- 1		
1	GIRARDI AND KEESE	
2	THOMAS V. GIRARDI, State Bar No. 36603	
3	ROBERT W. FINNERTY, State Bar No. 119775 CHRISTOPHER T. AUMAIS, State Bar No. 249901	
	1126 Wilshire Boulevard	110. 247701
4	Los Angeles, California 90017	
5	Telephone: (213) 977-0211 Facsimile: (213) 481-1554	
6	, ,	
7	[Additional Counsel appear on signature page]	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Putative	
9	Class	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – WESTERN DIVISION	
12		
13	AMANDA JANAYE WHITE, and ROBERT HONANIAN, individually	CASE NO. 2:17-cv-07991
14	and on behalf of all others similarly	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
	situated,	1. WILLFUL VIOLATION OF FAIR
15	Plaintiffs,	CREDIT REPORTING ACT
16	Traintins,	2. NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT
17	V.	3. Negligence
18	EQUIFAX, INC., a Georgia	4. Negligence Per Se
19	corporation,	5. VIOLATION OF STATE DATA
	Defendant.	Breach Statutes  6. Violation of California's
20		UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW CAL
21		Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 -
22		Unlawful Business Practices
23		7. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S
		UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW CAL.
24		Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 Unfair Business Practices
25		8. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S
26		Unfair Competition Law Cal.
27		Bus. & Prof. Code §17200
		FRAUDULENT/DECEPTIVE
28		BUSINESS PRACTICES

# J

#### 9. DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

### JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiffs Amanda Janaye White, and Robert Honanian, (hereinafter, "Plaintiff" or "Plaintiffs"), individually and on behalf of the Classes defined below, alleges the following against Equifax, Inc. ("Equifax") based upon personal knowledge with respect to herself and on information and belief derived from, among other things, investigation of counsel and review of publicly available documents as to all other matters:

#### **INTRODUCTION**

- 1. Plaintiffs brings this class action case against Equifax for its gross and systemic failures to secure and safeguard consumers' personally identifiable information ("PII") which Equifax collected from various sources in connection with the operation of its business as a consumer credit reporting agency, and for failing to provide timely, accurate and adequate notice to Plaintiffs and other Class members that their PII had been stolen and precisely what types of information were stolen.
- 2. Equifax has acknowledged that a cybersecurity incident ("Data Breach") potentially impacting approximately 143 million U.S. consumers occurred. It has also acknowledged that unauthorized persons exploited a U.S. website application vulnerability to gain access to certain files. Equifax claims that based on its investigation, the unauthorized access occurred from mid-May through July 2017. By

Equifax's own admission, the information accessed primarily includes names, Social Security numbers, birth dates, addresses and some driver's license numbers. Equifax has also confirmed that credit card numbers for approximately 209,000 U.S. consumers, and certain dispute documents with personal identifying information for approximately 182,000 U.S. consumers, were stolen.

- 3. Equifax learned of the Data Breach on July 29 2017, but failed to disclose it to affected consumers and the public at large until September 7, 2017. Instead, three senior Equifax executives sold at least \$1.8 million worth of shares before the public disclosure of the breach.
- 4. The PII for Plaintiffs and the class of consumers they seek to represent was compromised due to Equifax's acts and omissions and their failure to properly protect the PII.
- 5. Equifax could have prevented this Data Breach. Data breaches at other companies, including one of its major competitors, Experian have occurred.
- 6. The Data Breach was the inevitable result of Equifax's inadequate approach to data security and the protection of the PII that it collected during the course of its business.
- 7. Equifax disregarded the rights of Plaintiffs and Class members by intentionally, willfully, recklessly, or negligently failing to take adequate and reasonable measures to ensure its data systems were protected, failing to disclose to its customers the material fact that it did not have adequate computer systems and security

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

26

25

27 28 practices to safeguard PII, failing to take available steps to prevent and stop the breach from ever happening, and failing to monitor and detect the breach on a timely basis.

