

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP
PATRICK J. COUGHLIN (111070)
DAVID W. MITCHELL (199706)
BRIAN O. O'MARA (229737)
STEVEN M. JODLOWSKI (239074)
CARMEN A. MEDICI (248417)
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/231-1058
619/231-7423 (fax)
patc@rgrdlaw.com
davidm@rgrdlaw.com
bomara@rgrdlaw.com
sjodlowski@rgrdlaw.com
cmedici@rgrdlaw.com

ROBBINS ARROYO LLP
BRIAN J. ROBBINS (190264)
GEORGE C. AGUILAR (126535)
GREGORY DEL GAIZO (247319)
600 B Street, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/525-3990
619/525-3991 (fax)
brobbins@robbinsarroyo.com
gaguilar@robbinsarroyo.com
gdelgaizo@robbinsarroyo.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

[Additional counsel appear on signature page.]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

J THOMPSON and WILLIAM P.
DUNCANSON, Individually and on
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

1-800 CONTACTS, INC., VISION
DIRECT, INC. and DOES 1-15,

Defendants.

Case No. '16CV2552 LAB KSC

CLASS ACTION

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF
THE SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT
AND CALIFORNIA'S
CARTWRIGHT ACT AND UNFAIR
COMPETITION LAW

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs J Thompson and William P. Duncanson (“plaintiffs”) hereby bring
2 this action for damages and other relief against defendants 1-800 Contacts, Inc. (“1-
3 800 Contacts” or the “Company”), Vision Direct, Inc. (“VisionDirect”) and Does 1-15
4 (collectively “defendants”) for violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C.
5 §§1-3), and California’s Cartwright Act (California Business & Professions Code
6 §16700, *et seq.*) and Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code
7 §17200, *et seq.*). Plaintiffs make all allegations upon information and belief except as
8 to those paragraphs that are based on plaintiffs’ personal knowledge.

9 **THE CONSPIRACY**

10 1. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of all direct-to-consumer purchasers
11 of contact lenses, including those who purchased contact lenses online, in the United
12 States and a subclass of all California residents against defendant 1-800 Contacts as
13 the ringleader behind a scheme to prevent competition in the online market for contact
14 lenses and against 1-800 Contacts’ currently unnamed co-conspirators, Does 1-15.
15 This action arises out of defendants’ overarching scheme to restrain competition in the
16 direct-to-consumer and online markets for contact lenses.

17 2. As recently revealed in a complaint by the Federal Trade Commission
18 (“FTC”), 1-800 Contacts is the instigator and enforcer of an unlawful series of
19 agreements between 1-800 Contacts and at least 14 of its “competitors” to divide up
20 the direct-to-consumer and online markets for sales of contact lenses. These 15
21 “competitors” combine to control over 50% of the direct-to-consumer and online
22 markets for contact lenses. 1-800 Contacts accounts for over 50% of the online
23 market by itself. In particular, 1-800 Contacts abused its monopoly power and entered
24 into bilateral agreements with each of its competitors/co-conspirators to not bid
25 against each other in advertising auctions conducted by internet search engines.

26 3. Due to the massive amount of information available on the internet,
27 internet search engines have become indispensable to anyone seeking to use the
28 internet. Internet search engines are generally simple to use – a user need only enter

1 keywords, such as “contact lenses,” into a field and the search engine will use an
2 algorithm to find and list the webpages that are responsive to the query, usually
3 ranked in order of relevance. Search engines, such as Google or Bing, are usually free
4 to users. The main source of revenue for these search engines is the advertising they
5 sell, which appears in response to a user’s search and is displayed adjacent to the
6 respective search engine’s organic results. This form of advertising has a proven track
7 record of being successful, as it allows the advertisers to market directly to consumers
8 at the very moment they are looking to make a purchase or have expressed an interest
9 in a specific subject. Online search engine advertising is critical to nearly every
10 company’s ability to compete in the digital age. Google and Bing sell this advertising
11 through automated auctions.

12 4. A successful way for competitors to raise awareness of their products and
13 compete for sales is to purchase search advertising that mentions their competitors,
14 especially as a comparison. For example, if a consumer is looking to buy a television
15 for the cheapest price and knows a big retailer like Best Buy sells televisions, the
16 consumer might search for “cheaper than best buy for tvs.” Such a search will likely
17 yield sponsored ads by Best Buy, but also ads by competitors, such as Walmart.

18 5. This is not the case in the contact lenses industry. A search of “cheaper
19 than 1-800 contacts for contact lenses” yields sponsored advertising by only one
20 company, 1-800 Contacts. The reason for this disparity is that anticompetitive
21 bilateral agreements between 1-800 Contacts and its co-conspirators prevent each
22 other from bidding on any search keywords or phrases with the other company’s
23 brand names, websites or trademarks in them. In addition, the agreements require that
24 1-800 Contacts and its co-conspirators use “negative keywords.” This is an
25 instruction to the search provider that a company’s advertisement ***should not*** appear in
26 response to a search query that contains a particular term or terms. Normally negative
27 keywords are used to prevent advertising appearing from irrelevant queries that may
28 contain similar words. For example, a company that sells billiards accessories would

1 bid for the term “pool” in order to advertise for pool sticks, but use a negative
2 keyword of “swimming” to prevent its ads from appearing when someone is looking
3 for water-related accessories. While many companies use negative keywords to
4 properly tailor advertisements to interested consumers, defendants use negative
5 keywords to allocate the market for contact lenses. 1-800 Contacts and its co-
6 conspirators agreed to instruct search advertisers that their advertising should not
7 appear when a search includes a competitor’s trademark through the use of negative
8 keywords.

9 6. The 1-800 Contacts-led scheme has been ongoing for more than a
10 decade. In 2003, there was an estimated \$200 million worth of online contact lens
11 sales. Though 1-800 Contacts accounted for \$187 million worth of those sales, the
12 Company realized that it was beginning to have real competition for direct sales. 1-
13 800 Contacts thereafter devised a plan to unlawfully stifle online competitors so that it
14 could continue to sell contact lenses at higher prices than its rivals without losing
15 market share. Specifically, in order to restrict competition and maintain its market
16 share and pricing, 1-800 Contacts began accusing its then competitors of trademark
17 infringement if a rival’s advertisement appeared on the search results page in response
18 to internet search queries that involved 1-800 Contacts’ brand name, websites or
19 trademarks. 1-800 Contacts’ position was legally baseless and a transparent threat to
20 inundate its competitors with prolonged and costly litigation.

21 7. Between 2004 and 2013, fourteen of 1-800 Contacts’ competitors agreed
22 with 1-800 Contacts not to bid against 1-800 Contacts in certain auctions in order to
23 settle the sham lawsuits or threat thereof. Most of the competitors agreed to 1-800
24 Contacts’ terms before even asserting counter claims. The agreements – ***which are***
25 ***reciprocal*** – prevented 1-800 Contacts and its competitors from bidding in search
26 advertising auctions for any of the others’ trademarked terms and common variations,
27 including common misspellings, of any of those terms. Each competitor knew that by
28 entering into this agreement, its market share and profits would be protected. Of

1 course, to ensure this was the case, all a competitor needed to do was a Google search.
2 In addition, 13 of the agreements called for the adoption of negative keywords. Only
3 one competitor, Lens.com, refused to enter into an agreement. 1-800 Contacts and
4 Lens.com proceeded to litigate 1-800 Contacts' bogus trademark claim, and after
5 years of litigation, Lens.com prevailed. The district court in that action specifically
6 called the practice of seeking agreements that preclude a competitor's advertisements
7 from appearing on a search results page any time its mark is entered as a search term
8 "an anti-competitive, monopolistic protection to which [1-800 Contacts] is not
9 entitled."¹ Notably, in its answer to the FTC action, 1-800 Contacts admitted that it
10 entered into these agreements with competitors in all but one case to allegedly resolve
11 threatened or actual trademark litigation.

12 8. Members of the Class and the California Subclass (as defined herein)
13 were injured by defendants' actions. First, the members of the Class and California
14 Subclass paid supracompetitive prices for contact lenses. Indeed, the impetus for 1-
15 800 Contacts' scheme was to suppress competition to protect the margins the
16 Company traditionally enjoyed before competition entered the marketplace.

17 9. In addition, defendants' actions prevented the Class and California
18 Subclass from receiving the benefits of a fair and competitive marketplace for both
19 information and pricing of contact lenses sold directly to consumers, including online.
20 Because of the unlawful agreements, competitors could not advertise against 1-800
21 Contacts, and therefore customers did not receive information concerning
22 competitors' products and pricing. Because of these agreements, 1-800 Contacts
23 continued to give the impression that it was a low-cost provider of contact lenses,
24 shielding the public from information that would have driven the price of contact
25 lenses down.

27 ¹ *1-800 Contacts, Inc. v. Lens.com, Inc.*, 755 F. Supp. 1151, 1174 (D. Utah 2010),
28 *aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds*, 722 F.3d 1229 (10th Cir. 2013).

20. During the Class Period, plaintiff William P. Duncanson (“Duncanson”) purchased contact lenses directly from 1-800 Contacts through its website. Plaintiff Duncanson purchased these lenses at supracompetitive prices, and was injured thereby. Plaintiff Duncanson is a resident of San Francisco, California.

21. Defendant 1-800 Contacts is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the United States, with its principal place of business located at 261 West Data Drive, Draper, Utah 84020. 1-800 Contacts sells contact lenses and related products over the internet and by telephone throughout the United States, including to California residents.

22. Defendant VisionDirect is a leading online retailer of contact lenses and vision care supplies. The Bellevue, Washington-based company offers a full line of bestselling products like Acuvue®, Bausch & Lomb®, CIBA Vision®, and CooperVision®, plus specialty brands and lenses. VisionDirect was founded in 2000 and has since shipped over 8 million orders. In 2003, VisionDirect was acquired by drugstore.com®, and in 2011, it became part of the Walgreens group of companies.

23. The true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 15, inclusive (“Doe Defendants”), are presently not known to plaintiffs, who therefore sue these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will seek to amend this complaint and include these Doe Defendants’ true names and capacities when they are ascertained. Each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the conduct alleged herein and for the injuries suffered by the Class and California Subclass.

