to provide any information.

28 ///

1 113. Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 has very little knowledge of what happened to her that night
2 because of how intoxicated she was. She is unsure the extent of the sexual assault, but underwent a
3 SART exam, and continues to have tests run to make sure she is healthy.

4 114. LYFT never informed JANE ROE 1 whether this driver continues to drive for LYFT.
5 This predator may still be driving for LYFT.

6 115. JANE ROE 1 suffers emotional trauma following this assault. She is fearful, anxious,
7 and suffers from sadness and confusion over this assault. As a result of the assault, she had to undergo
8 medical procedures. ROE 1's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical treatment in
9 the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or future medical
10 and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

11 116. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 1 suffered. JANE
12 ROE 1 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
13 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
14 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally
15 JANE ROE 1 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
16 potential. JANE ROE 1 is entitled to damages for such harm.

17 **JOHN ROE**

18 117. On the evening of September 25, 2019, Plaintiff JOHN ROE was at the home he shares
19 with his wife in Los Angeles, California. He knew that his wife was out with friends and would be
20 home late. He was expecting her home at approximately 2:00am on the morning of September 26,
21 2019.

22 118. Plaintiff JOHN ROE was texting with his wife's friend who had called wife a
23 LYFT vehicle to bring her home as she was intoxicated and could not drive herself. The friend
24 informed JOHN ROE that the LYFT application showed that his wife had been dropped off at home. It
25 was now shortly after 2:00am. Plaintiff JOHN ROE became worried that his wife has lost her keys or
26 was unable to get into their home. He went outside to look for her.

27 119. Upon arriving outside, Plaintiff JOHN ROE was texting with his wife's friend, asking
28 what kind of vehicle his was should be arriving in. She told JOHN ROE it should be a Hyundai Elantra,

1 which Plaintiff JOHN ROE believed he saw across the street from their complex. He began walking
2 towards the vehicle.

3 120. Plaintiff JOHN ROE could see two people in the backseat of the vehicle. When he got
4 close, one person, later discovered to be the LYFT driver, Luiz, jumped out of the backseat, and into the
5 front. Plaintiff JOHN ROE then saw that the other person in the vehicle was his wife, Plaintiff JANE
6 ROE 1. The LYFT driver then sped off with Plaintiff JOHN ROE's wife, Plaintiff JANE ROE 1 still in
7 the backseat of the vehicle.

8 121. Plaintiff JOHN ROE became incredibly worried and concerned for the safety of his wife.
9 He suffered anguish, fright, and fear because he was unsure what the LYFT driver intended to do with
10 his wife, and was scared he may never see his wife again.

11 122. Plaintiff JOHN ROE called the police, who came to the home. The police tried to call
12 LYFT to get a license plate number for the LYFT vehicle that has driven off with Plaintiff JANE ROE
13 1. LYFT would not provide any information that would help the police find Plaintiff JOHN ROE's
14 wife.

15 123. After what seemed like an eternity the police informed Plaintiff JOHN ROE they may
16 have found the LYFT vehicle. The police took Plaintiff JOHN ROE to identify the vehicle. It was now
17 approximately 3:00am, and his wife had been missing form nearly 45 minutes. When Plaintiff JOHN
18 ROE arrived at the scene, he identified the vehicle, and was finally reunited with his wife, who was
19 intoxicated, and unsure of what was going on. The LYFT driver was arrested.

20 124. As a result of the LYFT driver taking his wife, Plaintiff JOHN ROE suffered severe
21 emotion distress including suffering, anguish, fright, horror, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, and
22 shock. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JOHN ROE 1 suffered. JOHN ROE 1
23 is entitled to damages for such harm.

24 **JANE ROE 2**

25 125. On February 10, 2019, plaintiff JANE ROE 2 used the ridesharing service offered by
26 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 2 used the LYFT App to summon a
27 driver, a LYFT driver named Oscar D. Salguero picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 2 and while within
28 Worcester County, Massachusetts and in route to JANE ROE 2's destination, plaintiff JANE ROE 2

1 was raped by the above-named LYFT driver who had responded to her request made through the LYFT
2 App.

3 126. JANE ROE 2 was out with a friend and tenant in Millbury, MA, which is within
4 Worcester County, MA. She had too much to drink, so she called a LYFT at some point between
5 1:00am and 2:25am to take her home. The LYFT driver Oscar D. Salguero raped plaintiff in the back
6 seat of the LYFT vehicle. JANE ROE 2 was in shock and disbelief at what was happening. She
7 thought of her child and the belief that she was going to be killed and made a split-second decision to
8 fight back. When JANE ROE 2 began to fight back, the LYFT driver fought back, and the two tumbled
9 out of the car. The LYFT driver tried to slam his door shut, but JANE ROE 2's arm was in the door.
10 He drove and dragged Jane 2 but was finally able to get away. She was left laying in the street. He also
11 threw her LapTop and purse into the road and then proceeded to run over them. Her belongings were
12 strewn across the street.

13 127. JANE ROE 2 crawled to a nearby house, and awoke the resident, telling the female
14 occupant that she was just raped by her LYFT driver. JANE ROE 2 was curled up in the fetal position
15 on the woman's front porch, crying and terrified. The woman called the police, who arrived to find
16 JANE ROE inconsolable.

17 128. JANE ROE 2 was taken by the police to have a rape kit done. She was noted to have
18 bruises and abrasions on her legs during the exam.

19 129. Oscar D. Oswego was charged with rape and incident assault and battery of a person
20 over 14. Ultimately, he pled guilty and was sentenced to prison.

21 130. Plaintiff JANE ROE 2's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
22 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 2 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
23 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

24 131. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 2 suffered. JANE
25 ROE 2 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
26 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
27 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,

28 ///

1 JANE ROE 2 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
2 potential. JANE ROE 2 is entitled to damages for such harm.

3 **JANE ROE 3**

4 132. On January 25, 2019, plaintiff JANE ROE 3 used the ridesharing service offered by
5 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 3 used the LYFT App to summon a
6 driver, a LYFT driver named Conway, last name unknown but to be alleged after discovery in this
7 litigation, picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 3 and while within Los Angeles, California and in route to
8 JANE ROE 3's destination, plaintiff JANE ROE 3 was raped by the LYFT driver (Conway) who had
9 responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

10 133. JANE ROE 3 was in Los Angeles, California for a two-week work training. She
11 currently resides in Prior Lake, Minnesota, and is unfamiliar with Los Angeles. JANE ROE 3 was out
12 with co-workers at a bar in the Venice area. She was intoxicated, and her co-workers used her LYFT
13 app to summon a LYFT to take her back to her hotel. When the LYFT vehicle arrived, the co-workers
14 matched the driver to the picture on the LYFT app. Plaintiff got in the car, but fell asleep while in the
15 vehicle.

16 134. JANE ROE 3 awoke in the LYFT vehicle with a different Lyft driver who was not the
17 LYFT Driver who was on the LYFT app, or the person who initially picked her up. The new LYFT
18 driver began telling JANE ROE 3 "you're beautiful" and telling her she was 'pretty' and 'gorgeous.'
19 JANE ROE 3 began to feel scared, and told the driver she needed to vomit, hoping she could get out of
20 the vehicle. Instead, when the driver pulled over, he stood in front of the open door, preventing JANE
21 ROE 3 from escaping, but allowing her to vomit. When they got back in the LYFT vehicle, the driver
22 began groping JANE ROE 3 and then raped her. The driver pulled the LYFT car over and continued to
23 rape JANE ROE 3. It was now 12:30am the next morning, January 26, 2019, and JANE ROE 3 was
24 terrified that she would be killed by this driver, so she remained still.

25 135. After the driver assaulted and raped JANE ROE 3 for some period of time, he stopped at
26 a gas station. While he was in the gas station, a co-worker called JANE ROE 3, she answered, and said
27 "I am not okay, I am inside the car with him." When the driver got back to the car, he instructed JANE
28 ROE JANE ROE 3's co-worker to Venmo him money for the ride and texted the co-worker his Venmo

1 information. The driver finally brought JANE ROE 3 back to her hotel. The trip receipt shows that the
2 ride terminated 2 minutes after it began, and only 3 blocks had been travelled.

3 136. The driver, who JANE ROE 3 later learned was a man named Lofti Ben Yedder, texted
4 JANE ROE 3 at approximately 1:40 in the morning, about 14 minutes after he brought her back to the
5 hotel. He told her "it was a real pleasure meeting you."

6 137. JANE ROE 3 reported to the assault to LYFT in the morning on January 26, 2019.
7 When she provided LYFT the phone number of the driver who assaulted her, they found a LYFT
8 account associated with that number. The person at LYFT that JANE ROE 3 spoke with was
9 unsympathetic and offered no real help except to refund JANE ROE 3 \$5.79 for her ride.

10 138. Plaintiff JANE ROE 3 went to the police station to report the rape. The police officers
11 took JANE ROE 3 to get a SART. The criminal investigation is believed to be ongoing.

12 139. Plaintiff JANE ROE 3's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
13 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 3 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
14 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

15 140. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 3 suffered. JANE
16 ROE 3 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
17 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
18 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
19 JANE ROE 3 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
20 potential. JANE ROE 3 is entitled to damages for such harm.