As a result of the Equifax Data Breach, the PII of the Plaintiffs and Class 8. members has been exposed to criminals for misuse. The injuries suffered by Plaintiffs and Class members, or likely to be suffered by Plaintiffs and Class members as a direct and proximate result of the Equifax Data Breach include: (a) theft of their personal and financial information; (b) costs associated with the detection and prevention of identity theft and unauthorized use of their financial accounts; (c) costs associated with time spent and the loss of productivity from taking time to address and attempt to ameliorate, mitigate, and deal with the actual and future consequences of the data breach, including finding fraudulent charges, cancelling and reissuing cards, purchasing credit monitoring and identity theft protection services, imposition of withdrawal and purchase limits on compromised accounts, and the stress, nuisance, and annoyance of dealing with all issues resulting from the Data Breach; (d) the imminent and certainly impending injury flowing from potential fraud and identify theft posed by their personal and financial information being placed in the hands of hackers; (e) damages to, and diminution in value of, their personal and financial information entrusted to Equifax for the sole purpose of Equifax's credit-reporting services and with the mutual understanding that Equifax would safeguard Plaintiff's and Class members' data against theft and not allow access and misuse of their data by others; (f) money paid to Equifax for creditreporting services during the period of the Data Breach in that Plaintiff and Class

19

21

24 25

23

27

28

26

members would not have obtained, or permitted others to obtain, Equifax's creditreporting services had Equifax disclosed that it lacked adequate systems and procedures to reasonably safeguard consumers' financial and personal information and had Equifax provided timely and accurate notice of the Data Breach; (g) overpayments paid to Equifax for credit-reporting services in that a portion of the price paid by Plaintiffs and the Class, or others on their behalf, to Equifax was for the costs of Equifax providing reasonable and adequate safeguards and security measures to protect customers' financial and personal data, which Equifax did not do, and as a result, Plaintiffs and members of the Class did not receive what was paid for and Equifax overcharged for these services; and (h) continued risk to their financial and personal information, which remains in the possession of Equifax and which is subject to further breaches so long as Equifax fails to undertake appropriate and adequate measures to protect Plaintiffs' and Class members' PII in its possession.

- The injuries to the Plaintiffs and Class members were directly and 9. proximately caused by Equifax's failure to implement or maintain adequate data security measures for PII.
- Further, Plaintiffs retains a significant interest in ensuring that their PII, 10. which, while stolen, remains in the possession of Equifax is protected from further breaches, and seeks to remedy the harms they have suffered on behalf of themselves and similarly situated consumers whose PII was stolen as a result of the Equifax Data Breach.

11 12

14

15

13

16

17

18

20

21

19

22 23

24

26

25

27 28

Plaintiffs bring this action to remedy these harms on behalf of themselves 11. and all similarly situated individuals whose PII was accessed during the Data Breach. Plaintiffs seeks the following remedies, among others: statutory damages under the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA") and state consumer protection statutes, reimbursement of out-of-pocket losses, other compensatory damages, further and more robust credit monitoring services with accompanying identity theft insurance, and injunctive relief including an order requiring Equifax to implement improved data security measures.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 12. This Court has federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 based on the Fair Credit Reporting Act claims alleged herein, and supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. Alternatively, this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because the amount in controversy exceeds \$5 million, exclusive of interest and costs, there are more than 100 putative class members, and many members of the proposed Classes are citizens of states different from Equifax.
- This Court has personal jurisdiction over Equifax because Equifax 13. regularly conducts business in California, and has sufficient minimum contacts in California. Equifax intentionally availed itself of this jurisdiction by marketing and selling products and services and by accepting and processing payments for those products and services within California.
  - Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because 14.

Equifax regularly transacts business in this District, and hundreds of thousands of the Class members, including Plaintiff, reside in this District. The cause of actions for hundreds of thousands of putative class members also arose, in part, in this District.