THE MARKET FOR CONTACT LENSES

The Relevant Markets

24. Plaintiffs first plead a relevant market for antitrust purposes as the market for direct-to-consumer sales of contact lenses. This includes both online and telephone sales of contact lenses to consumers (“direct-to-consumer”). Because of the ease of purchasing contacts without going to a physical store, the traditional retail

1 market for contacts exists separately, and is not a substitute for online and telephone
2 sales. A small but significant increase in the price for online contacts would not drive
3 consumers to purchase contacts in a retail store. Alternatively, the relevant market for
4 antitrust purposes is only online sales. Discovery and expert testimony may reveal
5 that online sales and telephone sales are not close economic substitutes. As detailed
6 below, the traditional retail sale of contact lenses exists in a different market. The
7 relevant geographic market is the United States. Regardless of whether the market is
8 defined as direct-to-consumer or online sales only, 1-800 Contacts has a significant
9 enough market share to exert market power.

10 25. A contact lens is a lightweight, corrective, cosmetic or therapeutic device
11 that is usually placed directly onto the cornea of the eye. Contact lenses have many
12 benefits for wearers, including appearance and practicality.

13 26. Contact lenses are considered medical devices by the United States Food
14 and Drug Administration (the “FDA”). Accordingly, the FDA regulates the
15 manufacture, distribution and sale of contact lenses in the United States.

16 27. In addition, in 2003, Congress enacted the Fairness to Contact Lens
17 Consumers Act, 15 U.S.C. §§7601-7610. Pursuant to this act, the FTC promulgated
18 rules concerning the sale of contact lenses with the intention of increasing competition
19 for the sale of contact lenses (the “Contact Lens Rule”). The Contact Lens Rule
20 places certain restrictions on how contact lenses can be sold. Most notably, the
21 Contact Lens Rule requires sellers to only sell to customers who have a valid
22 prescription and can confirm the accuracy of the prescription.

23 28. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that there
24 are approximately 40.9 million contact lens wearers in the United States aged eighteen
25 years and older, or approximately 16.7% of the adult population.

26 29. The markets for direct-to-consumer and online sales of contact lenses are
27 distinct from the traditional brick and mortar market. Direct-to-consumer contact lens
28 sellers are able to sell contact lenses anywhere in the United States that receives mail.

1 Online contact lens sellers provide the consumer the convenience of being able to
2 order contacts from any location without having to find a brick and mortar store
3 selling their needed type of contact lenses. According to data from Bain Capital
4 regarding the future of independent optometry, in 2012 an estimated 20% of contact
5 lens sales occurred online. That number has since increased.

6 30. In contrast to direct-to-consumer sales of contacts, retailers in the
7 traditional market operate from physical storefronts or professional offices, maintain
8 an eye-care professional on-site to examine and fit their customers, and issue contact
9 lens prescriptions. Traditional retailers do not set their prices based upon direct-to-
10 consumer prices. According to an economist with the FTC who examined online and
11 offline prices for contact lenses, “[O]ffline firms set prices on the assumption that
12 most of their customers are unaware of online prices.” See James C. Cooper, *Prices*
13 *and Price Dispersion in Online and Offline Markets for Contact Lenses*, FTC Bureau
14 of Economics Working Paper (Nov. 29, 2006).

15 **The Demand for Contact Lenses Is Inelastic**

16 31. “Elasticity” is a term used to describe the sensitivity of supply and
17 demand to changes in one or the other. For example, demand is said to be “elastic” if
18 an increase in the price of a product results in diminished revenues, with declines in
19 the quantity sold of that product outweighing the effects of higher prices. For
20 products with a highly elastic demand, customers have many feasible alternatives for
21 cheaper products of similar quality and decrease purchases sharply in the face of even
22 a small price increase. Here, the demand for contact lenses is inelastic.

23 32. Markets with lower elasticity facilitate collusion, allowing producers to
24 raise their prices without triggering customer substitution and sufficient lost sales
25 revenues as to offset the beneficial effect of higher prices on profits for products they
26 still continue to sell.

27 33. There is only one other medical device that provides some of the same
28 benefits as contact lenses – eyeglasses. Many people choose to wear contact lenses as

1 opposed to eyeglasses because they do not steam up, they provide a wider field of
2 vision, and they are more suitable for a number of sporting activities. In addition,
3 some people find wearing contact lenses more aesthetically pleasing than eyeglasses.
4 Contact lenses also have the ability to alter the color of a user's eye and can be used
5 solely for cosmetic purposes. Contact lens manufacturers, distributors, online sellers,
6 brick and mortar retailers and consumers do not compare the price of contact lenses to
7 those of glasses.

8 34. Contact lenses have a limited lifespan, and therefore a contact lens user
9 will have to periodically purchase more contact lenses. Contact lens users will
10 purchase contact lenses that are good for a set amount of time and buy a certain supply
11 of the contact lens. Usually, the contact lens users' eye-care providers will decide the
12 type of contact used, the strength of the contact, and whether a contact lens has to be
13 replaced daily, weekly or monthly. Therefore, consumers exert little choice in the
14 particular type of contact lens they will buy. As a result, contact lens purchasers will
15 continue to use and acquire contact lenses even if there is an increase in price.

16 **The Markets for Direct-to-Consumer and Online**
17 **Contact Lens Sales Are Highly Concentrated**

18 35. 1-800 Contacts has dominated the market for direct-to-consumer sales of
19 contact lenses since it was founded in 1995.

20 36. In 1999, orders of contact lenses in the direct-to-consumer market, as
21 opposed to the brick-and-mortar or traditional market, began to shift from over-the-
22 phone sales to sales through online channels.

23 37. Since then, sales of contact lenses through the internet have increased due
24 to the ease and convenience of ordering contacts online, among other factors. For
25 instance, a contact lens user can order new contact lenses online, even if they have
26 recently moved and have yet to find a new eye-care provider. Indeed, this is the exact
27 scenario that happened to plaintiff Thompson, which led to his first purchases from 1-
28 800 Contacts.

1 38. 1-800 Contacts is by far the most dominant company in direct-to-
2 consumer and online contact lens sales, accounting for between 50%-55% of the
3 market since 2005. Collectively, 1-800 Contacts and the fourteen companies that it
4 entered into the illegal bilateral agreements with account for over 80% of the market
5 for online contact lens sales.

6 **ANTICOMPETITIVE CONDUCT BY THE DEFENDANTS**

7 39. Defendants are horizontal competitors.

8 40. The conspiracy consisted of a continuing agreement, understanding or
9 concerted action between and among defendants and their co-conspirators in
10 furtherance of which defendants fixed, maintained or made artificial prices for contact
11 lenses sold directly to consumers, including online, in the United States and to
12 California residents by rigging search engine advertising auctions and preventing the
13 dissemination of information to the Class and California Subclass during the Class
14 Period. Defendants' conspiracy constitutes a *per se* violation of the Sherman Antitrust
15 Act and the Cartwright Act and is an unreasonable and unlawful restraint of trade and
16 an unlawful, unfair or fraudulent practice under the UCL.

17 41. At all relevant times, other corporations, individuals and entities willingly
18 conspired with defendants in their unlawful and illegal conduct. Numerous individuals
19 and entities participated actively during the course and in furtherance of the scheme
20 described herein. The individuals and entities acted in concert by joint ventures and by
21 acting as agents for principals in order to advance the objectives of the scheme to
22 benefit defendants and themselves through the manipulation of contact lens prices in
23 the United States and sold to California residents.

24 **Online Advertising and Sale of Contact Lenses**

25 42. Contact lens retailers such as 1-800 Contacts rely heavily on internet
26 advertising to attract and inform consumers about their products and to direct
27 consumers to their websites and phone representatives. The vast majority of this
28 advertising is done through internet search engines such as Google and Yahoo!.

1 Internet search engines are computer programs that allow web users to search the
2 World Wide Web for websites containing particular content. When a search term is
3 entered, the search engine compares the term against its databases and applies a
4 formula or algorithm to produce a search engine results page that lists the websites
5 that may relate to the user's search terms. Google's search engine, for example, has a
6 natural or organic system that lists results with the most relevant websites appearing
7 near the top of the page. In addition, search results pages list paid advertisements
8 above or to the right of the organic search results. These paid advertisements are
9 referred to as "sponsored links." Consumers depend on search engines to navigate the
10 nearly unlimited amount of content on the internet.

11 43. Search engine companies sell advertising space on search engine results
12 pages by way of auction. Advertisers bid on certain words or phrases known as
13 "keywords." When a user's search term matches an advertiser's keyword, a
14 sponsored link appears for that advertiser. The order and location of the sponsored
15 link depends on the amount bid for the keyword and the quality of the advertisement.
16 According to the terms and conditions of the search engine companies, advertisers
17 cannot pay to be listed in a specific order on the search engine results page, they can
18 only pay for advertisements.

19 44. When bidding on a keyword, an advertiser may specify whether
20 keywords should be applied as a "broad match," "phrase match," "exact match," or
21 "negative match." When an advertiser designates a keyword as a "broad match," its
22 sponsored link will appear anytime a search is conducted for that keyword, its plural
23 forms, its synonyms, or phrases similar to the word. When an advertiser designates a
24 keyword as a "phrase match," its sponsored link will appear when a user searches for
25 a particular phrase, even if the user includes other terms before or after the phrase.
26 When an advertiser designates a keyword as an "exact match," then its sponsored link
27 will appear only when the exact phrase bid on is searched on Google. In contrast,
28 when an advertiser designates a keyword as a "negative match," the advertiser ensures

1 that its link will not appear when certain terms are searched. For example, a contact
2 lens seller may specify that its link should not appear when the phrase “contact lists”
3 is entered.

4 45. Defendants pay for advertisements on a “cost-per-click” basis. This
5 means if a keyword generates a sponsored link, but the internet user does not click on
6 that link, the advertiser does not pay for its link appearing on the search results page.
7 The appearance of an advertiser’s link on a user’s computer is called an “impression.”
8 An advertiser selects the language used in its advertisements. The language can be
9 important in capturing a user’s attention so the user will click on the link to an
10 advertiser’s website. An advertiser can gauge the success of an impression (and the
11 search terms that led to that impression) by calculating how many impressions occur
12 in comparison to the number of clicks.