21 **JANE ROE 4**

22 141. On November 12, 2019, plaintiff JANE ROE 4 used the ridesharing service offered by
23 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 4 used the LYFT App to summon a
24 driver, a LYFT driver named Ran, last name unknown but to be alleged after discovery in this litigation,
25 picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 4 and while within Lake Oswego, Oregon, and in route to JANE ROE
26 4's destination, plaintiff JANE ROE 4 was sexually assaulted by the LYFT driver (Ran) who had
27 responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

28 ///

1 142. Upon arriving to pick up JANE ROE 3, LYFT's driver (Ran) asked her to cancel the
2 ride, because his LYFT app was not connecting. She was unable to find the app on her phone, so he
3 took her phone and cancelled the ride himself. When JANE ROE 3 started to get in the back seat, the
4 LYFT driver told her to get in the front seat. While in route to JANE ROE 3's home, the LYFT driver
5 was making small talk, telling her about his DJ business. He then reached over and began to sexually
6 assault JANE ROE 4. JANE ROE 4 was scared, pinned herself against the passenger door. The LYFT
7 driver then continued to assault JANE ROE 4. During the entire ride, the LYFT driver (Ran) kept
8 telling her how pretty she was and continued to assault her. When they finally arrived at her house,
9 JANE ROE4 ran out of the vehicle and up to her apartment. Before she was even inside, she had a text
10 from the driver saying to was nice to meet her.

11 143. The following morning, JANE ROE 4 googled the LYFT driver, Ran, and found a string
12 of complaints about him assaulting other female passengers in his LYFT vehicle.

13 144. JANE ROE 4 reported the sexual assault to LYFT via the LYFT application, telling them
14 that the LYFT driver had sexually assaulted her. She was informed that her report would be best
15 directed to a different department, and that her case would be 'forwarded to the appropriate
16 department.'" JANE ROE 4 received a canned response email from LYFT's Trust and Safety team.

17 145. LYFT responded by saying they would need to investigate the driver first. LYFT did not
18 tell her if they would remove or restrict him from the platform. JANE ROE 4 has not been informed if
19 any action has been taken to terminate Ran as a driver from LYFT. She has not been told whether
20 LYFT is aware of any prior reports of sexual assault perpetrated by their driver, Ran. LYFT never
21 informed JANE ROE 4 whether this driver continues to drive for LYFT. This sexual predator may still
22 be driving for LYFT.

23 146. Plaintiff JANE ROE 4's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
24 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 4 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
25 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

26 147. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 4 suffered. JANE
27 ROE 4 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
28 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,

1 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
2 JANE ROE 4 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
3 potential. JANE ROE 4 is entitled to damages for such harm.

4 **JANE ROE 5**

5 148. On or about March 24, 2019, plaintiff JANE ROE 5 used the ridesharing service offered
6 by defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. JANE ROE 5 received a text message notification that a
7 Crisis Triage center had requested a LYFT ride for her. A LYFT driver named Nicholas G. Johnson,
8 picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 5 and while within Nashville, Tennessee and in the parking lot of JANE
9 ROE 5's destination, plaintiff JANE ROE 5 was sexually assaulted by the above-named LYFT driver
10 who had responded to the request made through the LYFT App.

11 149. JANE ROE 5 was intoxicated at the time of the incident and scared for her personal
12 safety, so she was on the phone with a crisis center. The crisis center decided to bring her in to speak
13 with her in person, and they summoned a LYFT for her. The LYFT driver (Nicholas) made small talk
14 along their drive to the crisis center, and upon arriving at the final destination, he parked in the parking
15 lot. While parked, the LYFT driver (Nicholas) pulled out his erect penis and made Plaintiff JANE ROE
16 5 touch his penis. A person from the crisis center found the LYFT vehicle in the parking lot, and
17 escorted Plaintiff JANE ROE 5 into the center. When she arrived inside, the assault was reported to
18 police.

19 150. JANE ROE 5 later reported to LYFT by contacting their corporate office. She received a
20 voicemail from someone in LYFT's Trust and Safety team, but got no real help, and was given no real
21 answers. JANE ROE 5 has not been informed whether any action has been taken by LYFT to remove
22 their driver, Nicholas, from the platform. This predator may still be driving for LYFT.

23 151. In 2009, Nicholas G. Johnson was charged with Aggravated Assault with a Deadly
24 Weapon, a Felony in Tennessee. Had LYFT done a proper background check this assault would have
25 been discovered and the driver should never have been allowed to transport Plaintiff JANE ROE 5, or
26 any other passenger.

27 ///

28 ///

1 152. Plaintiff JANE ROE 5's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
2 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 5 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
3 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

4 153. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 5 suffered. JANE
5 ROE 5 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
6 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
7 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
8 JANE ROE 5 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
9 potential. JANE ROE 5 is entitled to damages for such harm.

10 **JANE ROE 6**

11 154. On September 22, 2019, plaintiff JANE ROE 6 used the ridesharing service offered by
12 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 6 used the LYFT App to summon a
13 driver, a LYFT driver named Francisco, last name unknown but to be alleged after discovery in this
14 litigation, picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 6 and while within Park City, Utah and in route to JANE ROE
15 6's destination, plaintiff JANE ROE 6 was sexually assaulted by the above-named LYFT driver who
16 had responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

17 155. JANE ROE 6 requested a LYFT vehicle after a night with her friends. While en route to
18 JANE ROE 6's house, the LYFT driver, Francisco, began sexually assaulting JANE ROE 6. JANE
19 ROE 6 was terrified that the LYFT driver would take her somewhere and rape her, so she did not say a
20 word. Instead JANE ROE 6 pulled herself as close as possible to the door. When they arrived at her
21 house, JANE ROE 6 ran out of the car, and into her home. She checked all of the windows and doors to
22 make sure they were locked, and the LYFT driver could not get in.

23 156. Plaintiff reported the sexual assault to LYFT. She received a scripted response, and an
24 email refunding her the fare, and giving JANE ROE 6 a \$5.00 credit for being sexually assaulted.

25 157. Plaintiff JANE ROE 6's feared for her life and suffered injuries required medical
26 treatment and will require medical treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 6 does not yet know the
27 reasonable value of the past or future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such
28 losses at the time of trial.

1 158. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 6 suffered. JANE
2 ROE 6 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
3 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
4 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
5 JANE ROE 6 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
6 potential. JANE ROE 6 is entitled to damages for such harm.

7 **JANE ROE 7**

8 159. On June 23, 2019, Plaintiff JANE ROE 7 used the ridesharing service offered by
9 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 7 used the LYFT App to summon a
10 driver, a LYFT driver named Shahnawaz, last name unknown but to be alleged after discovery in this
11 litigation, picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 7 and while within New York, New York and in route to
12 JANE ROE 7's destination, Plaintiff JANE ROE 7 was sexually assaulted by the above-named LYFT
13 driver who had responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

14 160. JANE ROE 7 was visiting New York City for the weekend. She was intoxicated and
15 requested a LYFT to take her to her destination for the evening. While in route to her final destination,
16 LYFT driver, Shahnawaz pressured Plaintiff JANE ROE 7 for sexual activity. He asked JANE ROE 7
17 to kiss him, and she said no. The LYFT driver then pulled the car over and climbed into the backseat
18 with JANE ROE 7. The LYFT driver climbed on top of Plaintiff JANE ROE 7 who was yelling "no"
19 at him. He persisted in his attempt to fondle, grope and rape JANE ROE 7. She succeeded in fighting
20 him off and ran from the vehicle.

21 161. JANE ROE 7 reported to LYFT in-app via the 'passenger help bot' feature. LYFT
22 responded with an automated email stating someone will reach out once they "start the review
23 process." Two days after the assault, and her report to LYFT, LYFT deactivated JANE ROE 7's LYFT
24 account, rendering her unable to access her account. Afterward, Plaintiff received a voicemail and
25 email from a LYFT Trust & Safety representative. Plaintiff returned the call, but no one answered.
26 JANE ROE 7 attempted multiple times to get answers or a response from LYFT, but has not received
27 any answers. LYFT has not informed JANE ROE 7 whether any action has been taken to remove
28 Shahnawaz from the LYFT platform. This sexual predator could still be driving for LYFT.

1 162. Plaintiff JANE ROE 7's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
2 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 7 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
3 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

4 163. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 7 suffered. JANE
5 ROE 7 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
6 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
7 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
8 JANE ROE 7 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
9 potential. JANE ROE 7 is entitled to damages for such harm.

10 **JANE ROE 8**

11 164. On September 6, 2019, Plaintiff JANE ROE 8 used the ridesharing service offered by
12 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 8 used the LYFT App to summon a
13 driver, a LYFT driver named Abdul, last name unknown but to be alleged after discovery in this
14 litigation, picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 8 and while within Brooklyn and/or New York City, New
15 York and in route to JANE ROE 8's destination, plaintiff JANE ROE 8 was sexually assaulted by the
16 above-named LYFT driver who had responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

17 165. JANE ROE 8 had requested a LYFT to take her to a job interview in New York City.
18 When she entered the LYFT vehicle she was on her cell phone. While on her call, she noticed the
19 LYFT driver, Abdul, looking at her in the rearview mirror. JANE ROE 8 then noticed that the LYFT
20 driver began to masturbate. Plaintiff JANE ROE 8 insisted the LYFT driver stop the car and she
21 immediately exited the vehicle and called the police to be safe.

22 166. Plaintiff JANE ROE 8 also reported the sexual assault to LYFT.

23 167. Plaintiff JANE ROE 8's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
24 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 8 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
25 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

26 168. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 8 suffered. JANE
27 ROE 8 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
28 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,

1 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
2 JANE ROE 8 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
3 potential. JANE ROE 8 is entitled to damages for such harm.