#### **PARTIES**

- 15. Plaintiff Amanda Janaye White resides in Riverside County, California, and is a California citizen. Following the disclosure of the Data Breach, White accessed Equifax's website, <a href="www.trustedidpremier.com">www.trustedidpremier.com</a>, inputting her last name and six digits from her social security number as instructed, and received a response indicating that Equifax believes her personal information was impacted by the Data Breach.
- 16. Plaintiff Robert Honanian resides in Los Angeles County, California, and is a California citizen. Following the disclosure of the Data Breach, Honanian accessed Equifax's website, <a href="www.trustedidpremier.com">www.trustedidpremier.com</a>, inputting his last name and six digits from his social security number as instructed, and received a response indicating that Equifax believes his personal information was impacted by the Data Breach.
- 17. Plaintiffs' personal and financial information was compromised as a result of Equifax's failures and gross misconduct that resulted in the Data Breach. Plaintiffs were harmed and sustained actual, concrete damages by having their financial and personal information compromised by the Data Breach.
- 18. Plaintiffs would not have provided, or would not have authorized others to provide, their personal and financial information to Equifax in connection with credit-reporting services had Equifax disclosed that it lacked adequate computer systems and

data security practices to safeguard consumers' personal and financial information from hacking and theft.

- 19. Plaintiffs suffered actual and concrete injury as a result of Equifax's systemic failures and gross misconduct that resulted in the Data Breach.
- 20. Defendant Equifax, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business located in Atlanta, Georgia. It provides credit information services to millions of business, governmental units, and consumers throughout the world. Equifax operates through various subsidiaries and agents, each of which entities acted as agents of Equifax, or in the alternative, in concert with Equifax.

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

21. Plaintiffs seek relief on behalf of themselves and as representatives of all others who are similarly situated.

#### A. Nationwide Class

22. Plaintiffs asserts statutory claims under the Fair Credit Reporting Act and common law claims for negligence on behalf of all U.S. consumers defined as follows:

All persons residing in the United States whose personally identifiable information (PII) was accessed, compromised, or acquired by unauthorized persons in the Equifax Data Breach first disclosed on or about September 7, 2017 (the "Nationwide Class").

#### **B.** Statewide Classes

23. Plaintiffs assert statutory claims under the laws of various individual states, and on behalf of separate statewide classes, defined as follows:

All persons residing in [STATE] whose PII was accessed, compromised, or acquired by unauthorized persons in the Equifax Data Breach first disclosed on or about September 7, 2017 (the "Statewide Classes").

#### C. California Subclass

24. Plaintiff also assert statutory claims under California's Unfair Competition Law on behalf of all California consumers defined as follows:

All persons residing in California whose PII was accessed, compromised, or acquired by unauthorized persons in the Equifax Data Breach first disclosed on or about September 7, 2017 (the "California Subclass").

- 25. Excluded from the Nationwide Class, the Statewide Classes, and the California Subclass (collectively, the "Classes") are Equifax, its affiliates, parents or subsidiaries, its officers, directors and members of their immediate families and any entity in which Equifax has a controlling interest, the legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns of any such excluded party, all persons who make a timely election to be excluded from the Class, government entities; and the judicial officer(s) to whom this case is assigned, and the members of their immediate families.
- 26. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or modify the definition of the proposed Classes if necessary after having had an opportunity to conduct discovery.
- 27. Each of the proposed Classes meets the criteria for certification under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a), (b)(2), (b)(3).
- 28. *Numerosity. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1)*. The members of the Class are so numerous that the joinder of each member is impractical. By Equifax's own admission,

the Classes consist of approximately 143 million members, the identity of whom are well within the knowledge of and can be ascertained by resort to Equifax's records. In fact, Equifax's <a href="www.trustedidpremier.com">www.trustedidpremier.com</a> website already maintains the identities of these class members, demonstrating Equifax has the administrative capability through its computer systems and other records to identify all members of the Classes, and such specific information is not otherwise available to Plaintiff.