13 46. Search advertising is crucial to advertisers because it allows them to
14 deliver a message to the consumer exactly when the consumer is expressing interest in
15 a specific subject and potentially at the same time the consumer is ready to make a
16 purchase. In the online contact lens market, consumers rarely have preference over
17 which particular retailer they make their purchase from. Instead, consumers most
18 frequently use generic search terms such as contact, contact lens and replaceable lens,
19 and purchase based on the lowest price available for their prescription.

20 **1-800 Contacts’ Scheme to Restrain Competition**
21 **and Maintain Its Dominant Market Position**

22 47. 1-800 Contacts was founded in February 1995 as 1-800-LENSNOW, but
23 changed its name to 1-800 Contacts in July 1995. Within one month of changing its
24 name, 1-800 Contacts received 2,000 calls and produced \$38,000 in revenue. 1-800
25 Contacts’ business grew rapidly over the next few years, as it became the most
26 dominant company in direct-to-consumer contact lens sales, including online sales.

27 48. By the early 2000s, however, competitors began to enter the direct-to-
28 consumer market for the sale of contact lenses. These competitors, like VisionDirect,

1 heavily invested in online search advertising and undercut 1-800 Contacts' prices.
2 Through lower prices, these competitors quickly grew their sales and became a serious
3 threat to 1-800 Contacts' dominant market position.

4 49. This sparked concern at 1-800 Contacts. In 2005, as Americans' comfort
5 with the internet and online shopping increased, in an effort to deter its competitors
6 and reduce competition, 1-800 Contacts implemented a business practice whereby it
7 conducted periodic online searches of "1-800 Contacts" and variations thereof on
8 internet search engines. Anytime its searches returned the sponsored link of a
9 competitor, 1-800 Contacts would send a cease-and-desist letter to the competitor that
10 accused the competitor of infringing upon its trademark by purchasing a keyword
11 using 1-800 Contacts' name from the internet search engine. But this claim was
12 incorrect.

13 50. 1-800 Contacts understood that it had no legal basis for these accusations.
14 1-800 Contacts knew that an internet search for "1-800 Contacts" would return a list
15 of links from various retailers that had acquired generic, non-infringing search terms
16 such as "contact" and "contact lens."

17 51. Before sending the cease-and-desist letters, 1-800 Contacts did not
18 confirm that its competitors had purchased "1-800 Contacts" as a keyword. With
19 respect to at least one competitor, Lens.com, 1-800 Contacts did not run any privacy
20 reports to determine the keywords that had generated search results containing the
21 links for the rival's website. Rather, it simply presumed that Lens.com had purchased
22 "1-800 Contacts" as a keyword.²

23 52. Indeed, in response to litigation threats, several competitors of 1-800
24 Contacts advised 1-800 Contacts that: (i) they had never used 1-800 Contacts'
25 trademark in their advertisements, and/or (ii) the use of generic keywords would

26
27 ² Whether or not it is legal to use a competitor's trade name as a search term (it
28 likely is) is irrelevant. The intent of the threatened legal action was to monopolize the
industry and to get 1-800 Contacts' competitors to agree to divvy up the market.

1 sometimes result in a search triggering a multitude of other contact lens sites,
2 including legitimate sponsored advertisements. Through its counsel, one competitor,
3 Memorial Eye, specifically advised 1-800 Contacts that it had ““never used, or even
4 considered using, [1-800 Contacts’] trademark in its sponsored advertisements, or
5 even a search phase trigger.”” 1-800 Contacts nevertheless continued with its threats,
6 hoping to protect its market share and extract an anticompetitive agreement from its
7 competitors by forcing them to incur substantial cost and/or limit the keywords they
8 purchased from search engines.

9 53. Competitors who refused to bow to 1-800 Contacts’ demands concerning
10 a limitation on keywords or use of negative keywords were threatened with litigation.
11 Most of these rivals lacked the size and resources to withstand substantial litigation.
12 Between 2004 and 2013, 1-800 Contacts was able to extract at least 14 horizontal
13 agreements that restrained trade and reduced output in the relevant markets.

14 54. All of the agreements prohibit 1-800 Contacts’ competitors from bidding
15 in a search advertising auction for 1-800 Contacts’ trademarked terms, as well as
16 variations thereof. All of the agreements are reciprocal, meaning that 1-800 Contacts
17 is likewise prohibited from bidding in a search advertising auction for its competitors’
18 trademarked terms, as well as variations thereof. This part of the agreement is market
19 allocation, a naked horizontal restraint on trade and *per se* illegal under the Sherman
20 Antitrust Act. Additionally, 13 of the agreements require 1-800 Contacts’ competitors
21 to use “negative keywords,” which direct a search engine not to display the
22 competitor’s advertisement in response to a search query that includes 1-800
23 Contacts’ trademarked names or variations thereof.

24 55. One such competitor who entered into an agreement with 1-800 Contacts
25 is VisionDirect. VisionDirect sold contact lenses online at www.visiondirect.com. It
26 entered into two horizontal agreements with 1-800 Contacts.

27 (a) The first agreement was entered into on June 24, 2005 (the “2005
28 Agreement”). Under the 2005 Agreement, VisionDirect was prohibited from

1 ““causing [its] website or Internet advertisement to appear in response to any Internet
 2 search for [1-800 Contacts’] brand name, trademark or URL.”” The agreement also
 3 prohibited VisionDirect from ““causing [its] brand name, or link to [its] Websites to
 4 appear as a listing in the search results page of an Internet search engine, when the
 5 user specifically searches for [1-800 Contacts’] brand name, trademark or URLs.””
 6 On information and belief, VisionDirect, through its counsel, Wilson Sonsini
 7 Goodrich & Rosati, expressed serious antitrust concerns about the enforceability of
 8 the 2005 Agreement as it related to the implementation of negative keywords. On
 9 January 24, 2008, Wilson Sonsini wrote 1-800 Contacts’ General Counsel:

10 Separate and apart from Vision Direct’s position regarding the interpretation of the
 11 contract, set forth in Ms. Caditz’s November 5, 2007 letter—that is, that the Agreement does not
 12 contemplate the implementation of negative key words—Vision Direct continues to believe that
 13 any agreement between the parties with regard to the implementation of negative key words
 14 creates an unacceptable risk of violating Section 1 of the Sherman Act, and as such, represents a
 15 serious antitrust issue. Any such agreement would appear to represent a restraint unrelated to the
 16 terms of the Agreement and unrelated to a valid intellectual property right, and one that
 17 depresses the price of key words to search companies such as Google, Yahoo! and Microsoft.

18 (b) The second agreement was entered into in 2009 (the “2009
 19 Agreement”). Under the 2009 Agreement, 1-800 Contacts and VisionDirect agreed to
 20 implement negative keyword lists in connection with their internet advertising efforts.
 21 There, too, VisionDirect expressed concern about the antitrust law problems
 22 associated with 1-800 Contacts’ agreement. VisionDirect expressed its concerns in the
 23 2009 Agreement, which provided:

24 RECITALS

25 WHEREAS, the Dispute arises out of the allegations that Vision Direct’s Internet advertisement appeared in the search
 26 results pages of one or more Internet search engines when a user searched for 1-800 Contacts.

27 WHEREAS, 1-800 Contacts claims that the appearance of such Internet advertisements violates the 2004 Settlement
 28 Agreement, and infringes 1-800 Contacts’ trademarks;

WHEREAS, Vision Direct and Drugstore.com have raised a concern that an agreement with a competitor to implement
 negative keywords could implicate the antitrust laws of the United States, and 1-800 Contacts has taken the position that no
 antitrust laws would be violated by such an agreement;

56. This action by VisionDirect was against its economic interests. In a
 competitive marketplace, VisionDirect would have continued to compete, in both

1 advertising and on price. It could have covered its prices and increased its market
2 share, taking from 1-800 Contacts. Instead, it agreed not to compete. This rationale
3 applies to the remainder of the Doe Defendants. No Doe Defendant was acting in its
4 best economic interest, unless there was a conspiracy.

5 57. Importantly, VisionDirect and the remainder of the Doe Defendants must
6 have known that the other defendants were coming to the same agreement with 1-800
7 Contacts. This tacit agreement, in light of the other allegations in the complaint,
8 including the continued market share of 1-800 Contacts, are enough to establish §1
9 liability through a hub-and-spoke conspiracy with 1-800 Contacts at the center. On
10 information and belief, 1-800 Contacts assured VisionDirect and the other Doe
11 Defendants that it was entering into agreements with all the participants in the direct-
12 to-consumer contact lens market. This would ensure that each market participant was
13 guaranteed to maintain its market share and, with no competing search results coming
14 up when each company's name was searched for, would enable VisionDirect and the
15 co-conspirators to charge supracompetitive prices.

16 58. Another factor making this conspiracy successful was how easy it was to
17 ensure that no competitor was cheating on the conspiracy and violating the terms of
18 their agreement. All it would take to ensure that a competitor was abiding by the
19 conspiracy was a simple internet search.

20 59. 1-800 Contacts also sought to force many of its other competitors to
21 implement measures similar to those agreed to by VisionDirect,³ including the
22 following:

23 (a) JSJ Enterprises: JSJ sold replacement contact lenses to consumers
24 at www.contactlensconnection.com.

25 (b) Premier Holdings: Premier Holdings sold replacement contact
26 lenses to consumers at www.ezcontactusa.com and www.filmart.com. After 1-800

27 _____
28 ³ On information and believe, these likely co-conspirators are the Doe Defendants.

1 Contacts initiated litigation, 1-800 Contacts and Premier Holdings entered into a string
2 of eight stipulations to extend the deadline to answer in order for the parties to
3 continue settlement discussions.

