	Case 1:17-cv-04996-TWT Docume	nt 1 Filed 09/08/17	Page 1 of 6					
1 2 3 4 5 6	Richard Morin (SBN 285275) Law Office of Rick Morin, PC 555 Capitol Mall Suite 750 Sacramento, CA 95814-4508 Phone: (916) 333-2222 Fax: (916) 273-8956 Email: legal@rickmorin.net Attorney for Plaintiffs							
7								
8 9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
10								
11	Valorie Anne Smart, David Waterstram	Case No.						
12	Miller, and Angela Lynn Miller, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION	COMPLAINT FOR					
13	Plaintiffs,	Jumy Trial Doman	had					
14	V.	Jury Trial Deman	ueu					
15 16	Equifax Inc.; Equifax Information Services LLC; and Does 1-10,							
17	Defendants.							
18								
19	Plaintiffs Valorie Anne Smart, David Waterstram Miller, and Angela Lynn Miller, individually							
20	and on behalf of all others similarly situated		1 7					
21	Equifax Information Services LLC; and Does 1		and allege as follows:					
22	INTRODUCTION							
23	1. Defendants harvest massive amounts of consumer data for sale and use by its partners							
24	and customers. While obtaining, exploiting, and selling sensitive consumer data is Defendants'							
25	business, Defendants admitted in September of 2017 that hackers were able to penetrate Defendants'							
26	computer systems to steal consumer information belonging to over 140 million Americans.							
27	Outrageously, Defendants only warned the pub	1						
28	theft was allegedly discovered. During this time	e, consumers' data was	s unnecessarily exposed. In fact,					

RICK MORIN

Case 1:17-cv-04996-TWT Document 1 Filed 09/08/17 Page 2 of 6

Defendants left consumers in the dark regarding potential risks and steps that they could take to protect themselves from Defendants' negligence. For two whole months, Defendants willfully disregarded the risk to consumers that their data was in the hands of nefarious actors. Defendants' negligence has, and will cause, harm to countless California consumers, some of which likely already suffered harm from the theft. Consumers have had enough of large businesses carelessly handling confidential personal information and profiting from that same data.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Valorie Anne Smart is an adult resident of Sacramento County, California.

3. Plaintiff David Waterstram Miller is an adult resident of Sacramento County, California

4. Plaintiff Angela Lynn Miller is an adult resident of Sacramento County, California.

5. Defendant Equifax Inc. is a Georgia Corporation with its principal place of business in Atlanta, Georgia.

6. Defendant Equifax Information Services LLC is a Georgia Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business in Atlanta, Georgia.

7. Plaintiffs do not know the true names of Doe Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the harm complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that each Defendant herein, including Does 1 to 10, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Does 1 to 10 are ascertained.

JURISDICTION

8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$100,000,000.

9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because each conducts business in
California, intentionally avails itself of the markets and benefits of California through its marketing
and sales of the products at issue in California so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court
consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, and a substantial part of the acts

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred within California.

VENUE

10. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the acts described herein have impacted residents of this district and Defendants have done and continue to do business, and intentionally avail themselves of the markets within this district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

11. Plaintiffs file this complaint on behalf of over an estimated 20 million consumers located in the State of California that have been harmed by Defendants' negligence.

12. Specifically, Defendants have admitted that they have negligently allowed hackers to steal confidential consumer data for over 140 million consumers throughout the country, including, but not limited to, names, addresses, social security numbers, driver's license numbers, and in some cases, credit card numbers. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that a large number of these consumers are located in the State of California.

13. Plaintiffs' data was stolen by alleged criminals using an online service owned and operated by Defendants that Defendants failed to adequately protect, harden, and secure against unauthorized access. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that Defendants had the technical means to protect their confidential consumer information, but failed to do so.

14. Defendants owed California consumers a legal duty to use reasonable care to protect their valuable personal information from unauthorized access from third parties. It was reasonably foreseeable that the failure to protect consumer information would cause serious harm, including identity theft, to California consumers.

15. Despite knowing about this data breach in June and July of 2017, Defendants waited until September of 2017 to notify California consumers of the data breach.

16. Defendants negligently failed to maintain their computer systems to prevent unauthorized access to confidential consumer data. Defendants knew, or should have known, that their lackadaisical approach to computer security would result in harm to consumers.

Plaintiffs have been damaged by Defendants negligence.

//

17.

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

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

18. Plaintiffs file this Complaint on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated consumers in the State of California. The similarly situated consumers are known to Defendants and are readily identifiable and locatable through Defendants' own records. The Class that Plaintiffs seek to represent is defined as follows:

All California consumers that had personally identifiable information, including, but not limited to, name, address, driver's license number, or social security number, collected and stored by Defendants in the past year, and who were subject to risk of data loss, credit harm, or identity theft, or had to pay for credit monitoring services, as a result of Defendants' data breach that occurred in May to July of 2017.