4 **JANE ROE 9**

5 169. On November 30, 2018, Plaintiff JANE ROE 9 used the ridesharing service offered by
6 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 9 used the LYFT App to summon a
7 driver, a LYFT driver named Kuder, last known currently unknown but to be alleged after discovery in
8 this litigation, picked up Plaintiff JANE ROE 9 and while within Cleveland, Ohio and in route to JANE
9 ROE 9's destination, Plaintiff JANE ROE 9 was sexually assaulted by the above-named LYFT driver
10 who had responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

11 170. JANE ROE 9 called for a LYFT ride home at approximately 11:50pm after arriving back
12 in Cleveland via Greyhound Bus following a visit to her sister's home in Columbus, Ohio. The LYFT
13 driver helped JANE ROE 9 put her bags in the trunk, and offered her the front seat. She politely
14 declined, saying she would sit in the back seat. A few minutes into the ride, the LYFT driver, Kuder,
15 pulled over on the side of the road where it was very dark. The LYFT driver told JANE ROE 9 that he
16 wanted to have sex with her. JANE ROE 9 responded that he was being incredibly inappropriate and
17 asked him to take her to her destination. Instead of taking JANE ROE 9 to her destination, the LYFT
18 driver exited the front seat and got into the back seat with JANE ROE 9 and sat on top of her,
19 preventing her from leaving. The LYFT driver began holding and groping JANE ROE 9's breasts and
20 used his fingers to touch her vagina. The LYFT driver began kissing JANE ROE 9's neck, telling her
21 sexually inappropriate things. JANE ROE 9 was terrified, thinking that this LYFT driver was going to
22 kill her. She again, very forcefully told the LYFT driver to take her to her destination. He stopped the
23 assault, and took JANE ROE 9 to her destination. The driver slapped her bottom hard before leaving.

24 171. JANE ROE 9 reported the assault to LYFT, who acknowledged her report, refunded her
25 fare, and told her the driver was no longer driving for LYFT. Incredibly, after being told by LYFT that
26 Kuder would no longer drive for LYFT, JANE ROE 9 spotted the same LYFT driver, Kuder, driving
27 another passenger with a LYFT sign in his car.

28 ///

1 172. Plaintiff JANE ROE 9's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
2 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 9 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
3 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

4 173. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 9 suffered. JANE
5 ROE 9 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
6 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
7 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
8 JANE ROE 9 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
9 potential. JANE ROE 9 is entitled to damages for such harm.

10 **JANE ROE 10**

11 174. On October 16, 2019, Plaintiff JANE ROE 10 used the ridesharing service offered by
12 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 10 used the LYFT App to summon a
13 driver, a LYFT driver named Favio de los Santos Santo picked up Plaintiff JANE ROE 10 and while
14 within Brooklyn, New York and in route to JANE ROE 10's destination, Plaintiff JANE ROE 10 was
15 sexually assaulted by the LYFT driver (Favio) who had responded to her request made through the
16 LYFT App.

17 175. JANE ROE 10 was picking up some food on October 16, 2019, and requested a LYFT
18 vehicle through her LYFT app to take her home. While in route to her destination, the LYFT driver,
19 Favio, pulled his vehicle over and got into the backseat with JANE ROE 10. JANE ROE 10 protested
20 that her food would get cold. When the LYFT driver, Favio, got into the backseat he requested JANE
21 ROE 10 perform oral sex on him. She declined, again stating she wanted to go home. The LYFT
22 driver then asked JANE ROE 10 if he could kiss her. JANE ROE 10 again said no, and that she just
23 wanted to go home. Instead of taking JANE ROE 10 home the LYFT driver took out his penis and
24 made JANE ROE 10 look at it. He also took out a picture of another woman and told JANE ROE 10 he
25 wanted to have a threesome with her and JANE ROE 10. The LYFT driver then started to sexually
26 assault her by touching and licking JANE ROE 10's breasts. The LYFT driver would not let JANE
27 ROE 10 go until she called his number.

28 ///

1 176. JANE ROE 10 reported the assault to the police, who requested she not report to LYFT
2 so they could investigate. LYFT Driver Favio de los Santos Santo was charged with forcible touching,
3 sexual abuse in the 3rd degree, and harassment.

4 177. Plaintiff JANE ROE 10's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
5 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 10 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
6 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

7 178. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 10 suffered. JANE
8 ROE 10 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
9 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
10 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
11 JANE ROE 10 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
12 potential. JANE ROE 10 is entitled to damages for such harm.

13 **JANE ROE 11**

14 179. On August 25, 2019, Plaintiff JANE ROE 11 used the ridesharing service offered by
15 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. A LYFT driver by the name of Rajabboy Juraey picked up
16 Plaintiff JANE ROE 11 and while within Baltimore, Maryland, and in route to Plaintiff JANE ROE
17 11's destination, Plaintiff JANE ROE 11 was sexually assaulted by LYFT's driver, Rajabboy Juraey,
18 who had responded to the request.

19 180. Plaintiff JANE ROE 11 had been out with friends on the evening of August 24, 2019,
20 and became intoxicated. Just after midnight on August 25, 2019 she decided to request a LYFT to take
21 her to a friend's house. LYFT's driver, Rajabboy Juraey responded to JANE ROE 11's request through
22 the LYFT application. ROE 11 was unfamiliar with the area her friend's house was in, but knew it was
23 not a great part of town. While trying to find the destination, LYFT's driver, Rajabboy Juraey, began
24 assaulting JANE ROE 11 by grabbing her breasts. She immediately pulled away and began yelling at
25 him. She was afraid to get out of the car in a neighborhood she was unfamiliar and felt trapped. Shortly
26 thereafter she was able to get out and run from the vehicle.

27 181. JANE ROE 11 notified LYFT about the assault she experienced once inside. LYFT at
28 first claimed they were unable to find the ride in question. Lyft later gave her a refund for being

1 sexually assaulted. LYFT did not tell Plaintiff JANE ROE 11 whether they had taken any action to
2 remove Rajabboy Juraey from their platform. This predator may still be driving for LYFT.

3 182. Had LYFT performed an adequate background check of Rajabboy Juraey before
4 allowing him to be a LYFT driver, they would have discovered that he had multiple traffic-related
5 violations including: driving on a suspended license; having no registration; speeding; and a cell phone
6 violation. As recently as 2017 LYFT's driver, Rajabboy Juraey was driving without a license.

7 183. Plaintiff JANE ROE 11's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
8 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 11 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
9 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

10 184. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE11 suffered. JANE
11 ROE 11 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
12 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
13 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
14 JANE ROE11 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
15 potential. JANE ROE 11 is entitled to damages for such harm.

16 **JANE ROE 12**

17 185. On December 9, 2018, plaintiff JANE ROE 12 used the ridesharing service offered by
18 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. A LYFT driver named John Granillo picked up plaintiff
19 JANE ROE and while within Glendora, California and in route to Plaintiff JANE ROE 12's destination,
20 Plaintiff JANE ROE 12 was raped by LYFT's driver (John) who had responded to the request.

21 186. On December 8, 2018 Plaintiff JANE ROE 12 was hanging out with friends at the
22 University of La Verne. They were hanging out late and drinking, so JANE ROE 12's friends requested
23 a LYFT to take her back to her home in Glendora, California. LYFT's driver, John Granillo, picked up
24 Plaintiff JANE ROE after midnight on December 9, 2018.

25 187. During the drive, LYFT's driver, John Granillo, made small talk with Plaintiff JANE
26 ROE 12, who was intoxicated. When they turned onto JANE ROE 12's street, instead of stopping at
27 the destination, LYFT's driver, John Granillo, drove to the end of the street. He climbed into the
28 backseat of the vehicle with JANE ROE 12. JANE ROE 12 was confused and upset that the LYFT

1 driver was in the backseat with her. LYFT's driver, John Granillo, began touching Plaintiff JANE ROE
2 12's body and groping her and then raped her. JANE ROE 12 told the LYFT driver that she had to
3 urinate, so she exited the vehicle and ran home.

4 188. JANE ROE 12 arrived to her home in tears, she called some friends to tell them what had
5 happened. JANE ROE 12 reported the assault to the police and underwent an SART exam. JANE ROE
6 12 suffered additional emotional distress by the process of having to report to the police, who she did
7 not feel treated her as a victim of sexual assault.

8 189. Plaintiff JANE ROE 12's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
9 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 12 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
10 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

11 190. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 12 suffered. JANE
12 ROE 12 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
13 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
14 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
15 JANE ROE 12 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
16 potential. JANE ROE 12 is entitled to damages for such harm.

17 **JANE ROE 13**

18 191. On July 18, 2018 Plaintiff JANE ROE 13 used the ridesharing service offered by
19 Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After JANE ROE 13's boyfriend used the LYFT app to
20 summon a driver, a LYFT driver named David Carter picked up plaintiff JANE ROE 14 and while in or
21 around Greenberg, Maryland, and in route to JANE ROE 13's destination in Stafford, Virginia, JANE
22 ROE 13 was kidnapped and raped by LYFT's driver, David Carter, who had responded to the request
23 made through the LYFT App.