- 29. *Commonality. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2) and (b)(3)*. Consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2) and with 23(b)(3)'s predominance requirement, this action involves common questions of law and fact that predominate over any questions affecting individual Class members. The common questions include:
  - a. Whether Equifax engaged in the wrongful conduct alleged herein;
  - b. Whether Equifax owed a duty to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes to adequately protect their PII;
  - c. Whether Equifax owed a duty to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes to provide timely and accurate notice of the Data Breach to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes;
  - d. Whether Equifax breached its duty to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes by failing to provide adequate data security;
  - e. Whether Equifax breached its duty to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes by failing to provide timely and accurate notice of the Data Breach to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes;
  - f. Whether Equifax knew or should have known that their data security systems were highly vulnerable to attack;
  - g. Whether Equifax unlawfully failed to disclose that it did not maintain computers and security practices adequate to reasonably safeguard consumers' financial and personal data;

4

5

6

7

8 9

11 12

10

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

25 26

24

27 28 counsel experienced in the prosecution of class actions. Plaintiffs intend to vigorously prosecute this case and will fairly and adequately protect the Class' interests.

Superiority. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). A class action is superior to any 32. other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, and no unusual difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class action. The quintessential purpose of the class action mechanism is to permit litigation against wrongdoers even when damages to individual Plaintiffs may not be sufficient to justify individual litigation. Here, the damages suffered by Plaintiffsand the Class are relatively small compared to the burden and expense required to individually litigate their claims against Equifax, and thus, individual litigation to redress Equifax's wrongful conduct would be impracticable. Individual litigation by each Class member would also strain the court system. Individual litigation creates the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments, and increases the delay and expense to all parties and the court system. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of a single adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

Injunctive and Declaratory Relief. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) and (c). The 33. requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) and (c) are also met because Equifax, through its uniform conduct, has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Classes, making injunctive and declaratory relief appropriate for the Classes as a whole.

#### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

- 34. Equifax is one of three nationwide credit-reporting companies that tracks and rates the financial history of U.S. consumers. The companies are supplied with data about loans, loan payments and credit cards, as well as information on everything from child support payments, credit limits, missed rent and utilities payments, addresses and employer history. All of this information, and more, factors into consumers' credit scores.
- 35. Unlike other data breaches, not all of the people affected by the Equifax breach may be aware that they are customers of the company. Equifax gets its data from credit card companies, banks, retailers, and lenders who report on the credit activity of individuals to credit reporting agencies, as well as by purchasing public records.
- 36. According to Equifax's report on September 7, 2017, the breach was discovered on July 29th. The perpetrators gained access by "[exploiting] a [...] website application vulnerability" on one of the company's U.S.-based servers. The hackers were then able to "gain access to certain files." See <a href="https://www.equifaxsecurity2017.com/">https://www.equifaxsecurity2017.com/</a> (last visited September 22, 2017).
- 37. Included among those files was a treasure trove of personal data: names, dates of birth, Social Security numbers and addresses. In some cases -- Equifax states around 209,000 -- the records also included actual credit card numbers. Documentation about disputed charges was also leaked. Those documents contained additional

personal information on around 182,000 Americans.

- 38. Personal data like this is a major score for cybercriminals who will likely look to capitalize on it by launching targeted phishing campaigns.
- 39. Plaintiffs suffered actual injury in the form of damages to and diminution in the value of their PII a form of intangible property that Plaintiffs entrusted to Equifax and that was compromised in and as a result of the Equifax Data Breach.
- 40. Additionally, Plaintiffs have suffered imminent and impending injury arising from the substantially increased risk of future fraud, identity theft and misuse posed by their PII being placed in the hands of criminals who have already, or will imminently, misuse such information.
- 41. Moreover, Plaintiffs have a continuing interest in ensuring that his private information, which remains in the possession of Equifax, is protected and safeguarded from future breaches.
- 42. At all relevant times, Equifax knew, or reasonably should have known, that the PII it collected, maintained and stored is highly sensitive, susceptible to attack, and could be used for wrongful purposes by third parties, such as identity theft and fraud.
- 43. Equifax recognized its obligation to maintain the security of U.S. consumers' PII and financial information in its Privacy Policy:

For more than 100 years, Equifax has been a catalyst for commerce by bringing businesses and consumers together. Equifax also provides products and services that bring businesses together with other businesses.