4 (c) LensWorld: LensWorld sold replacement contact lenses to
5 consumers at www.lensworld.com, www.contactmania.com and
6 www.contactlensworld.com. After extensive settlement discussions, LensWorld
7 ultimately allowed the court to enter an order, through a default motion, which
8 required LensWorld to “implement the negative keywords attached hereto as Exhibit
9 A in any search engine advertising campaign performed for the benefit of
10 [LensWorld], where possible, for so long as any one of [1-800 Contacts’] federally
11 registered trademarks remain active.” The list included 36 different search terms,
12 including “www.contacts.com.”

13 (d) Lensfast: Lensfast sold replacement contact lenses to consumers at
14 www.lensfast.com, www.contactlens.com and www.e-contacts.com. It also sold
15 contacts over the telephone at 1-800 LENSFAST.

16 (e) Lenses for Less: Lenses for Less sold replacement contact lenses to
17 consumers at www.lensesforless.com.

18 (f) Arlington Contact Lens Service: Arlington Contact Lens Service,
19 which did business as Discount Contact Lenses, sold replacement contact lenses to
20 consumers at www.discountcontactlenses.com and www.aclens.com.

21 (g) Empire Vision Center: Empire Vision Center sold replacement
22 contact lenses to consumers at www.lens123.com.

23 (h) Contact Lens King: Contact Lens King sold replacement contact
24 lenses to consumers at www.contactlensking.com.

25 (i) Tram Data: Tram Data LLC sold replacement contact lenses to
26 consumers at www.replacemycontacts.com.

27 (j) Walgreen Company: Walgreen Company sold replacement contact
28 lenses to consumers at www.walgreens.com.

1 (k) Standard Optical: Standard Optical sold replacement contact lenses
2 to consumers at www.standardoptical.net.

3 (l) Web Eye Care: Web Eye Care, Inc. sold replacement contact
4 lenses to consumers at www.webeyecare.com.

5 (m) Memorial Eye: Memorial Eye P.A. sold replacement contact lenses
6 to consumers at www.shipmycontacts.com, www.ship-my-contacts.com and
7 www.iwantcontacts.com.

8 **1-800 Contacts' Lawsuit Against Lens.Com**
9 **Is Dismissed for Lack of Merit**

10 60. 1-800 Contacts also sent cease-and-desist letters and ultimately filed a
11 lawsuit against its rival, Lens.com. As it had with many of its other rivals, 1-800
12 Contacts sought an order preventing Lens.com ““from using any variation of the 1-800
13 CONTACTS Marks and any other marks or names that are confusingly similar,””
14 including ““sponsored advertising triggers, other identifiers, keywords or other terms
15 used to attract or divert traffic on the Internet or to secure higher placement within the
16 search engine results.”” Also, as it had with its other rivals, 1-800 Contacts based its
17 lawsuit on the incorrect presumption that Lens.com had purchased “1-800 Contacts”
18 as a keyword from search engines. However, Lens.com fought the lawsuit.

19 61. On December 14, 2010, the district court dismissed 1-800 Contacts’
20 lawsuit. In a published 40-page decision, the court found that “[1-800 Contacts] has
21 presented no evidence to show that [Lens.com] ever purchased [1-800 Contacts’]
22 exact service mark as a keyword.” *1-800 Contacts, Inc.*, 755 F. Supp. at 1160. More
23 importantly, the court took aim at 1-800 Contacts’ practice of seeking agreements,
24 through cease-and-desist letters, that precluded a competitor’s advertisements from
25 appearing on a search-results page anytime its mark is entered as a search term. It
26 said that such a result would be “an anti-competitive, monopolistic protection to
27 which it is not entitled”:

28 As stated above, Plaintiff [1-800 Contacts] sends cease and desist
letters anytime a competitor’s advertisement appears when Plaintiff’s

1 mark is entered as a search term. Were Plaintiff actually able to preclude
2 competitor advertisements from appearing on a search-results page
anytime its mark is entered as a search term, it would result in an anti-
3 competitive, monopolistic protection, to which it is not entitled.

4 *Id.* at 1174.

5 62. The district court's skepticism about such agreements continued, as it
6 questioned whether any such contract between 1-800 Contacts and Lens.com would
7 survive an antitrust challenge. According to the order:

8 Were this actually an agreement entered into by the parties, the
9 court questions whether it would survive an antitrust challenge. [1-800
10 Contacts] does not seek merely to preclude usage of its trademark.
11 Instead, it wants to obliterate any other competitor advertisement from
12 appearing on a search-results page when a consumer types in
"1800Contacts" as a *search term* or some variation of it. This is
disturbing given that broad matching of the generic term "contacts"
could trigger an advertisement if a consumer enters the search term
"1800Contacts." A trademark right does not grant its owner the right to
stamp out every competitor advertisement.

13 *Id.* at 1188 (emphasis in original).

14 63. On July 16, 2013, the Tenth Circuit affirmed the district court's summary
15 judgment on all of 1-800 Contacts' claims based on keyword use that did not result in
16 ads displaying 1-800 Contacts' mark in their text.

17 **ANTICOMPETITIVE EFFECTS OF THE AGREEMENTS**

18 64. Defendants' conduct harmed plaintiffs and the Class and California
19 Subclass by depriving them of a marketplace in which consumers of contact lenses
20 make their decisions about the purchase of contact lenses free from the influence of
21 defendants' bilateral agreements, which restrain truthful advertising by competitors
22 responsible for the vast majority of direct-to-consumer sales of contact lenses.

23 65. Defendants' price-fixing conspiracy had the following anticompetitive
24 effects, among others: (a) price competition has been restrained or eliminated with
25 respect to contacts lenses sold directly to consumers, including online, in the United
26 States and California; (b) the price of contact lenses sold directly to consumers,
27 including online, in the United States and California has been fixed, raised,
28 maintained, or stabilized at artificially inflated levels; and (c) purchasers of contact

1 lenses sold directly to consumers, including online, in the United States and California
2 have been deprived of free and open competition. During the Class Period, plaintiffs
3 and the members of the Class and the California Subclass paid supracompetitive
4 prices for contact lenses sold directly to consumers, including online, in the United
5 States and California.

6 66. Plaintiffs have suffered significant injury as a result of defendants'
7 contact lens price manipulation conspiracy. Typically, when consumers conduct web
8 searches for contact lenses, they are presented with options from a range of contact
9 lens sellers. Any sellers who were offering the same contact lenses at prices higher
10 than their competitors would either (i) retain higher prices and risk losing business to
11 rivals or (ii) lower prices to bring their prices in line with their competitors' prices and
12 compete for the business. Falling prices would, in turn, stimulate additional
13 competition among various contact lens sellers. However, through agreements that
14 rigged search results in response to online user queries, defendants ensured that
15 consumers were presented with only one option – the option to pay whatever
16 defendants wanted to charge in a competition-free market – as long as it was not
17 enough to drive them to run another search. But for defendants' anticompetitive
18 conduct, consumers such as plaintiffs would have been aware of and presented with
19 options from various sellers of contact lenses, and would have purchase lenses from
20 the seller featuring the lowest price.

21 67. By reason of the alleged violations of federal and California laws,
22 plaintiffs and the members of the Class and California Subclass have sustained injury
23 to their business or property in the form of the overcharges they paid for contact
24 lenses sold directly to consumers, including online, in the United States and
25 California. Plaintiffs and the Class paid more for contact lenses than they would have
26 in the absence of defendants' illegal contract, combination, or conspiracy, and, as a
27 result, have suffered damages in an amount presently undetermined. This is an
28 antitrust injury of the type that the antitrust laws were meant to punish and prevent.

1 68. In formulating and effectuating the contract, combination or conspiracy,
2 defendants and their co-conspirators engaged in anticompetitive activities, the purpose
3 and effect of which was to fix, maintain, suppress, inflate and otherwise make
4 artificial the price of contact lenses sold directly to consumers, including online, in the
5 United States and to California residents.

6 69. Plaintiffs suffered antitrust injury in that they paid more for contact
7 lenses purchased from defendants than they would have paid had the manipulation not
8 occurred.

9 70. Injury to plaintiffs and the Class and the California Subclass also resulted
10 from defendants' deprivation of the benefits of free and open competition in the
11 market for online contact lens sales.

12 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

13 71. Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Rules 23(a), (b)(2)
14 and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of all Class members,
15 defined as: All persons that made at least one retail purchase of contact lenses from
16 defendants from January 1, 2004 through the present ("Class Period"). Excluded from
17 the Class are defendants, their parent companies, subsidiaries and affiliates, any co-
18 conspirators, governmental entities and instrumentalities of government, states and
19 their subdivisions, agencies and instrumentalities.

20 72. Plaintiffs also bring this action on behalf of the California Subclass,
21 which is defined as: all members of the Class that reside in California that made at
22 least one retail purchase of contact lenses from defendants from January 1, 2004
23 through the present.

24 73. The Class and California Subclass are ascertainable and are ones for
25 which records should readily exist.

26 74. Members of each class are so numerous that joinder is impracticable.
27 Plaintiffs do not know the exact size of the Class and Subclass, but because of the
28 nature of the trade and commerce involved, plaintiffs believe that there are tens, if not

1 hundreds, of thousands of Class members as described above, the exact number and
2 identities being known to defendants and their co-conspirators. Moreover, the
3 members of the Class are dispersed across the United States.

4 75. There is a well-defined community of interest among plaintiffs and the
5 members of the Class and California Subclass. Because defendants have acted in a
6 manner generally applicable to the Class and California Subclass, questions of law
7 and fact common to members of the Class and California Subclass predominate over
8 questions, if any, that may affect only individual members of the Class and California
9 Subclass. Such generally applicable conduct is inherent in defendants' wrongful and
10 anticompetitive conduct.