24 192. JANE ROE 13's boyfriend requested a LYFT at approximately 2:01 am to take her to
25 her home in Virginia. Plaintiff JANE ROE 13 was intoxicated, and did not have her phone with her,
26 leaving her isolated and alone. Instead of taking JANE ROE 13 to her home in Virginia where her
27 mother was waiting for her, LYFT's driver terminated the ride early. LYFT's driver took JANE ROE

28 ///

1 13 to his own home, where he raped her. The next morning, LYFT's Driver, David Carter, dumped
2 JANE ROE 13 at the home of a relative.

3 193. JANE ROE 13 reported the rape to LYFT. In response to JANE ROE 13's report to
4 LYFT, David Carter was deactivated as a LYFT driver. At some point after he was deactivated as a
5 LYFT driver, JANE ROE 13's mother saw David Carter at a Hertz Hub where he was wearing a pink
6 LYFT shirt identifying him as a full-time employee of LYFT. Incredibly, LYFT's response to JANE
7 ROE 13's report of kidnapping and rape was to hire her accused rapist and kidnapper, who was also in
8 the midst of a criminal investigation, as a full-time employee.

9 194. JANE ROE 13 also reported her kidnapping and rape to the police. The police were able
10 to get a full confession from David Carter. On March 21, 2019 LYFT driver David Carter was charged
11 with 2nd degree rape, 4th degree sex offense, 2nd degree assault, 3rd degree sex offense, and perverted
12 practice. On April 23, 2019 David Carter pled guilty to 3rd degree sex offense and was sentenced to 10
13 years in jail, of which all but 18 months and 214 days were suspended. Additionally, LYFT driver
14 David Carter was ordered to provide a DNA sample and register as a lifetime sex offender.

15 195. During the police investigation, LYFT was not cooperative and was not forthcoming
16 with information regarding their driver. The State was forced to obtain a court order asking LYFT to
17 produce all investigative records regarding the rape of JANE ROE 13 and LYFT's driver David Carter.

18 196. Plaintiff JANE ROE 13's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
19 treatment in the future. Plaintiff JANE ROE 13 does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
20 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

21 197. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that JANE ROE 13 suffered. JANE
22 ROE 13 suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional distress,
23 panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment, shame,
24 mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness. Additionally,
25 JANE ROE 13 has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost earnings and earning
26 potential. JANE ROE 13 is entitled to damages for such harm.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **BRENDA CHARITY**

2 198. On May 26, 2019, plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY used the ridesharing service offered by
3 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. A LYFT driver named Ruben, last name unknown but to be
4 alleged after discovery in this litigation, picked up plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY after transportation as
5 arranged through Southeast Transportation. While within Atlanta, Georgia and in route to Plaintiff
6 BRENDA CHARITY's destination, Plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY was sexually assaulted by LYFT's
7 driver (Ruben) who had responded to the request.

8 199. Plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY got into a LYFT which had been arranged by her
9 healthcare, to take her to a medical appointment. During the ride, the LYFT driver, Ruben, kept asking
10 Plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY "Do you feel good? Do you feel good yet?" She assumed he was
11 referring to her medical appointments. The LYFT driver said he was getting lost, and pulled into a dark
12 underground parking garage. Plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY was terrified as they pulled in. Once
13 parked, Ruben climbed over the median and got in the backseat with BRENDA CHARITY. Once in
14 the backseat, Ruben completely exposed himself to BRENDA CHARITY, taking out his penis.
15 Plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY, fearing that she would be raped, or killed, decided to lie to the LYFT
16 driver, Ruben. She told him she had just been diagnosed with HIV in an attempt to scare him. Her plan
17 seemed to work. He climbed back into the front seat, and drove BRENDA CHARITY to her
18 destination. The LYFT driver, Ruben, began masturbating in the front seat while driving BRENDA
19 CHARITY to her destination.

20 200. BRENDA CHARITY attempted to report the assault twice to Southeast Transportation,
21 the company that summoned the LYFT for her.

22 201. Plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY's injuries required medical treatment and will require
23 medical treatment in the future. Plaintiff BRENDA CHARITY does not yet know the reasonable value
24 of the past or future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time
25 of trial.

26 202. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that BRENDA CHARITY suffered.
27 BRENDA CHARITY suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to
28 emotional distress, panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation,

1 embarrassment, shame, mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of
2 powerlessness. Additionally, BRENDA CHARITY has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer
3 future lost earnings and earning potential. BRENDA CHARITY is entitled to damages for such harm.

4 **CAROLINE MILLER**

5 203. On September 1, 2019, Plaintiff CAROLINE MILLER used the ridesharing service
6 offered by defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After CAROLINE MILLER used the LYFT App
7 to summon a driver, a LYFT driver named Chadwick Demon Foster picked up plaintiff CAROLINE
8 MILLER and while within Cartersville, Georgia and in route to CAROLINE MILLER's destination in
9 or around Acworth, Georgia, plaintiff CAROLINE MILLER was raped by LYFT's driver, Chadwick
10 Demon Foster who had responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

11 204. CAROLINE MILLER requested a LYFT at approximately 2:39 am to take her from a
12 friend's house to her car, where she had left it earlier in the evening. While in route to her vehicle
13 which was approximately 35 minutes away, Plaintiff CAROLINE MILLER fell asleep. When she
14 awoke, the LYFT driver Chadwick Demon Foster was raping and groping her. She immediately pushed
15 his body away. The LYFT driver stated "I'm taking you to a hotel." Scared for her life, and trying to
16 buy time, CAROLINE MILLER informed the driver that she had asthma and would need to stop at her
17 car to get asthma medication. She informed a friend of what was happening, and the friend called the
18 police. When the LYFT driver took CAROLINE MILLER to her vehicle she pretended to look for her
19 asthma medication, giving police time to arrive on the scene. When the police arrived at the vehicle,
20 LYFT driver Chadwick Demon Foster was questioned and arrested.

21 205. CAROLINE MILLER reported the rape to LYFT via a phone call the next day. All
22 LYFT did was refund her for the ride fare.

23 206. LYFT never informed CAROLINE MILLER whether this driver continues to drive for
24 LYFT. This sexual predator may still be driving for LYFT.

25 207. Plaintiff CAROLINE MILLER's injuries required medical treatment and will require
26 medical treatment in the future. Additionally, as a result of her injuries, Plaintiff CAROLINE MILLER
27 lost her job as a server, she has now had to find alternative employment doing housework. Plaintiff

28 ///

1 CAROLINE MILLER does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or future medical and
2 incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

3 208. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that CAROLINE
4 MILLER suffered. CAROLINE MILLER suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including
5 but not limited to emotional distress, panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock,
6 humiliation, embarrassment, shame, mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and
7 feelings of powerlessness. Additionally, CAROLINE MILLER has suffered past lost earnings and will
8 suffer future lost earnings and earning potential. CAROLINE MILLER is entitled to damages for such
9 harm.

10 **TYKAJA HALL**

11 209. Early on the morning of December 31, 2017, plaintiff TYKAJA HALL used the
12 ridesharing service offered by defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After TYKAJA HALL's
13 friend used the LYFT App to summon a driver for the two women, a LYFT driver named Jose Gerardo
14 Lopez picked up plaintiff TYKAJA HALL and her friend, and after dropping the friend off, and while
15 within Fridley, Minnesota and in route to TYKAJA HALL's destination, plaintiff TYKAJA HALL was
16 raped by LYFT's driver, Jose Gerardo Lopez who had responded to the request made through the
17 LYFT App.

18 210. TYKAJA HALL was out with her friends celebrating a birthday. When their evening
19 out was done, TYJAKA HALL's friend requested a LYFT to take the women home as they were
20 intoxicated and it was after 2:00am. When the LYFT vehicle arrived at TYKAJA HALL's friend's
21 house, her friend exited the vehicle, and the driver, Jose Gerardo Lopez offered to take Ms. HALL
22 home for free since it was close to where he lived. Lyft's driver, Jose Gerardo Lopez, turned the LYFT
23 app off before she got in the vehicle. LYFT's driver, Jose Gerardo Lopez, asked TYKAJA HALL how
24 her night was, and offered her alcohol. TYKAJA HALL declined, but LYFT's driver continued
25 pressuring her by talking about the nice, expensive tequila he had, telling TYKAJA HALL that he
26 wanted her to try it. LYFT's driver continued to pressure TYKAJA HALL. She noticed the LYFT
27 driver was not driving her in the direction of her home.

28 ///

1 211. While LYFT's driver, Jose Gerardo Lopez was driving TYKAJA HALL he reached over
2 and began touching her breasts. LYFT's driver took TYKAJA HALL's hand and put it on his penis,
3 trying to get her to masturbate him. TYKAJA HALL was unable to fight Jose Gerardo Lopez off. The
4 LYFT driver took off TYKAJA HALL's bra, and continued touching and groping her exposed breasts.
5 He offered to take her to get food, TYKAJA HALL said "no, please take me home." Instead of taking
6 her home, LYFT's driver pulled over into an empty parking lot, and made TYKAJA HALL get into the
7 backseat of the LYFT vehicle. Once parked, LYFT's driver got in the backseat with TYKAJA HALL.
8 Jose Gerardo Lopez then got on top of TYKAJA HALL and raped her. TYKAJA HALL pleaded with
9 him to take her home. In an effort to end the sexual assault, TYKAJA HALL urinated in the backseat
10 of the LYFT vehicle. Finally, approximately two to three hours after the LYFT ride began, LYFT's
11 driver dropped TYKAJA HALL off at her home.