We have built our reputation on our commitment to deliver reliable information to our customers (both businesses and consumers) and to protect the privacy and confidentiality of personal information about consumers. We also protect the sensitive information we have about businesses. Safeguarding the privacy and security of information, both online and offline, is a top priority for Equifax

See <a href="http://www.equifax.com/privacy/">http://www.equifax.com/privacy/</a> (last visited September 22, 2017).

- 44. Equifax further promises to consumers that "[w]e will not disclose your personal information to third parties except to provide you with the disclosure or service you request . . ." See <a href="http://www.equifax.com/privacy/personal-credit-reports">http://www.equifax.com/privacy/personal-credit-reports</a> (last visited September 22, 2017). Equifax also promises that it is "committed to protecting the security of your information through procedures and technology designed for this purpose." *Id*.
- 45. It is well known and the subject of many media reports that PII is highly coveted and a frequent target of hackers. Despite the frequent public announcements of data breaches of corporate entities, including Experian, Equifax maintained an insufficient and inadequate system to protect the PII of Plaintiffs and Class members.
- 46. Although Equifax claims to be a leader in data security and its privacy policy promises to reasonably safeguard consumer data, Equifax's own data security practices were inadequate. Equifax was well aware of this fact because it had experienced multiple data breaches in recent years.
- 47. In March 2014, Equifax reported a data breach to the New Hampshire Attorney General involving an IP address operator who was able to obtain Equifax

49.

consumer credit reports using sufficient personal information to bypass Equifax's identity verification process. *See* Letter from Troy G. Kubes, Vice President & Associate Group Counsel at Equifax Legal Department, to Attorney General Joseph Foster, March 5, 2014, <a href="https://www.doj.nh.gov/consumer/security-breaches/documents/equifax-20140305.pdf">https://www.doj.nh.gov/consumer/security-breaches/documents/equifax-20140305.pdf</a> (last visited September 22, 2017).

- 48. In May 2016, Equifax's W-2 Express website suffered a data breach where an attacker was able to access, download and post the names, addresses, social security numbers and other personal information of over 430,000 Kroger employees. The attackers were able to access the W-2 data by merely entering Equifax's portal with an employee's default PIN code, which was the last four digits of the employee's Social Security number and their four-digit birth year. *See* Crooks Grab W-2s from Credit Bureau Equifax, Krebs on Security, <a href="http://krebsonsecurity.com/2016/05/crooks-grab-w-2s-from-credit-bureau-equifax/">http://krebsonsecurity.com/2016/05/crooks-grab-w-2s-from-credit-bureau-equifax/</a> (last visited September 22, 2017).
- vulnerable. In 2016, a security researcher found a common vulnerability known as cross-site scripting (XSS) on the main Equifax website. Such XSS bugs allow attackers to send specially-crafted links to Equifax customers and, if the target clicks through and is logged into the site, their username and password can be revealed to the hacker. *See*A Brief History of Equifax Security Fails, Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/thomasbrewster/2017/09/08/equifax-data-breach-history/#53a60715677c (last visited September 22, 2017).