11 76. Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:

12 (a) whether defendants and their co-conspirators entered into an
13 agreement, combination or conspiracy to rig the bidding in search engine advertising
14 auctions, increase or maintain supracompetitive prices for contact lenses, allocate the
15 market for online contact lens sales, and/or prevent the dissemination of information
16 concerning competitors' pricing of contact lenses;

17 (b) the identity of the participants of the alleged conspiracy;

18 (c) the duration of the conspiracy alleged herein and the acts
19 performed by defendants and their co-conspirators in furtherance of the conspiracy;

20 (d) whether, pursuant to bidding agreements, defendants agreed to
21 restrict bidding in search advertising auctions;

22 (e) whether the bidding agreements were necessary to yield a
23 procompetitive benefit that is cognizable and non-pretextual;

24 (f) whether such agreements are *per se* unlawful because they restrict
25 competition;

26 (g) whether such agreements are unlawful under the rule of reason;

27 (h) whether 1-800 Contacts possessed market power or monopoly
28 power over direct-to-consumer and online sales of contact lenses;

1 (i) whether the law requires definition of a relevant market when
2 direct proof of market power or monopoly power is available and, if so, the definition
3 of the relevant market(s);

4 (j) whether defendants' conduct affected interstate and intrastate
5 commerce;

6 (k) whether the conduct of defendants and their co-conspirators, as
7 alleged in this complaint, caused injury to plaintiffs and the other members of the
8 Class;

9 (l) whether the effects of defendants' alleged conspiracy were
10 anticompetitive in nature; and

11 (m) the appropriate nature of class-wide injunctive or other equitable
12 relief.

13 77. Among the questions of law and fact common to the California Subclass
14 are:

15 (a) whether the alleged conspiracy violated the Cartwright Act;

16 (b) whether the alleged conspiracy violated the UCL;

17 (c) whether the conduct of defendants and their co-conspirators, as
18 alleged in this complaint, caused injury to the plaintiffs and the other members of the
19 California Subclass;

20 (d) the effect of defendants' alleged conspiracy on the prices of
21 contact lenses sold directly to consumers, including online, to California residents
22 during the Class Period;

23 (e) the appropriate class-wide measure of damages; and

24 (f) the appropriate nature of class-wide injunctive or other equitable
25 relief.

26 78. There are no defenses of a unique nature that may be asserted against
27 plaintiffs individually, as distinguished from the other members of the Class, and the
28 relief sought is common to the Class.

1 79. There are no defenses of a unique nature that may be asserted against
2 plaintiffs individually, as distinguished from the other members of the California
3 Subclass, and the relief sought is common to the California Subclass.

4 80. Plaintiffs are members of the Class and their claims are typical of the
5 claims of the other members of the Class. Plaintiffs were damaged by the same
6 wrongful conduct of defendants.

7 81. Plaintiffs are members of the California Subclass and their claims are
8 typical of the claims of the other members of the California Subclass. Plaintiffs were
9 damaged by the same wrongful conduct of defendants.

10 82. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of other Class
11 and California Subclass members because they have no interests antagonistic to, or
12 that conflict with, those of any other Class or California Subclass member. Plaintiffs
13 are committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action and have retained competent
14 counsel, experienced in litigation of this nature, to represent them and the other
15 members of the Class and California Subclass.

16 83. A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient
17 adjudication of this controversy. Class treatment will enable a large number of
18 similarly situated parties to prosecute their claims in a single forum simultaneously,
19 efficiently, and without the unnecessary duplication of evidence, effort and expense
20 that would result if individual actions were pursued.

21 84. This case is also manageable as a class action. Plaintiffs know of no
22 difficulty to be encountered in the prosecution of this action that would preclude its
23 maintenance as a class action. In any event, the benefits of proceeding as a class
24 action, including providing injured persons or entities with a method for obtaining
25 redress for claims that could not practicably be pursued individually, substantially
26 outweigh potential difficulties in the management of this action as a class action.

1 85. Defendants' unlawful acts alleged in this complaint had a substantial
2 effect on commerce and caused antitrust injury to plaintiffs and the Class and the
3 California Subclass.

4 86. Defendants' unlawful acts had the purpose and effect of manipulating the
5 price of contact lenses sold directly to consumers, including over the internet, in the
6 United States and to California residents.

7 87. As a direct result of defendants' violations, plaintiffs and the members of
8 the Class and California Subclass have been damaged.

9 88. As a direct and foreseeable result of defendants' unlawful anticompetitive
10 acts, the prices of contact lenses sold directly to consumers, including online, in the
11 United States and to California residents was manipulated and inflated.

12 89. In addition, as a direct and foreseeable result of defendants' unlawful
13 anticompetitive acts, plaintiffs, the Class and the California Subclass were deprived of
14 the ability to receive truthful and non-misleading advertising.

15 **INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COMMERCE**

16 90. At all relevant times, 1-800 Contacts and its co-conspirators promoted,
17 distributed and sold substantial amounts of contact lenses in a continuous and
18 uninterrupted flow of commerce across state and national lines throughout the United
19 States.

20 91. Defendants transmitted and received funds, as well as contracts, invoices
21 and other forms of business communications and transactions, in a continuous and
22 uninterrupted flow of commerce across state and national lines throughout the United
23 States.

24 92. In furtherance of their efforts to monopolize and restrain competition,
25 defendants employed the United States mails and interstate telephone lines, as well as
26 interstate travel. Defendants' activities were within the flow of, and have substantially
27 affected (and will continue to substantially affect), interstate commerce.
28

1 93. Defendants' anticompetitive conduct also had substantial intrastate
2 effects in that price competition in California has been restrained or eliminated with
3 respect to contact lenses sold directly to consumers and online, the price of contact
4 lenses sold directly to consumers and online in California has been fixed, raised,
5 maintained or stabilized at artificially inflated levels, and purchasers of contact lenses
6 sold directly to consumers and online in California have been deprived of free and
7 open competition. The agreements to restrict bidding in search advertising auctions
8 for the online sale of contact lenses directly impacted and disrupted commerce within
9 California.

10 94. During the Class Period, contact lenses sold by defendants were shipped
11 into California and were sold to or paid for by plaintiffs and Class members in
12 California.

13 **PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS ARE TIMELY**

14 95. Plaintiffs bring their claims within the applicable statute of limitations.

15 96. Defendants concealed their anti-competitive activities by, among other
16 things, engaging in secret communications in furtherance of the conspiracy.
17 Defendants agreed among themselves not to discuss publicly or otherwise reveal the
18 nature and substance of their agreements alleged herein.

19 97. None of the facts or information available to plaintiffs, if investigated
20 with reasonable diligence, could or would have led to the discovery of the conduct
21 alleged in this complaint. Plaintiffs and the Class were led to believe that the prices
22 offered to them were the product of legitimate market conditions rather than
23 defendants' manipulative collusive activities.

24 98. As a result, plaintiffs were prevented from learning of the facts needed to
25 commence suit against defendants until no earlier than August 8, 2016, when the FTC
26 filed a complaint against 1-800 Contacts. There are many other reasons why these
27 facts could not have been known, including that: (i) defendants' advertising strategies
28 are not public information; (ii) search engines do not publish information concerning

1 particular search terms and search algorithms; and (iii) the horizontal agreements
2 restricting trade were not disclosed publicly.

3 99. Because of defendants' active steps, including the fraudulent
4 concealment of their conspiracy to prevent plaintiffs from discovering and suing them
5 for the anti-competitive activities alleged in this complaint, defendants are equitably
6 estopped from asserting that any otherwise applicable limitations period has run, or
7 that the statute of limitations began running before August 8, 2016.

8 **MONOPOLY POWER**

9 100. At all relevant times, 1-800 Contacts had market power because it had the
10 power to maintain the price of contact lenses sold directly to consumers and online
11 without losing so many sales as to make the supracompetitive price unprofitable.
12 Indeed, to this day, 1-800 Contacts' prices for contact lenses are consistently up to
13 40% higher than the prices charged by others in the direct-to-consumer and online
14 markets.

15 101. At all relevant times, 1-800 Contacts operated in the relevant markets. 1-
16 800 Contacts sold contact lenses directly to consumers and online at prices well in
17 excess of its marginal costs and the competitive price for contact lenses, and enjoyed
18 the resulting high profit margins and correspondence financial benefits – to the
19 financial detriment of plaintiffs and Class members.

20 102. 1-800 Contacts, at all relevant times, had enjoyed high barriers to entry
21 with respect to competition in the relevant product market due to regulatory
22 protections. The FTC has studied the various barriers to entry in the contact lens
23 market. Such barriers to entry include:

24 (a) New entrants must acquire and possess a substantial amount of
25 inventory of contact lenses from various manufacturers to attract consumers and meet
26 their needs with prompt delivery.

27 (b) Before entering the market, new entrants must invest an enormous
28 amount of money and other resources into their businesses. For example, new

entrants must recruit, hire and train personnel and lease or buy real estate. New entrants must invest in the significant information and systems infrastructure necessary to support online commerce. New entrants must also create and then invest in the significant promotional activities necessary to attract customers to their online sales website.

(c) New entrants must overcome established, dominant sellers such as 1-800 Contacts, VisionDirect and the Doe Defendants, and established buyer preferences. As alleged herein, 1-800 Contacts has dominated the market for direct-to-consumer and online sales of contact lenses for many years.

(d) 1-800 Contacts' practices also serve to deter potential new competitors from entering the direct-to-consumer and online markets for the sale of contact lenses.

(e) New entrants must establish and maintain relationships with contact lens manufacturers and consumers. New entrants must negotiate and acquire distribution rights from contact lens manufacturers to sell their products online. Establishing and maintaining relationships with manufacturers is costly and time-consuming. New entrants must also attract enough customers to cover their substantial operating expenses.

**1-800 CONTACTS' UNILATERAL ARBITRATION
PROVISION IS NOT BINDING AND UNENFORCEABLE**

103. 1-800 Contacts' website has a "Terms of Service" page. The terms of service page claims that "Any dispute relating in any way to your visit to this website or to products you purchase through us shall be submitted to confidential arbitration in Salt Lake City, Utah, except that, to the extent you have in any manner violated or threatened to violate our intellectual property rights, we may seek injunctive or other appropriate relief in any state or federal court in the state of Utah, and you consent to exclusive jurisdiction and venue in such courts."

1 104. This paragraph about arbitration, however, is not binding on plaintiffs,
2 the Class or the California Subclass. Any agreement to arbitrate is not specifically
3 highlighted. In fact, there are no direct links to the “Terms of Service” page on 1-800
4 Contacts homepage. The only way to find the Terms of Service page is to click on the
5 “Common Questions (FAQ)” link on the 1-800 Contacts’ homepage, which itself is in
6 extremely small print and is likely to be overlooked, as shown in Exhibit A.