12 212. When TYKAJA HALL arrived home she crawled into a window in the back of her home
13 so that the LYFT driver would not see which house she entered. TYKAJA HALL was crying and
14 inconsolable in a bathtub when her sister found her. TYKAJA HALL managed to articulate that she
15 had been raped by the LYFT driver, so her sister and mother called the police, who came and began an
16 investigation. TYKAJA was confident that she was also drugged by the Lyft driver.

17 213. On January 8, 2018, police obtained a search warrant to search the LYFT vehicle of Jose
18 Gerardo Lopez, which the police executed on January 9, 2018. The search warrant revealed the type of
19 habitual perpetrators that drive LYFT vehicles. During the search of the vehicle, police found at least
20 three bottles of fruity flavored alcohol, including a bottle of tequila, small paper cups, and numerous
21 condoms. Police stated that it looked that this type of incident had been done many times prior.

22 214. On February 4, 2019, LYFT's driver, Jose Gerardo Lopez was found guilty of criminal
23 sexual assault in the fourth degree.

24 215. Plaintiff TYKAJA HALL's injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
25 treatment in the future. Plaintiff TYKAJA HALL does not yet know the reasonable value of the past or
26 future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

27 216. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that TYKAJA HALL suffered.
28 TYKAJA HALL suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to emotional

1 distress, panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment,
2 shame, mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of
3 powerlessness. Additionally, TYKAJA HALL has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future lost
4 earnings and earning potential. TYKAJA HALL is entitled to damages for such harm.

5 **INGRID FERREIRA**

6 217. On September 25, 2019, Plaintiff INGRID FERREIRA used the ridesharing service
7 offered by defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After INGRID FERREIRA used the LYFT App
8 to summon a driver, a LYFT driver named David, last name unknown but to be alleged after discovery
9 in this litigation, picked up plaintiff INGRID FERREIRA and while within Newark, New Jersey and in
10 route to INGRID FERREIRA's destination, plaintiff INGRID FERREIRA was sexually assaulted by
11 1LYFT's driver (David) who had responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

12 218. Plaintiff INGRID FERREIRA had just finished her shift at her job as a waitress, and she
13 and a co-worker split a LYFT to take them both home at approximately 10:40pm. The co-worker's stop
14 was first, and after she got out, INGRID FERREIRA, knowing she still had approximately 20 minutes
15 before she reached her home, put in earbuds with loud music. At different points in the ride, the LYFT
16 driver (David) tapped INGRID FERREIRA on the leg, first to offer her water, which she accepted, and
17 next to offer her pizza, which she declined. She resumed listening to music and looking at her phone.
18 While looking at her phone, INGRID FERREIRA noticed the car had not been moving for a few
19 minutes. LYFT's driver had stopped in the right lane of traffic at a cross street, but there was no stop
20 light or stop sign there. INGRID FERREIRA realized it was now past the time that she should have
21 reached her destination, and she asked LYFT's driver if everything was okay, he responded that the
22 GPS had stopped working but that he was retrying his app. The car remained still for a few more
23 minutes and INGRID FERREIRA noticed LYFT's driver scrolling through his phone, and saw his
24 shoulder moving up and down. A few minutes later LYFT's driver began driving again and they
25 reached INGRID FERREIRA's destination. When the LYFT vehicle stopped, INGRID FERREIRA
26 began gathering her belongings, and tried to open the door, but it was locked and she did not see a
27 mechanism to unlock the door from the backseat. LYFT's driver (David) then turned his whole body
28 toward INGRID FERREIRA, his penis was out and exposed to her and he was driving. LYFT's driver

1 told INGRID FERREIRA that he wanted to take her out. INGRID FERREIRA grabbed her cell phone
2 and called her husband, who was inside the house. This caused the LYFT driver to put his penis back in
3 his pants and unlock the door. INGRID FERREIRA grabbed her belonging and got out of the vehicle,
4 but LYFT's driver (David) got out, began to approach her and tried to put his hands on her. INGRID
5 FERREIRA's husband was now walking towards the vehicle and LYFT's driver (David) jumped in the
6 car and sped away quickly, with the backdoor still open.

7 219. INGRID FERREIRA and her husband reported the incident to the Newark Police
8 Department.

9 220. Plaintiff INGRID FERREIRA's injuries required medical treatment and will require
10 medical treatment in the future. Plaintiff INGRID FERREIRA does not yet know the reasonable value
11 of the past or future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time
12 of trial.

13 221. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that INGRID FERREIRA suffered.
14 INGRID FERREIRA suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to
15 emotional distress, panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation,
16 embarrassment, shame, mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of
17 powerlessness. Additionally, INGRID FERREIRA has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future
18 lost earnings and earning potential. INGRID FERREIRA is entitled to damages for such harm.

19 **ERIN MARSHALL**

20 222. On March 16, 2018 Plaintiff ERIN MARSHALL used the ridesharing service offered by
21 defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After ERIN MARSHALL used the LYFT App to summon a
22 driver, a LYFT driver named Joshua Kyam Quaid picked up plaintiff ERIN MARSHALL and while
23 within Tucson, Arizona and in route to ERIN MARSHALL's destination, plaintiff ERIN MARSHALL
24 was raped by LYFT's driver (Joshua) who had responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

25 223. Plaintiff ERIN MARSHALL had been out at a bar and because she was intoxicated,
26 decided to take a LYFT home. LYFT's driver, Joshua Kyam Quaid, responded to the request made via
27 the LYFT application, and picked ERIN MARSHALL up. ERIN MARSHALL and the LYFT driver
28 engaged in some small talk, and ERIN MARSHALL was distracted and did not notice that they were

1 not driving towards her destination. LYFT's driver pulled the LYFT vehicle over in a dark area, and
2 climbed into the backseat with ERIN MARSHALL, who was confused and disoriented. LYFT's driver,
3 Joshua, took advantage of plaintiff ERIN MARSHALL's state, he groped and then raped her. ERIN
4 MARSHALL told LYFT's driver "I don't want to do this; I want to go home." LYFT's driver (Joshua)
5 got back in the front seat, and ERIN MARSHALL thought he was taking her home, however they were
6 still going in the wrong direction. ERIN MARSHALL threatened to throw herself out of the vehicle in
7 order to get LYFT's driver (Joshua) to take her home.

8 224. Immediately upon arriving home, ERIN MARSHALL explained what happened to her
9 then husband, who took her to the hospital to have a SART and called LYFT to report the driver.

10 225. LYFT's driver Joshua was arrested and charged with kidnapping and sexual assault. On
11 September 20, 2019 LYFT's driver Joshua pled guilty.

12 226. Plaintiff ERIN MARSHALL's injuries required medical treatment and will require
13 medical treatment in the future. Plaintiff ERIN MARSHALL does not yet know the reasonable value of
14 the past or future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of
15 trial.

16 227. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that ERIN MARSHALL suffered.
17 ERIN MARSHALL suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to
18 emotional distress, panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation,
19 embarrassment, shame, mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of
20 powerlessness. Additionally, ERIN MARSHALL has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future
21 lost earnings and earning potential. ERIN MARSHALL is entitled to damages for such harm.

22 **HANNAH WELLS**

23 228. On September 7, 2019, Plaintiff HANNAH WELLS used the ridesharing service offered
24 by defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100. After HANNAH WELLS used the LYFT App to
25 summon a driver, a LYFT driver named Nabaz, last name unknown but to be alleged after discovery in
26 this litigation, picked up plaintiff HANNAH WELLS and while within Atlanta, Georgia and in route to
27 HANNAH WELLS' destination, plaintiff HANNAH WELLS was sexually assaulted by LYFT's driver
28 (Nabaz) who had responded to her request made through the LYFT App.

1 229. Plaintiff HANNAH WELLS requested a LYFT at approximately 2:55am. She got in the
2 backseat of the vehicle like she would normally do. LYFT's driver (Nabaz) asked HANNAH WELLS
3 to get in the front seat instead, and he pulled over to allow her to move up. During the drive, LYFT's
4 driver (Nabaz) commented multiple times about how beautiful HANNAH WELLS was. She said
5 'thank you' so as not to be rude, but HANNAH WELLS felt uncomfortable. Once the LYFT vehicle
6 got on the highway, LYFT's driver (Nabaz) put his arm on the back of the passenger seat that
7 HANNAH WELLS was sitting in, she asked him why he did this, and to remove his arm from her seat.
8 LYFT's driver continued to compliment HANNAH WELLS' beauty, he began to touch and sexually
9 assault her when they stopped at a stop light. HANNAH WELLS called another person so that they
10 could hear the ride in hope that the assaults would end.

11 230. HANNAH WELLS reported the assault to LYFT who refunded her the ride fare and
12 gave her a \$25.00 ride credit. LYFT did not tell HANNAH WELLS whether any investigation into
13 NABAZ had taken place or was planned, or whether he had been removed from the platform as a LYFT
14 driver. This sexual predator could still be driving for LYFT.

15 231. Plaintiff HANNA WELLS' injuries required medical treatment and will require medical
16 treatment in the future. Plaintiff HANNAH WELLS does not yet know the reasonable value of the past
17 or future medical and incidental expenses but will prove the value of such losses at the time of trial.

18 232. LYFT's actions were a substantial factor in the harm that HANNAH WELLS suffered.
19 HANNAH WELLS suffered general damages of pain-and-suffering, including but not limited to
20 emotional distress, panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation,
21 embarrassment, shame, mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of
22 powerlessness. Additionally, HANNAH WELLS has suffered past lost earnings and will suffer future
23 lost earnings and earning potential. HANNAH WELLS is entitled to damages for such harm.