Independent security researchers have also found that Equifax's website is

28

- 50. Researcher Kenneth White just recently discovered a link in the source code on the Equifax consumer sign-in page that pointed to Netscape, a web browser that was discontinued in 2008. Kevin Beaumont, a British security professional, found decade-old software in use, including IBM WebSphere, Apache Struts and Java, many of which are outdated and subject to well-known vulnerabilities. *Id*.
- 51. Given its critical role in credit markets, and the vast amounts of the most detailed PII and financial information of U.S. consumers that can be easily used by hackers or customers of hackers to prey on innocent consumers by using their identities and credit, Equifax was aware of the need to have the most current protective measures in place to prevent a hack and to minimize the impact of a hack should an intrusion occur. It is incomprehensible that Equifax had such poor protections and systems in place to allow hackers to infiltrate the PII and financial information of 143 million U.S. consumers for well over a month before being detected.
- On September 13, 2017, Equifax confirmed that there was a vulnerability 52. called CV-2017-5638. its systems Apache Struts See in https://www.equifaxsecurity2017.com/ (last visited on September 22, 2017). According to the Apache Software Foundation, the software company that Equifax used to build the website that was hacked, the Data Breach occurred due to Equifax's failure to install security updates to a server that it received from Apache in a timely manner. See <a href="https://blogs.apache.org/foundation/date/20170914">https://blogs.apache.org/foundation/date/20170914</a> (last visited on September 25, 2017). That vulnerability was well known to Equifax in early March 2017, when a

security patch was issued. Yet, shockingly, Equifax failed to install the patch, leaving its web server unsecure.

- 53. PII is a valuable commodity because it contains not only payment card numbers but PII as well. A "cyber blackmarket" exists in which criminals openly post stolen payment card numbers, social security numbers, and other personal information on a number of underground Internet websites. PII is "as good as gold" to identity thieves because they can use victims' personal data to open new financial accounts and take out loans in another person's name, incur charges on existing accounts, or clone ATM, debit, or credit cards.
- 54. Social Security numbers are a particularly popular target for hackers. Combinations of Social Security numbers, birth dates and names sell for more than credit card numbers in an increasingly sophisticated black market, where such information is sold and resold through popular auction sites.
- 55. Legitimate organizations and the criminal underground alike recognize the value in PII contained in a merchant's data systems; otherwise, they would not aggressively seek or pay for it. For example, in "one of 2013's largest breaches . . . not only did hackers compromise the [card holder data] of three million customers, they also took registration data [containing PII] from 38 million users." *See* Verizon 2014 PCI Compliance Report, available at: <a href="http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en\_us/solutions/industries/docs/retail/verizon\_pci2014.pdf">http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en\_us/solutions/industries/docs/retail/verizon\_pci2014.pdf</a> (hereafter "2014 Verizon Report"), at 54 (last visited September 20, 2017).

- 56. At all relevant times, Equifax knew, or reasonably should have known, of the importance of safeguarding PII and of the foreseeable consequences that would occur if its data security system was breached, including, specifically, the significant costs that would be imposed on individuals as a result of a breach.
- 57. Equifax was, or should have been, fully aware of the significant number of people whose PII it collected, and thus, the significant number of individuals who would be harmed by a breach of Equifax's systems.
- 58. Unfortunately, and as alleged below, despite all of this publicly available knowledge of the continued compromises of PII in the hands of other third parties, Equifax's approach to maintaining the privacy and security of the PII of Plaintiffs and Class members was lackadaisical, cavalier, reckless, or at the very least, negligent.
- 59. The ramifications of Equifax's failure to keep Plaintiffs' and Class members' data secure are severe.
- 60. The FTC defines identity theft as "a fraud committed or attempted using the identifying information of another person without authority." 17 C.F.R § 248.201 (2013). The FTC describes "identifying information" as "any name or number that may be used, alone or in conjunction with any other information, to identify a specific person." *Id*.
- 61. Personal identifying information (PII) is a valuable commodity to identity thieves once the information has been compromised. As the FTC recognizes, once identity thieves have personal information, "they can drain your bank account, run up

your credit cards, open new utility accounts, or get medical treatment on your health insurance." Federal Trade Commission, Warning Signs of Identity Theft, available at: <a href="https://www.consumer.ftc.gov/articles/0271-warning-signs-identity-theft">https://www.consumer.ftc.gov/articles/0271-warning-signs-identity-theft</a> (last visited September 20, 2017).