7 105. After clicking on the Common Questions link, there is still no immediate
8 mention of arbitration. Instead, the last link on the Common Questions page, which
9 has to be scrolled down to see in most browsers, is a link entitled “Terms of Service,”
10 as shown in Exhibit A.

11 106. After clicking on the Terms of Service link, a consumer can finally
12 access the Terms of Service page, which contains the mention of arbitration. Even in
13 the unlikely event that a consumer did find and review the Terms of Service page
14 before ordering contact lenses through 1-800 Contacts’ website, the arbitration
15 language is only viewable if a user scrolls down to a section titled “Disputes,” as
16 shown in Exhibit A.

17 107. In addition, there is no place for a consumer to acknowledge receipt of
18 the arbitration provision or for a consumer to acknowledge that it understood that it
19 was governed by the arbitration provision. In fact, there is no requirement that a
20 1-800 Contacts customer even see the arbitration provision before ordering contacts
21 through 1-800 Contacts’ website, let alone take action to expressly consent to the
22 arbitration provision. Accordingly, there was never any meeting of the minds, as
23 required by law, regarding the arbitration of disputes and any reasonable user of 1-800
24 Contacts’ website would be surprised by the existence of the arbitration provision.

25 108. 1-800 Contacts retained the full right to unilaterally modify the terms of
26 the arbitration agreement, as shown by its carve out of intellectual property disputes.

27 109. Accordingly, 1-800 Contacts’ arbitration provision is unconscionable,
28 contrary to public policy and unenforceable.

COUNT I

**For Violations of §§1 and 3 of the Sherman Antitrust Act
Against All Defendants
(On Behalf of the Class)**

110. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding allegations.

111. Defendants, and their co-conspirators, entered into and engaged in a conspiracy in unreasonable restraint of trade in violation of §§1 and 3 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. §§1 and 3. The conspiracy consisted of a continuing agreement, understanding, or concerted action between and among defendants and their co-conspirators in furtherance of which defendants artificially fixed, raised, maintained and/or stabilized the prices for contact lenses sold directly-to-consumers, including online, throughout the United States.

112. Defendants' unlawful conduct was through mutual understandings, combinations or agreements by, between and among 1-800 Contacts, VisionDirect and the other Doe Defendants. Defendants' conspiracy is a *per se* violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and is, in any event, an unreasonable and unlawful restraint of trade.

113. There is no legitimate business justification for, or procompetitive benefit caused by, defendants' unreasonable restraint of trade. Any ostensible procompetitive benefit was pretextual or could have been achieved by less restrictive means.

114. Defendants' conspiracy, and the resulting impact on the prices of contact lenses, and the information provided to consumers, occurred in and affected interstate commerce and commerce in and between the territories of the United States.

115. As a direct, intended, foreseeable, and proximate result of defendants' conspiracy and overt acts taken in furtherance therefore, plaintiffs and each member of the Class have suffered injury. Plaintiffs' and each Class member's damages are directly attributable to defendants' conduct, which resulted in all Class members paying more for contact lenses than they would have otherwise paid, but for defendants' agreements.

116. Plaintiffs' and the Class's injuries are the type the antitrust laws were designed to prevent and flow from that which makes defendants' conduct unlawful. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to treble damages, attorneys' fees, reasonable expenses, and cost of suit for the violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

COUNT II

**For Violation of §2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act
Against 1-800 Contacts
(On Behalf of the Class)**

117. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding allegations.

118. At all relevant times, 1-800 Contacts possessed substantial monopoly and market power with respect to direct-to-consumer and online sales of contact lenses. 1-800 Contacts possessed the power to control prices, and prevent prices from falling, in direct-to-consumer sales of contact lenses, including in online sales.

119. In violation of §2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 1-800 Contacts monopolized, attempted to monopolize and conspired or agreed to monopolize the direct-to-consumer and online markets for contact lenses. As previously alleged, beginning in 2004 and continuing thereafter, 1-800 Contacts abused its monopoly power to inflate the price of contact lenses sold directly to consumers, among other ways, by (i) sending a series of cease-and-desist letters that included baseless representations regarding competitors' supposed purchases and uses of 1-800 Contacts' service mark as a keyword for online searches, (ii) seeking agreements that far exceed the scope of 1-800 Contacts' trademark rights, (iii) filing objectively and subjectively baseless litigation against competitors for the purpose of interfering with their ability to compete in the online market for contact lenses, and (iv) entering into anticompetitive agreements with its competitors that prevented direct-to-consumer and online sellers of contact lenses from competing against each other, and with 1-800 Contacts.

120. 1-800 Contacts did not obtain or maintain its monopoly power by reason of a superior product, business acumen or historic accident.

121. 1-800 Contacts' scheme harmed competition as detailed above.

122. As a direct and proximate result of 1-800 Contacts' illegal and monopolistic conduct, as alleged herein, plaintiffs and the Class were injured.

COUNT III

For Violations of the Cartwright Act Against All Defendants (On Behalf of the California Subclass)

123. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding allegations.

124. The acts and practices detailed above violate the Cartwright Act, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §16700, *et seq.*

125. It is appropriate to bring this action under the Cartwright Act because many of the purchasers reside in California and because other overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy and overcharges flowing from those acts occurred in California.

126. As detailed above, the anticompetitive conduct described herein constitutes a *per se* violation of California's antitrust laws and is an unreasonable and unlawful restraint of trade. The anticompetitive effects of defendants' conduct far outweigh any purported non-pretextual, pro-competitive justification.

127. As a proximate result of defendants' unlawful conduct, plaintiffs and the members of the California Subclass they seek to represent have been injured in their business or property in violation of the Cartwright Act, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §16700, *et seq.*, by paying supracompetitive prices for contact lenses bought over the internet during the Class Period. Such overcharges are the type of injury the antitrust laws were designed to prevent and flow directly from defendants' unlawful conduct. Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass are proper entities to bring a case concerning this conduct.

128. Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass have standing to and hereby seek monetary relief, including treble damages, together with other relief, as well as attorneys' fees and costs, as redress for defendants' Cartwright Act violations.

COUNT IV

**For Violations of California's Unfair Competition Law
Against All Defendants
(On Behalf of the California Subclass)**

129. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding allegations.

130. Plaintiffs bring this claim under §§17203 and 17204 of the Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code to enjoin, and obtain restitution and disgorgement of all monetary gains that resulted from, acts that violated §17200, *et seq.*, of the Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code, commonly known as the UCL.

131. Plaintiffs and the members of the California Subclass have standing to bring this action under the UCL because they have been harmed and have suffered injury by being forced to pay inflated, supracompetitive prices for contact lenses sold directly to California residents during the Class Period.

132. In formulating and carrying out the alleged agreement, understanding and conspiracy, defendants and their co-conspirators did those things that they combined and conspired to do, including but not limited to, the acts, practices and course of conduct set forth herein, and these acts constitute unfair competition in violation of the UCL.

133. Defendants' conspiracy had the following effects, among others: (i) price competition in the market for contact lenses sold directly to California residents, including online, during the Class Period was restrained, suppressed and/or eliminated; (ii) prices for contact lenses sold to California residents during the Class Period by defendants and their co-conspirators have been fixed, raised, maintained and stabilized at artificially high, non-competitive levels; and (iii) plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass who purchased contact lenses in California during the Class Period directly from defendants have been deprived of the benefits of free and open competition.

134. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' anticompetitive conduct, plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass have been injured in their business

1 or property by paying more for contact lenses sold directly to California residents and
2 purchased directly from defendants during the Class Period than they would have paid
3 absent of the conspiracy.

4 135. The anticompetitive behavior, as described above, is unfair,
5 unconscionable, unlawful and fraudulent, and in any event it is a violation of the
6 policy or spirit of the UCL.

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray that the Court:

9 A. Determine that this action may be maintained as a class action pursuant
10 to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a), (b)(2), and (b)(3), and direct that reasonable notice of this
11 action, as provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2), be given to the Class and California
12 Subclass, and declare plaintiffs representative of the Class and California Subclass;

13 B. Enter a judgment awarding plaintiffs and the Class and California
14 Subclass damages against defendants as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct
15 alleged in this complaint, plus treble damages and all other available damages,
16 including any statutory or liquidated damages or otherwise;

17 C. Award to plaintiffs and the Class and California Subclass their costs of
18 suit, including reasonable attorneys' and experts' fees and expenses;

19 D. Order that defendants, their directors, officers, employees, agents,
20 successors, members, and all persons in active concert and participation with them be
21 enjoined and restrained from, in any manner, directly or indirectly, committing any
22 additional violations of the law as alleged herein; and

23 E. Award any other and further relief as the Court may deem just and
24 proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs respectfully demand a trial by jury on all issues that can be tried to a jury.

DATED: October 13, 2016

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP
PATRICK J. COUGHLIN
DAVID W. MITCHELL
BRIAN O. O'MARA
STEVEN M. JODLOWSKI
CARMEN A. MEDICI

s/Steven M. Jodlowski

STEVEN M. JODLOWSKI

655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/231-1058
619/231-7423 (fax)

ROBBINS ARROYO LLP
BRIAN J. ROBBINS
GEORGE C. AGUILAR
GREGORY DEL GAIZO
600 B Street, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/525-3990
619/525-3991 (fax)

BROWNSTEIN LAW GROUP, PC
JOSHUA S. BROWNSTEIN
M. RYDER THOMAS
353 Sacramento Street, Suite 1140
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415/986-1338
415/986-1231 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

I:\Admin\CptDraft\Antitrust\Cpt 800 Contacts.docx

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

J THOMPSON and WILLIAM P. DUNCANSON, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego

(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Steven M. Jodlowski, Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101 619/231-1058

DEFENDANTS

1-800 CONTACTS, INC., VISION DIRECT, INC. and DOES 1-15,

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant _____

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

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

Attorneys (If Known)

'16CV2552 LAB KSC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
28 U.S.C. §1332(d)

Brief description of cause:

Complaint for Violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act and California's Cartwright Act and Unfair Competition Law

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

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

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE _____

DOCKET NUMBER _____

DATE

10/13/2016

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

s/ Steven M. Jodlowski

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____

AMOUNT _____

APPLYING IFP _____

JUDGE _____

MAG. JUDGE _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

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

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If 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.