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **STRICT PRODUCT LIABILITY BASED ON DESIGN DEFECT OF THE LYFT**
26 **RIDESHARING APP AND FAILURE OF THE LYFT APP TO MEET MINIMUM**
27 **REASONABLE CONSUMER SAFETY EXPECTATIONS)**

28 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

///

1 233. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 232 as
2 though fully stated in this cause of action.

3 234. Defendant LYFT manufactured and distributed the LYFT App.

4 235. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the LYFT App did not perform as
5 safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected it to perform when used or misused in an intended
6 or reasonably foreseeable way, because the LYFT App falsely led each Plaintiff to form a reasonable
7 minimum safety expectation that was not met.

8 236. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff was harmed.

9 237. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the LYFT App's failure to
10 communicate to the Plaintiff a true expectation of the lack of safety in use of the LYFT App was a
11 substantial factor in causing harm to the Plaintiff.

12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **STRICT PRODUCT LIABILITY BASED ON A FAILURE TO WARN OF THE RISKS POSED**
14 **BY THE LYFT RIDESHARING APP**

15 (Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)

16 238. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 237 as
17 though fully stated in this cause of action.

18 239. Defendant LYFT manufactured and distributed the LYFT App.

19 240. The LYFT App presented potential risks of introducing each driver to a potential
20 plaintiff victim who, because of the nature of the ridesharing arrangement created and facilitated by the
21 LYFT App, could neither escape from the driver's vehicle nor control the place where the driver would
22 take the potential ROE plaintiff victim, risks that were known or knowable at the time of manufacture
23 and distribution of the LYFT App.

24 241. The potential risks presented a substantial danger when the LYFT App was used or
25 misused in an intended or reasonably foreseeable way.

26 242. Ordinary consumers such as each of these Plaintiffs would not have recognized the
27 potential risks.

28 243. Defendant LYFT failed to adequately warn of the potential risks.

1 244. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff was harmed.

2 245. The lack of sufficient warnings was a substantial factor in causing the harm suffered by
3 each Plaintiff.

4 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **NEGLIGENT DESIGN DEFECT OF THE LYFT RIDESHARING APP**

6 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

7 246. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 245 as
8 though fully stated in this cause of action.

9 247. Defendant LYFT designed and manufactured the LYFT App.

10 248. Defendant LYFT owed to each Plaintiff a duty not to design, manufacture, or distribute
11 the LYFT App, with its defective design and defective manufacture.

12 249. Defendant LYFT was negligent in designing and manufacturing the LYFT App.

13 250. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff was.

14 251. Defendant LYFT's negligence was a substantial factor in causing the harm suffered by
15 each Plaintiff.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **NEGLIGENCE BASED ON FAILURE TO WARN OF THE DESIGN DEFECTS OF THE**
18 **LYFT RIDSHARING APP**

19 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

20 252. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 251 as
21 though fully stated in this cause of action.

22 253. Each Plaintiff herein claims that defendant LYFT was negligent by not using reasonable
23 care to warn about facts that made the LYFT App likely to be dangerous.

24 254. Defendant LYFT designed and manufactured the LYFT App.

25 255. Defendant LYFT knew or reasonably should have known that the LYFT App was
26 dangerous or likely to be dangerous when used or misused in a reasonably foreseeable manner.

27 256. Defendant LYFT knew or reasonably should have known that users such as each of these
28 ROE plaintiffs would not realize the danger.

1 257. Defendant LYFT failed to adequately warn of the danger.

2 258. A reasonable manufacturer and reasonable distributor under the same or similar
3 circumstances would have warned of the danger.

4 259. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff was harmed.

5 260. Defendant LYFT's failure to warn was a substantial factor in causing the harm suffered
6 by each Plaintiff.

7 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **NEGLIGENCE BASED ON FAILURE TO RECALL OR RETROFIT THE LYFT**
9 **RIDESHARING APP**

10 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

11 261. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 260 as
12 though fully stated in this cause of action.

13 262. Defendant LYFT designed the LYFT App.

14 263. Defendant LYFT knew or reasonably should have known that the LYFT App was
15 dangerous or was likely to be dangerous when used in a reasonably foreseeable manner.

16 264. Defendant LYFT became aware of this defect after the LYFT App was designed,
17 manufactured, and distributed.

18 265. Defendant LYFT failed to recall or retrofit or warn of the danger of the LYFT App.

19 266. A reasonable manufacturer and distributor under the same or similar circumstances
20 would have recalled or retrofitted or both recalled and retrofitted the LYFT App.

21 267. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff was harmed.

22 268. Defendant LYFT's failure to recall or retrofit the LYFT App was a substantial factor in
23 causing the harm suffered by each Plaintiff.

24 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATIONS ABOUT THE LYFT RIDESHARING APP**

26 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

27 269. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 268 as
28 though fully stated in this cause of action.

1 270. Defendant LYFT represented to each Plaintiff that it was true that the LYFT App was
2 safe to use and would provide a safe experience.

3 271. Defendant LYFT's representation was false.

4 272. Defendant LYFT knew that the representation was false when it made it or at a minimum
5 knew that it made the representation recklessly and without regard for its truth.

6 273. Defendant LYFT intended that each Plaintiff rely on the representation.

7 274. Each Plaintiff reasonably relied on defendant LYFT's representation.

8 275. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff was harmed.

9 276. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff's reliance on
10 defendant LYFT's representation was a substantial factor in causing the harm suffered by each Plaintiff.

11 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **CONCEALMENT OF THE RISKS INHERENT IN USE OF THE LYFT RIDESHARING APP**

13 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

14 277. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 276 as
15 though fully stated in this cause of action.

16 278. Defendant LYFT intentionally failed to disclose to each Plaintiff the fact that the LYFT
17 App was defective in its design and manufacture, was not safe to use as defendant LYFT otherwise
18 represented, and posed risks and dangers of which defendant LYFT was aware at the time it designed,
19 manufactured, and distributed the LYFT App.

20 279. Defendant LYFT disclosed some facts to each Plaintiff, asserting that there supposedly
21 were safeguards in place, but intentionally failed to disclose other facts about the risks and potential
22 dangers, making the disclosures that defendant LYFT did make incomplete and deceptive.

23 280. Defendant LYFT intentionally failed to disclose certain facts about the risks and
24 potential dangers that were known only to it and that each Plaintiff could not have discovered in the
25 ordinary course of downloading and using the LYFT App.

26 281. Each Plaintiff did not know of the concealed facts.

27 282. Defendant LYFT intended to deceive each Plaintiff by concealing the facts.

28 ///

1 283. Had the omitted information been disclosed, each Plaintiff reasonably would have
2 behaved differently.

3 284. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff was harmed.

4 285. Defendant LYFT's concealment was a substantial factor in causing the harm suffered by
5 each Plaintiff.

6 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION ABOUT THE LYFT RIDESHARING APP**

8 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

9 286. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 285 as
10 though fully stated in this cause of action.

11 287. Defendant LYFT represented to each Plaintiff that it was true that the LYFT App would
12 provide for a safe ridesharing experience.

13 288. Defendant LYFT's representation was not true.

14 289. Although defendant LYFT may have honestly believed that the representation was true,
15 defendant LYFT had no reasonable grounds for believing the representation was true when it made it.

16 290. Defendant LYFT intended that each Plaintiff rely on this representation.

17 291. Each Plaintiff reasonably relied on defendant LYFT's representation.

18 292. In each case where a Plaintiff was sexually assaulted, the Plaintiff was harmed.

19 293. Each Plaintiff's reliance on defendant LYFT's representation was a substantial factor in
20 causing the harm suffered by each Plaintiff.

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **NEGLIGENT HIRING, SUPERVISION, AND RETENTION**

23 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

24 294. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 293 as
25 though fully stated in this cause of action.

26 295. Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive hired each LYFT DRIVER.

27 ///

28 ///

1 296. LYFT's hiring of the LYFT DRIVERS was mostly automated, after each LYFT
2 DRIVER merely filled out some short forms online, uploaded photos of a driver license, vehicle
3 registration and proof of vehicle insurance.

4 297. At the time each LYFT DRIVER applied to drive for LYFT, LYFT was not performing
5 adequate background checks for its drivers. After minimal information was provided to LYFT, each
6 LYFT DRIVER was hired and engaged as a LYFT driver.

7 298. LYFT did not interview, check the references of, provide training to, or advise any
8 LYFT DRIVER of any anti-sexual assault policies when hiring him. LYFT had no reasonable basis for
9 believing that any LYFT DRIVER was fit to drive or interact with passengers, and LYFT failed to use
10 reasonable care in determining whether a LYFT DRIVER was fit for those tasks. LYFT should have
11 known of each LYFT DRIVER's unfitness but failed to use reasonable care to discover the DRIVER's
12 unfitness and incompetence.

13 299. Despite failing to reasonably endeavor to investigate each LYFT DRIVER's competence
14 to transport and interact with passengers in a moving vehicle, LYFT employed each LYFT DRIVER.

15 300. LYFT knew or should have known that assigning to an inadequately screened driver the
16 task of transporting vulnerable customers late at night created an unreasonable risk of harm to LYFT's
17 passengers, including each plaintiff herein, particularly when LYFT had been on notice of the string of
18 sexual assaults committed by LYFT's drivers.