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

20. The exact number of aggrieved consumers in California can easily be determined because Defendants, as data brokers, know the identities and locations of all consumers that were involved in the 2017 data breach.

21. Each aggrieved consumer suffered injuries as alleged in this complaint, and these injuries were directly and proximately caused by Defendants' negligent failure to adequately protect its databases from unauthorized access.

22. The proposed class is so numerous that joinder is impracticable. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the proposed class includes millions of California consumers based upon Defendants' estimate that the 2017 data breach affected over 140 million consumers throughout the country.

25 23. Common questions of fact and law predominate over any questions affecting only
26 individual class members. Common questions include whether Equifax acted negligently and whether
27 Plaintiffs are entitled to damages.

24. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect and represent the interests of the class

because their claims are typical of the claims of the proposed class, they are represented by a qualified
and competent consumer protection law firm, and they will vigorously prosecute this litigation for the
benefit of aggrieved California consumers. Finally, Plaintiffs' interests are not antagonistic or in
conflict with the interests of the proposed class.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(NEGLIGENCE AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

25. Plaintiffs replead and incorporate by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

26. Defendants voluntarily acquired sensitive and confidential information belonging to Plaintiffs and the putative class.

27. As a mass repository of sensitive consumer data, Defendants owed Plaintiffs a duty of care to reasonably protect the sensitive consumer data from unauthorized access by third parties.

28. Defendants breached their legal duty by failing to maintain adequate safeguards.

29. Defendants' technical safeguards, if any, fell well below the standard of care.

30. Defendants' negligence directly and proximately caused a foreseeable risk of data loss, credit harm, an identity theft, along with other economic losses, in an amount to be proven at trial.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court:

- 1. Certify this matter as a class action;
- 2. Award judgment to Plaintiffs, and each of them;

3. Award damages in an amount to be proven at trial;

- 4. Award costs of suit herein; and
 - 5. Issue orders or further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: September 8, 2017

Law Office of Rick Morin, PC

Much M

By: Richard Morin Attorney for Plaintiffs

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

	Case 1:17-cv-04996-TWT	Document 1	Filed 09/08/17	Page 6 of 6						
1	 	FMAND FOD	ΠΙΡΥ ΤΡΙΑΙ							
2		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL								
2		Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial for all claims for which a jury is permitted.								
4	DATED: September 8, 2	2017	Law Offic	e of Rick Morin, PC						
5			\sim							
6			lh	'ch M						
7			By: Richa							
8			Attorney f	or Plaintiffs						
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
		6								

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12) Case 1:17-cv-04996-CVVII CCVVERSHEEF 09/08/17 Page 1 of 2

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

purpose of initiating the ervir a	Seket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	Hows on Next Tride of	1111510	<i>((m.)</i>				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Valorie Anne Smart, Dav	id Waterstram Miller, a	and Angela Lynn Mill	ler	DEFENDANTS Equifax Inc.; Equifa	ax Informa	tion Services L	LLC; and Does 1-10	
(b) County of Residence of (E2)	f First Listed Plaintiff S CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	nia County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, J Law Office of Rick Morin, 555 Capitol Mall Suite 75 (916) 333-2222	PC			Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. CI	I TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
I U.S. Government I 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)				FF DEF 1 □ 1	Incorporated <i>or</i> Pri of Business In T			
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			Citizen of Another State		of Business In Another State		
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) DRTS	FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	DAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
 Itol Insurance Itol Insurance I20 Marine I30 Miller Act I40 Negotiable Instrument I50 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment I51 Medicare Act I52 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) I53 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits I60 Stockholders' Suits I90 Other Contract I95 Contract Product Liability I96 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 970duct Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 360 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 441 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 9ERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability 9RISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty	TY 0 71 74 75 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 11 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 11 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION	□ 422 Appe □ 423 With 28 U ■ 820 Copy □ 820 Copy □ 840 Trade ■ 861 HIA □ 861 Black □ 864 SSID □ 865 RSI (■ 870 Taxe; or D 871 IRS- 26 U 26 U	al 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights it emark SECURITY (1395ff) c Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) 'Title XVI 405(g)) ML TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	 375 False Claims Act 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 895 Environmental Matters 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 	
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions				
		Remanded from Appellate Court		stated or 5 Transfe bened Anothe (specify)	er District	□ 6 Multidistr Litigation		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	28 U S C § 1332	ause:	e filing $\overline{(I)}$	Do not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless div	versity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	, , ,	IS A CLASS ACTION	D	EMAND \$		HECK YES only URY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: X Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER		
DATE 09/08/2017 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF ATTO /s/ Richard Mori		OF RECORD				
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI	DGE	
Print	Save As						Reset	

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

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

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below. United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

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

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

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV.** Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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