EXHIBIT A

Welcome back Brennan | (Not Brennan?) Please Sign Out | My Account | View Cart (1)

1800contacts®
Fast, Free Shipping
On All Web Orders
Unbeatable Price Guarantee
We'll Beat Any Price
Contact Lens Specialist
Live Chat Available 24/7

Select Your Brand ▼
Customer Service ▼
Search by Brand or Keyword



Customer Resources

Common Questions (FAQ)

Click the ☐ sign to expand the answer to the questions you would like answered.

Account Questions

- ☐ How do I sign in if I can't remember my password?
- ☐ How do I sign in if I can't remember my email?
- ☐ How do I change the email or password on my account?
- ☐ Can I still sign in to my account if I've forgotten my password and no longer have access to my old email address?
- ☐ Why didn't I get a forgot password email?

Placing orders

- ☐ How do I place an order?
- ☐ How do I order if I wear a different brand in each eye?
- ☐ How do I use an order code?

Prescription questions

- ☐ Do I need a prescription to place an order?
- ☐ How do I order if I don't have a copy of my prescription?
- ☐ How do I know if my prescription is still valid?
- ☐ Want to send us a copy of your prescription and get your order faster?

Order Status and Shipping Questions

- ☐ How do I check the status of my order?
- ☐ How do I print an invoice?
- ☐ How long does it take for my order to ship?
- ☐ What shipping options and rates are available?
- ☐ What is 1-800 CONTACTS' return policy?

International Orders

- ☐ What if my eye doctor is outside the United States?
- ☐ What do I need to know if I am shipping to an international address?

Payment Questions

- ☐ Can I use my FSA (flexible spending account) to pay for my order?
- ☐ Does 1-800 CONTACTS accept vision insurance?

Product Questions

- ☐ Does 1-800 CONTACTS sell name brand contact lenses?
- ☐ How do I order gas permeable contacts on the website?
- ☐ What if I can't find my contact lenses on the website?

Company Information

- ☐ About us
- ☐ Hours of Operation and Contact Information
- ☐ Notice of Privacy Practices
- ☐ Privacy policy
- ☐ Terms of service

Company Information

Our Commitment

Gajillion Percent Promise

Contact Lens Types

Contact Lens Brands

ABOUT US

- The Company
- Careers
- Corporate Contacts
- Community
- Affiliate Program
- Public Relations
- Press Releases
- Company Accolades
- AdChoices

LET US HELP YOU

- How to Order
- Common Questions (FAQ)
- Contact Us
- Chat with Us
- Order Status
- How to Read Your Rx
- Doctors and My Rx
- Insurance
- Students

PRODUCT CATEGORIES

- Full Product List
- Daily Disposables
- Toric & Astigmatism
- Color & Enhancing Lenses
- Multifocal & Bifocal Lenses
- Eye Care Solutions

CUSTOMER RESOURCES

- My Account
- Customer Testimonials
- PSA / HSA
- Return Policy
- Privacy Policy
- Connect
- Site Map
- Notice of Privacy Practices
- SMS Terms & Conditions

EYE PROFESSIONALS

- Rx Verification Info
- Legislative Efforts
- FCLCA



The material provided on this site is for informational purposes only. Have your eyes examined regularly and always follow your eye care professional's instructions for the proper use and care of your contact lenses. If you experience pain or discomfort from your contact lens, discontinue use immediately and consult your eye care professional. All discounts and promotions are applied to future purchases only and cannot be applied to past purchases. © 1800Contacts.com, All Rights Reserved

Welcome back Brennan | (Not Brennan?) Please Sign Out | My Account | View Cart (1)

1800contacts®
Fast, Free Shipping
On All Web Orders
Unbeatable Price Guarantee
We'll Beat Any Price
Contact Lens Specialist
[Live Chat Available 24/7](#)

Select Your Brand ▼
Customer Service ▼



Customer Resources

Terms of Service

Terms of Service

Welcome to the 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS") website. The following Terms of Service govern your use of this website. If you visit or shop at 1800contacts.com, you accept these conditions, so please read them carefully.

Privacy

Please review our [Privacy Policy](#), which also governs your visit to 1800contacts.com, to understand our privacy-related practices.

No Professional Advice

Any information supplied through this website or by any of our employees or agents, whether by telephone, e-mail, letter, facsimile or other form of communication, is for informational purposes or general guidance and does not constitute medical or other professional advice. Health-related information provided through this website is not a substitute for medical advice and it is important that you not make medical decisions without first consulting your personal physician or other healthcare professional. The receipt of any questions or feedback you submit to us does not create a professional relationship and does not create any privacy interests other than those described in our Privacy Policy.

Electronic Communications

When you visit 1800contacts.com or send e-mails to us, you are communicating with us electronically and are consenting to receive communications from us electronically regarding a purchase or response to a question or comment or because you have chosen to receive promotional, legal or reminder emails about your contact lenses. We will communicate with you by e-mail or by posting notices on this website. You agree that all agreements, notices, disclosures and other communications that we provide to you electronically satisfy any legal requirement that such communications be in writing.

Intellectual Property

Unless otherwise noted, all information, account information, articles, data, images, passwords, customer numbers, screens, text, user names, web pages or other materials (collectively, the "Content") appearing on the website are the exclusive property of 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" or its subsidiaries):

1. All information, products, services, text, graphics, logos, button icons, images, audio clips, digital downloads, data compilations, software and other Content contained on or used in the website is protected by United States and international copyright laws. All rights reserved. Please assume that everything you see or read on the website is copyrighted to, or used with permission from 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" unless otherwise noted).
2. The trademarks, logos, service marks and trade dress (collectively, the "Trademarks") displayed on the website are registered and unregistered Trademarks of 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" or others. The Trademarks may not be used in connection with any product or service that is not ours, in any manner that is likely to cause confusion among customers or in any manner that disparages or discredits 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS"). All other trademarks not owned by 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" or its subsidiaries that appear on this website are the property of their respective owners, who may or may not be affiliated with, connected to, or sponsored by 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" or its subsidiaries).
3. Images of people, objects or places displayed on the website are either the property of, or used with permission by, 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS").
4. We own or use by permission all software contained on the website, including without limitation all HTML code. Copyright and other laws and international treaty provisions protect this software. The law expressly prohibits any modification, redistribution or reproduction of the software, and such actions could result in severe civil and criminal penalties. We will seek and support prosecuting violators to the maximum extent possible.
5. You may not copy, display, distribute, download, license, modify, publish, re-post, reproduce, reuse, sell, transmit, use to create a derivative work or otherwise use the Content of the website for public or commercial purposes without 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS") authorization. Nothing on this website shall be construed to confer any grant or license of any intellectual property rights, whether by estoppel, by implication or otherwise.

Violations of system or network security may result in civil or criminal liability. We will investigate occurrences that may involve such violations and may involve, and cooperate with, law enforcement authorities in prosecuting users involved in such violations.

We also reserve the right to disclose any information necessary to satisfy any applicable law, regulation, legal process or governmental request.

Patents

One or more patents may apply to this Web site, including without limitation: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,528,490; 5,761,649; and 6,029,142.

Website License and Prohibited Uses

We grant you a limited license to access and make personal use of this website and not to download (other than page caching) or modify it, or any portion of it, except with our express written consent. This license does not include the use of the website to do any of the following, including but not limited to:

1. resell or commercially use this website or its contents;
2. download or copy any account information for the benefit of another merchant or other person or entity;
3. use any false or inaccurate information for purposes of establishing an account with us;
4. provide any information or take any other action with the purpose of establishing an account with us in order to place test orders;
5. delete or revise any material or other information of ours or any other user;
6. harvest or otherwise collect information about others, including e-mail addresses, without their consent;
7. collect or otherwise use any data located on the website for litigation or legislative purposes;
8. take any action that imposes an unreasonable or disproportionately large load on the website's infrastructure;
9. use any device, software or routine to interfere or attempt to interfere with the proper working of the website or any activity being conducted on this website;
10. use any engine, software, tool, agent or other mechanism (including without limitation browsers, spiders, robots, avatars or intelligent agents) to navigate or search the website other than (i) the search engine and search agents available from 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" and (ii) generally available third party web browsers;
11. allow any other person or entity to use your Customer Number or other identifying information;
12. attempt to decipher, decompile, disassemble or reverse engineer any of the software comprising or in any way making up a part of the Service; or

You further agree not to violate or attempt to violate the security of the website, including, without limitation, actions such as:

1. accessing data not intended for you or logging into a server or account that you are not authorized to access;
2. attempting to probe, scan or test the vulnerability of a system or network or to breach security or authentication measures without proper authorization;
3. attempting to interfere with service to any user, host or network, including, without limitation, by way of submitting a virus to or overloading, using any type of spyware or redirecting software, "flooding," "spamming," "mailbombing" or "crashing" the website;
4. forcing the placement of cookies;
5. sending unsolicited e-mail, including promotions and/or advertising of products or services; or
6. forging any TCP/IP packet header or any part of the header information in any e-mail or posting.

This website or any portion of this website may not be reproduced, duplicated, copied, sold, resold, visited or otherwise exploited for any commercial purpose without our express written consent. You may not frame or utilize framing techniques to enclose any trademark, logo or other proprietary information (including images, text, page layout or form) of 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" without express written consent. You may not use any meta tags or any other "hidden text" utilizing 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" name or Trademarks without our express written consent. Any unauthorized use terminates the permission or license granted by us. You are granted a limited, revocable and nonexclusive right to create a hyperlink to the home page of 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" so long as the link does not portray 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" or our products or services in a false, misleading, derogatory or otherwise offensive matter. You may not use any 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" logo or other proprietary graphic or trademark as part of the link without our express written permission.