19 301. Each LYFT DRIVER was and/or became unfit to perform the work for which he was
20 HIRED as he improperly and illegally took advantage of LYFT's passengers, including each plaintiff
21 JANE ROE herein, when each attempted to use the service for a safe ride, sometimes after drinking,
22 thereby causing each Plaintiff psychological and physical harm.

23 302. Because of each LYFT DRIVER's unfitness to perform the task of transporting each
24 Plaintiff, each Plaintiff was sexually harassed, assaulted and/or stalked, causing her to fear for her
25 personal safety.

26 303. LYFT and inclusively DOES 1 through 100's negligence in hiring, retaining, and or
27 supervising each LYFT DRIVER caused each plaintiff to be sexually harassed, assaulted and/or stalked.

28 ///

1 304. As a direct and legal result of LYFT's general negligence, each Plaintiff has suffered
2 general non-economic damages according to proof.

3 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **COMMON CARRIER NEGLIGENCE**

5 **(Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)**

6 305. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 304 as
7 though fully stated in this cause of action.

8 306. LYFT provides prearranged transportation services for compensation using an online
9 enabled application or platform to connect passengers with drivers. Consequently, LYFT is a
10 Transportation Network Company as defined by California Public Utilities Code Section 5431c.

11 307. LYFT provides transportation through a digital application made available to the general
12 public for the purpose of transporting its users, the passengers, from place to place for profit. LYFT has
13 widely offered its services to the general public and charges standard fees for its services through its
14 application. LYFT does not allow discrimination against passengers on the basis of race, color, national
15 origin, religion, gender, gender identity, physical or mental disability, medical
16 condition, marital status, age, or sexual orientation. Any member of the public can use LYFT's services
17 for transportation.

18 308. As a common carrier, LYFT must carry its passengers, including Plaintiffs, safely.

19 309. LYFT has a duty to employ the utmost degree of care and diligence that would be
20 expected of a very cautious company. LYFT has a duty to do all that human care, vigilance, and
21 foresight reasonably can do under the circumstances to avoid harm to passengers, including plaintiffs.

22 310. LYFT must use reasonable skill to provide everything necessary for safe transportation,
23 in view of the transportation used and the practical operation of the business.

24 311. Despite complaints to LYFT of sexual assaults committed by LYFT drivers and lawsuits
25 against LYFT for sexual assault, LYFT, at the direction of its managing agents, executives and officers,
26 has failed to implement safety precautions that would address the sexual assault problem.

27 312. LYFT does not provide a consistent and reliable way for passengers to report sexual
28 abuse and rape.

1 313. LYFT does not warn passengers, including Plaintiffs, of the dangers of riding with
2 LYFT and fails to warn passengers, including Plaintiffs, of past complaints regarding LYFT drivers.

3 314. LYFT does not have an effective program in place to deal with the sexual predator crisis
4 posed by some of its drivers.

5 315. LYFT knows that its female passengers are in a uniquely vulnerable situation enclosed in
6 a moving vehicle and that a subset of its drivers are sexual predators.

7 316. LYFT, at the direction of its managing agents, executives and officers, has not exercised
8 reasonable care to protect its passengers, including Plaintiffs, from harassment, assault, and rape by
9 LYFT's drivers.

10 317. LYFT, at the direction of its managing agents, executives and officers, has not exercised
11 the utmost degree of care in order to protect its passengers, including Plaintiffs, from the danger posed
12 by sexual predators who drive for LYFT. If LYFT had used the highest degree of care, LYFT could
13 have prevented or dramatically reduced the likelihood of the sexual assaults of its passengers, including
14 plaintiffs.

15 318. LYFT failed to safely transport Plaintiffs.

16 319. LYFT failed to use the utmost care and vigilance to protect all such Plaintiffs from its
17 own LYFT DRIVERS who sexually harassed and assaulted in the course of transporting them to their
18 destinations.

19 320. LYFT, at the direction of its managing agents, executives and officers, failed to take
20 reasonable precautions to protect its vulnerable female passengers, including each Plaintiff, from the
21 foreseeable and known risk of sexual harassment and sexual assault by its LYFT DRIVERS. If LYFT
22 had used the highest degree of care, LYFT could have prevented or reduced the likelihood of the sexual
23 assaults of its passengers, including of the Plaintiffs.

24 321. As a legal and direct result of the aforementioned conduct and omissions of Defendants
25 LYFT and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Plaintiffs were sexually harassed, assaulted and/or stalked,
26 causing each of them to fear for her personal safety.

27 322. As a direct and legal result of LYFT's negligence, each plaintiff has suffered damages,
28 both economic and general, non-economic damages according to proof.

1 ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

2 VICARIOUS LIABILITY FOR THE TORTS OF LYFT'S DRIVERS

3 (Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)

4 323. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 322 as
5 though fully stated in this cause of action.

6 324. LYFT is vicariously liable for the torts of its drivers through the theories of *respondent*
7 *superior*, nondelegable duties, agency, and ostensible agency. LYFT's liability for the acts of its drivers
8 is not contingent upon the classification of its drivers as employees.

9 325. Under the doctrine of *respondent superior*, LYFT is responsible for the torts of its
10 employees committed within the scope of employment. The modern rationale for the theory is that an
11 employer who profits from an enterprise which, through the torts of its employees, causes harm to
12 others should bear the costs of the injury instead of the innocent injured plaintiff.

13 326. LYFT profits from transporting vulnerable passengers late at night. LYFT encourages
14 both sober and intoxicated passengers to use its services. At the same time, LYFT, at the direction of its
15 managing agents, executives and officers, does not take reasonable steps to protect its passengers or
16 warn them of the dangers of riding with LYFT. LYFT,
17 and not the victims of LYFT's negligence, should bear the costs of injuries that result from torts such as
18 sexual assault, kidnapping and rape.

19 327. LYFT drivers are employees. LYFT reserves the right to control the activities of LYFT
20 DRIVERS. LYFT controls the prices charged to customers, controls contact with the customer base,
21 controls the ability of a driver to see where he will be driving before he accepts a ride, and reserves the
22 right to terminate drivers with or without cause.

23 328. LYFT drivers' acts of sexual harassment and sexual assault of each of the plaintiff
24 JANE ROEs occurred within the scope of employment and/or authority of each of the LYFT drivers.
25 The kidnapping, assault, rape and other forms of sexual conduct committed against each Plaintiff,
26 whether sober or intoxicated, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, was committed against a
27 woman who had been placed in an improperly screened LYFT driver's car with little to no supervision.
28 Each such incident was incidental to and a foreseeable result of the act of transporting customers.

1 329. LYFT may maintain that its drivers are contractors and not employees. Nevertheless,
2 whether the LYFT drivers are characterized as contractors, employees or agents, LYFT has a non-
3 delegable duty to connect customers with safe transportation.

4 330. The doctrine of nondelegable duty recognizes when one party owes a duty to another
5 which, for public policy reasons, cannot be delegated. It operates to ensure that when a harm occurs, the
6 injured party will be compensated by the party whose activity caused the harm and who may therefore
7 properly be held liable for the acts of his agent, whether the agent was an employee or an independent
8 contractor. The doctrine recognizes that an entity may not delegate its duties to a contractor in order to
9 evade its own responsibilities. This is especially so when allowing delegation would incentivize the
10 employers to hire incompetent contractors in order to further the employer's pecuniary interests.

11 331. In advertising to customers, including Plaintiffs, that LYFT provides them a safe ride to
12 their destinations and by profiting off of women who use LYFT for that very purpose and are attacked,
13 LYFT has a duty to its customers that cannot be delegated. To allow LYFT to delegate the liability for
14 the assaults by its drivers to anyone else would encourage LYFT to continue to utilize the cheapest,
15 fastest, and most haphazard safety procedures. LYFT would be disincentivized from hiring only
16 competent drivers, since the more drivers LYFT has, the more money LYFT makes.

17 332. Further, LYFT drivers act as agents of and operate as extensions of LYFT. LYFT
18 drivers represent LYFT's business and further LYFT's pecuniary interests.

19 333. LYFT drivers display the LYFT logo when interacting with customers, and in many
20 cases LYFT drivers are the only people with whom LYFT's customers have direct contact. LYFT
21 drivers provide the service that LYFT claims to provide, namely, transportation.

22 334. By allowing LYFT drivers to represent LYFT's business, LYFT creates the impression
23 that its drivers, including the LYFT drivers involved as tortfeasors herein, were LYFT's employees
24 and/or agents.

25 335. Each JANE ROE plaintiff herein reasonably believed that her LYFT driver was an
26 employee or agent of LYFT, and, relying on this belief, each JANE ROE plaintiff hired each respective
27 LYFT driver and suffered harm as a result of her contact with each respective LYFT DRIVER.

28 ///

1 336. For these reasons and others, LYFT is vicariously liable for the tortious acts of its
2 drivers, regardless of whether LYFT's drivers are employees, agents, apparent agents, or contractors of
3 LYFT.

4 TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

5 VICARIOUS LIABILITY FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT

6 (Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)

7 337. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 336 as
8 though fully stated in this cause of action.

9 338. At the time of each assault alleged herein, each LYFT driver intended to cause harmful
10 and offensive contact with each respective Plaintiff herein, and placed each respective Plaintiff in
11 reasonable apprehension of imminent harmful and offensive contact.

12 339. Each respective LYFT driver committed these tortious and wrongful acts while acting in
13 the course and scope of his employment with LYFT as an employee/agent of LYFT. Therefore, LYFT
14 is liable for each LYFT driver's assault of each respective Plaintiff and is responsible for damages
15 caused by said conduct under the principles of vicarious liability, including the doctrine of *respondeat*
16 *superior*. Even if any LYFT driver had not been an employee, LYFT's duty to provide transportation
17 free of assault is nondelegable and LYFT is liable for each LYFT driver's actions, because to allow
18 LYFT to delegate its duty of providing the safe transportation it promises would incentivize LYFT to
19 create a greater risk of harm to the public.

20 340. Under the theories of *respondeat superior*, nondelegable duty, agency, and ostensible
21 agency, LYFT is liable for the tortious acts of each LYFT driver.

22 341. As a direct and legal result of each LYFT driver's sexual assault upon each respective
23 Plaintiff, each respective Plaintiff has suffered economic and general, non-economic damages according
24 to proof.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

2 INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

3 (Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)

4 342. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 341 as
5 though fully stated in this cause of action.

6 343. Defendant LYFT's conduct was outrageous.

7 344. Defendant LYFT intended to cause emotional distress to each Plaintiff or at a minimum
8 defendant LYFT acted with reckless disregard of the probability that each Plaintiff would suffer
9 emotional distress, knowing that each Plaintiff was or would be present when the conduct precipitated
10 by use of the LYFT App occurred.

11 345. Each Plaintiff suffered severe emotional distress including but not limited to emotional
12 distress, panic, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, embarrassment,
13 shame, mortification, hurt feelings, disappointment, depression and feelings of powerlessness.

14 346. The emotional distress suffered by Plaintiffs is such that an ordinary, reasonable person
15 would be unable to cope with it

16 347. Defendant LYFT's conduct was a substantial factor in causing the severe emotional
17 distress suffered by each Plaintiff.

18 FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

19 GENERAL NEGLIGENCE

20 (Alleged Against Defendant LYFT and DOES 1 through 100)

21 348. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 347 as
22 though fully stated in this cause of action.

23 349. Defendant LYFT owed to each Plaintiff a duty to use ordinary care to prevent injury to
24 plaintiff as a result of the conduct and inaction of LYFT and the conduct and inaction of each LYFT
25 DRIVER.

26 350. In doing those things alleged herein above, defendant LYFT acted negligently,
27 carelessly and recklessly, resulting in serious injury to each individual Plaintiff.

28 ///

1 351. As a proximate result of the acts and failures to act of defendant LYFT, each Plaintiff
2 was hurt and injured in her health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to her nervous system and
3 person, all of which have caused, and continue to cause, each Plaintiff great mental, physical, and
4 nervous pain and suffering.

5 352. Each Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that these injuries will result
6 in some permanent disability. As a result of these injuries, each Plaintiff has suffered general damages
7 in an amount within the jurisdiction of this court.

8 353. As a proximate result of the acts and failures to act of defendant LYFT, each Plaintiff
9 has incurred, and will continue to incur, medical and related expenses. The full amount of these
10 expenses is not known to any individual Plaintiff at this time. Each Plaintiff will move to amend this
11 complaint to state the amount when it becomes known to her, or on proof thereof.

12 354. As a further legal result of the acts and failures to act of defendant LYFT, each Plaintiff
13 was prevented from attending to her usual occupation and each Plaintiff is informed and believes that
14 she will be prevented from attending to her usual occupation for a period of time in the future. Further,
15 each Plaintiff is entitled to prejudgment interest on that amount when determined.

16 **RELIEF SOUGHT**

17 Plaintiffs BRENDA CHARITY, INGRID FERREIRA, TYKAJA HALL, ERIN MARSHALL,
18 CAROLINE MILLER, HANNAH WELLS; and each ROE plaintiff seeks judgment against defendant
19 LYFT and against DOES 1 through 100 as follows:

- 20 1. For compensatory damages for the described losses with respect to each cause of action;
21 2. For special damages, including but not limited to, past and future medical expenses
22 according to proof;
23 3. For general damages according to proof;
24 4. For past and future emotional distress;
25 5. For pre-judgment interest, if warranted;
26 6. For costs incurred in this litigation;

27 ///


28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

7. For punitive damages with respect to each cause of action; and
8. For all other relief that the court deems just and proper.

Dated: December 4, 2019.

ESTEY & BOMBERGER, LLP



R. Michael Bomberger, Esq.
Attorney for All ROE Plaintiffs

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):
Stephen J. Estey, Esq. (SBN 163093)/ R Michael Bomberger, Esq. (SBN 169866)
Estey & Bomberger LLP
2869 India Street
San Diego, CA 92103
TELEPHONE NO.: (619) 295-0035 FAX NO.: (619) 295-0172
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs

FOR COURT USE ONLY
FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court
DEC 04 2019
CLERK OF THE COURT
BY: *Shalene Johnson*
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STREET ADDRESS: 400 McAllister Street
MAILING ADDRESS: 400 McAllister Street
CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Francisco, CA 94102
BRANCH NAME: Civic Center Courthouse

CASE NAME:
Jane Roe 1, et al. v. LYFT, Inc. et al.

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET
 Unlimited
(Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000)
 Limited
(Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)

Complex Case Designation
 Counter Joinder
Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)

CASE NUMBER: **CGC-19-581262**
JUDGE:
DEPT:

Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2).

1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:

Auto Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Auto (22) <input type="checkbox"/> Uninsured motorist (46)	Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Breach of contract/warranty (06) <input type="checkbox"/> Rule 3.740 collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Other collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage (18) <input type="checkbox"/> Other contract (37)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403) <input type="checkbox"/> Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) <input type="checkbox"/> Construction defect (10) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mass tort (40) <input type="checkbox"/> Securities litigation (28) <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/Toxic tort (30) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41)
Other PIP/D/W (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Asbestos (04) <input type="checkbox"/> Product liability (24) <input type="checkbox"/> Medical malpractice (45) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other PI/PD/W (23)	Real Property <input type="checkbox"/> Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14) <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful eviction (33) <input type="checkbox"/> Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of judgment (20)
Non-PI/PD/W (Other) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Business tort/unfair business practice (07) <input type="checkbox"/> Civil rights (08) <input type="checkbox"/> Defamation (13) <input type="checkbox"/> Fraud (16) <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property (19) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional negligence (25) <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-PI/PD/W tort (35)	Unlawful Detainer <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (31) <input type="checkbox"/> Residential (32) <input type="checkbox"/> Drugs (38)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint <input type="checkbox"/> RICO (27) <input type="checkbox"/> Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful termination (36) <input type="checkbox"/> Other employment (15)	Judicial Review <input type="checkbox"/> Asset forfeiture (05) <input type="checkbox"/> Petition re: arbitration award (11) <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of mandate (02) <input type="checkbox"/> Other judicial review (39)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership and corporate governance (21) <input type="checkbox"/> Other petition (not specified above) (43)

2. This case is is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:
- a. Large number of separately represented parties
 - b. Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve
 - c. Substantial amount of documentary evidence
 - d. Large number of witnesses
 - e. Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
 - f. Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. monetary b. nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 14
5. This case is is not a class action suit.
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)

Date: December 4, 2019
R Michael Bomberger, Esq.
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

[Signature]
(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)

By Fax

NOTICE

- Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result in sanctions.
- File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.
- If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.
- Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

<p>Auto Tort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto) <p>Other P/PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asbestos (04) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/Wrongful Death Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24) Medical Malpractice (45) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medical Malpractice—Physicians & Surgeons Other Professional Health Care Malpractice Other PI/PD/WD (23) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism) Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress Other P/PI/PD/WD <p>Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business Tort/Unfair Business Practice (07) Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil harassment) (08) Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13) Fraud (16) Intellectual Property (19) Professional Negligence (25) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal Malpractice Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35) <p>Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15) 	<p>Contract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of Contract/Warranty (06) Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) Contract/Warranty Breach—Seller Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence) Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty Other Breach of Contract/Warranty <p>Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff Other Promissory Note/Collections Case <p>Insurance Coverage (not provisionally complex) (18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Auto Subrogation Other Coverage <p>Other Contract (37)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractual Fraud Other Contract Dispute <p>Real Property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14) Wrongful Eviction (33) Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writ of Possession of Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure Quiet Title Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure) <p>Unlawful Detainer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial (31) Residential (32) Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise, report as Commercial or Residential) <p>Judicial Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asset Forfeiture (05) Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11) Writ of Mandate (02) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writ—Administrative Mandamus Writ—Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter Writ—Other Limited Court Case Review Other Judicial Review (39) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Health Officer Order Notice of Appeal—Labor Commissioner Appeals 	<p>Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400–3.403)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03) Construction Defect (10) Claims Involving Mass Tort (40) Securities Litigation (28) Environmental/Toxic Tort (30) Insurance Coverage Claims (arising from provisionally complex case type listed above) (41) <p>Enforcement of Judgment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforcement of Judgment (20) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract of Judgment (Out of County) Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) Sister State Judgment Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes Other Enforcement of Judgment Case <p>Miscellaneous Civil Complaint</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RICO (27) Other Complaint (not specified above) (42) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declaratory Relief Only Injunctive Relief Only (non-harassment) Mechanics Lien Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex) <p>Miscellaneous Civil Petition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership and Corporate Governance (21) Other Petition (not specified above) (43) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civil Harassment Workplace Violence Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Election Contest Petition for Name Change Petition for Relief From Late Claim Other Civil Petition
---	--	--

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Lyft Facing Another Lawsuit Over Alleged Failure to Respond to 'Sexual Predator Crisis'](#)