Reselling Products Prohibited

You are absolutely prohibited from reselling in any manner any products you purchase from 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS", whether you purchased the products through the website or by any other means.

Your Account

If you use this website, you are responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of your account, Customer Number and other related login and account information and for restricting access to your computer, and you agree to accept responsibility for all activities that occur under your account or password. You agree to immediately notify us of any unauthorized use of your Customer Number or account or any other breach of security. In consideration of your use of this website, you agree to (a) provide true, accurate, current and complete information about yourself as prompted by the forms for your account, prescription and order information (the "Account Information") and (b) maintain and promptly update the Account Information to keep it true, accurate, current and complete. If you provide any information that is untrue, inaccurate, not current or incomplete, or we have reasonable grounds to suspect that such information is untrue, inaccurate, not current or incomplete, we may suspend or terminate your account and refuse any and all current and future use of this website. Account Information and certain other information about you are also subject to our Privacy Policy. We reserve the right to refuse service, terminate accounts, remove or edit content, or cancel orders in our sole discretion.

Reviews, Comments, Communications and Other Content

We welcome your comments regarding our products, services and website. You may post reviews, comments and other content and submit suggestions, ideas, comments, questions or other information, so long as the content is not illegal, obscene, threatening, defamatory, invasive of privacy, infringing of intellectual property rights or otherwise injurious to third parties or objectionable and does not consist of or contain software viruses, political campaigning, commercial solicitation, chain letters, mass mailings or any form of "spam." You may not use a false e-mail address, impersonate any person or entity, or otherwise mislead as to the origin of a communication or other content. We reserve the right (but not the obligation) to remove or edit such content, but we do not regularly review posted content.

If you do post content or submit material, and unless we indicate otherwise, you grant 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" a nonexclusive, royalty-free, perpetual, irrevocable and fully sublicensable right to use, reproduce, modify, adapt, publish, translate, create derivative works from, distribute and display such content throughout the world in any media. You grant 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" and any of our sublicensees the right to use the name that you submit in connection with such content, if they choose. You represent and warrant that you own or otherwise control all of the rights to the content that you post; that the content is accurate; that use of the content you supply does not violate this policy and will not cause injury to any person or entity; and that you will indemnify 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS" for all claims resulting from content you supply. We have the right but not the obligation to monitor and edit or remove any activity or content. We take no responsibility and assume no liability for any content posted by you or any third party.

Copyright Complaints

We respect the intellectual property of others. If you believe that your work has been copied and is accessible on the website in a way that constitutes copyright infringement, please notify us and provide the following information:

1. a description of the copyrighted work that you claim has been infringed, including the URL (i.e., web page address) of the location where the copyrighted work exists or a copy of the copyrighted work;
2. identification of the URL or other specific location on the website where the material that you claim is infringing is located;
3. your name, address, telephone number and email address;
4. a statement that you have a good faith belief that the use of the copyrighted work is not authorized by the copyright owner, its agent or the law;
5. a statement that the information in the notification is accurate, and under penalty of perjury, that the signatory is either the owner, or is authorized to act on behalf of the owner, of an exclusive copyright right that is allegedly infringed; and
6. an electronic or physical signature of the owner or of the person authorized to act on behalf of the owner of the copyright interest.

Our agent for notice claims of copyright infringement on the website can be reached as follows:

Legal Department

1-800 CONTACTS, INC.,
261 Data Drive
Draper, Utah 84020
Telephone: 1-800-266-8228
email: legal@1800contacts.com

Product Descriptions

We attempt to be as accurate as possible in describing offered products. However, we do not warrant that product descriptions or other content of this website are accurate, complete, reliable, current or error-free. If a product we offer is not as described, your sole remedy is to return it in unused condition.

Export

The U.S. export control laws regulate the export and re-export of technology originating in the United States. This includes the electronic transmission of information and software to foreign countries and to certain foreign nationals. You agree to abide by these laws and their regulations-including but not limited to the Export Administration Act and the Arms Export Control Act and not to transfer, by electronic transmission or otherwise, any content derived from this website to either a foreign national or a foreign destination in violation of such laws.

Our Rights

We may elect to electronically monitor areas of this website and may disclose any Content, records or electronic communication of any kind (i) to satisfy any law, regulation or government request, (ii) if such disclosure is necessary or appropriate to operate the website; or (iii) to protect our rights or property or the rights of the users. We are not responsible for screening, policing, editing or monitoring such Content. If notified of allegedly infringing, defamatory, damaging, illegal or offensive Content, we may investigate the allegation and determine in our sole discretion whether to remove or request the removal of such Content from the website.

We may terminate your access, or suspend your access to all or part of the website, without notice, for any conduct that we, in our sole discretion, believe is in violation of any applicable law or is harmful to the interests of another user or us.

Because customer service is paramount to our business, we reserve the right to refuse to sell products to you if it reasonably appears to us that you intend to resell the products. In addition, we reserve the right to limit quantities of items purchased by each customer.

Links to Third Party Websites

Occasionally, we may make available a link to a third party's website. These links will let you leave this website. The linked websites are not under our control, and we are not responsible for the contents of any linked website or any link contained in a linked website, or any changes or updates to such websites. We are not responsible for webcasting or any other form of transmission received from any linked website. We provide the links to you only as a convenience. We do not endorse any third party linked website or its use or contents.

Disclaimer of Warranties and Limitation of Liability

THIS WEBSITE IS PROVIDED BY 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS ON AN "AS IS" AND "AS AVAILABLE" BASIS. 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE OPERATION OF THIS WEBSITE OR THE INFORMATION, CONTENT, MATERIALS OR PRODUCTS INCLUDED ON THIS WEBSITE. YOU EXPRESSLY AGREE THAT YOUR USE OF THIS WEBSITE IS AT YOUR SOLE RISK.

TO THE FULL EXTENT PERMISSIBLE BY APPLICABLE LAW, 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS DOES NOT WARRANT THAT THIS WEBSITE, ITS SERVERS OR E-MAIL SENT FROM 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS ARE FREE OF VIRUSES OR OTHER HARMFUL COMPONENTS. 1-800 CONTACTS, INC. ("1-800 CONTACTS WILL NOT BE LIABLE FOR ANY DAMAGES OF ANY KIND ARISING FROM THE USE OF THIS WEBSITE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, PUNITIVE AND CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES.

CERTAIN STATE LAWS DO NOT ALLOW LIMITATIONS ON IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR THE EXCLUSION OR LIMITATION OF CERTAIN DAMAGES. IF THESE LAWS APPLY TO YOU, SOME OR ALL OF THE ABOVE DISCLAIMERS, EXCLUSIONS OR LIMITATIONS MAY NOT APPLY TO YOU, AND YOU MIGHT HAVE ADDITIONAL RIGHTS.

Applicable Law

By visiting this website, you agree that the laws of the state of Utah, without regard to principles of conflict of laws, will govern these Terms of Service and any dispute of any sort that might arise between us.

Disputes

Any dispute relating in any way to your visit to this website or to products you purchase through us shall be submitted to confidential arbitration in Salt Lake City, Utah, except that, to the extent you have in any manner violated or threatened to violate our intellectual property rights, we may seek injunctive or other appropriate relief in any state or federal court in the state of Utah, and you consent to exclusive jurisdiction and venue in such courts. Arbitration under this agreement shall be conducted under the rules then prevailing of the American Arbitration Association. The arbitrator's award shall be binding and may be entered as a judgment in any court of competent jurisdiction. To the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, no arbitration under these Terms of Service shall be joined to an arbitration involving any other party subject to these Terms of Use, whether through class arbitration proceedings or otherwise. You agree that regardless of any statute or law to the contrary, any claim or cause of action arising out of or related to use of the website or the Terms of Use must be filed within one year after such claim or cause of action arose or be forever barred.

Website Policies and Modification

Please review our other policies, such as our Privacy Policy, posted on this website. We reserve the right to make changes to our website, policies and these Terms of Service at any time.

General Information

These Terms of Service constitute the entire agreement and govern the use of the website. You also may be subject to additional terms and conditions that may apply when you use third-party content or third-party software. Our failure to exercise or enforce any right or provision of the Terms of Use shall not constitute a waiver of such right or provision. If any provision of the Terms of Use is found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, the parties nevertheless agree that the court should endeavor to give effect to the parties' intentions as reflected in the provision, and the other provisions of the Terms of Use remain in full force and effect.

Android Pay Promotion

\$20 off Android Pay promotion valid for first orders from the 1-800 CONTACTS Android App. Offer will expire 5/31/2016 11:59pm, MT. Discount valid for U.S. Residents only for use of Android Pay while placing order. See product page for details.

Offer is subject to change without notice, and may not be combined with other offers. Other conditions may apply.

	ABOUT US	LET US HELP YOU	PRODUCT CATEGORIES	CUSTOMER RESOURCES	EYE PROFESSIONALS
Company Information	The Company	How to Order	Full Product List	My Account	Rx Verification Info
Our Commitment	Careers	Common Questions (FAQ)	Daily Disposables	Customer Testimonials	Legislative Efforts
Gajillion Percent Promise	Corporate Contacts	Contact Us	Toric & Astigmatism	FSA / HSA	FCLCA
Contact Lens Types	Community	Chat with Us	Color & Enhancing Lenses	Return Policy	
Contact Lens Brands	Affiliate Program	Order Status	Multifocal & Bifocal Lenses	Privacy Policy	
	Public Relations	How to Read Your Rx	Eye Care Solutions	Connect	
	Press Releases	Doctors and My Rx		Site Map	
	Company Accolades	Insurance		Notice of Privacy Practices	
	AdChoices	Students		SMS Terms & Conditions	



The material provided on this site is for informational purposes only. Have your eyes examined regularly and always follow your eye care professional's instructions for the proper use and care of your contact lenses. If you experience pain or discomfort from your contact lens, discontinue use immediately and consult your eye care professional. All discounts and promotions are applied to future purchases only and cannot be applied to past purchases. © 1800Contacts.com, All Rights Reserved.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Second Antitrust Class Action Filed Against 1-800 Contacts](#)