- 62. Identity thieves can use personal information, such as that of Plaintiffs and Class members which Equifax failed to keep secure, to perpetrate a variety of crimes that harm victims. For instance, identity thieves may commit various types of government fraud such as: immigration fraud; obtaining a driver's license or identification card in the victim's name but with another's picture; using the victim's information to obtain government benefits; or filing a fraudulent tax return using the victim's information to obtain a fraudulent refund.
- 63. Javelin Strategy and Research reports that identity thieves have stolen \$112 billion in the past six years. *See* <a href="https://www.javelinstrategy.com/coverage-area/2016-identity-fraud-fraud-hits-inflection-point">https://www.javelinstrategy.com/coverage-area/2016-identity-fraud-fraud-hits-inflection-point</a> (last visited September 20, 2017).
- 64. Reimbursing a consumer for a financial loss due to fraud does not make that individual whole again. On the contrary, identity theft victims must spend numerous hours and their own money repairing the impact to their credit. After conducting a study, the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics ("BJS") found that identity theft victims "reported spending an average of about 7 hours clearing up the issues" and resolving the consequences of fraud in 2014. Victims of Identity Theft, 2014 (Sept. 2015) available at:

There may be a time lag between when harm occurs versus when it is

65.

regarding data breaches:

[L]aw enforcement officials told us that in some cases, stolen data may be held for up to a year or more before being used to commit identity theft. Further, once stolen data have been sold or posted on the Web, fraudulent use of that information may continue for years. As a result, studies that attempt to measure the harm resulting from data breaches cannot necessarily rule out all future harm.

discovered, and also between when PII or PCD is stolen and when it is used. According

to the U.S. Government Accountability Office ("GAO"), which conducted a study

GAO, Report to Congressional Requesters, at 29 (June 2007), available at <a href="http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07737.pdf">http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07737.pdf</a> (last visited September 20, 2017)

- 66. Plaintiffs and Class members now face years of constant surveillance of their financial and personal records, monitoring, and loss of rights. The Class is incurring and will continue to incur such damages in addition to any fraudulent use of their PII.
- 67. The PII of Plaintiffs and Class members is private and sensitive in nature and was left inadequately protected by Equifax. Equifax did not obtain Plaintiffs' and Class members' consent to disclose their PII to any other person as required by applicable law and industry standards.
- 68. The Equifax Data Breach was a direct and proximate result of Equifax's failure to properly safeguard and protect Plaintiffs' and Class members' PII from

unauthorized access, use, and disclosure, as required by various state and federal regulations, industry practices, and the common law, including Equifax's failure to establish and implement appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to ensure the security and confidentiality of Plaintiffs' and Class members' PII to protect against reasonably foreseeable threats to the security or integrity of such information.

- 69. Equifax had the resources to prevent a breach, but neglected to adequately invest in data security, despite the growing number of well-publicized data breaches.
- 70. Had Equifax remedied the deficiencies in its data security systems, followed security guidelines, and adopted security measures recommended by experts in the field, Equifax would have prevented the Data Breach and, ultimately, the theft of its customers' PII.
- 71. As a direct and proximate result of Equifax's wrongful actions and inaction and the resulting Data Breach, Plaintiffs and Class members have been placed at an imminent, immediate, and continuing increased risk of harm from identity theft and identity fraud, requiring them to take the time which they otherwise would have dedicated to other life demands such as work and effort to mitigate the actual and potential impact of the Data Breach on their lives including, inter alia, by placing "freezes" and "alerts" with credit reporting agencies, contacting their financial institutions, closing or modifying financial accounts, closely reviewing and monitoring their credit reports and accounts for unauthorized activity, and filing police reports.

This time has been lost forever and cannot be recaptured. In all manners of life in this country, time has constantly been recognized as compensable, for many consumers it is the way they are compensated, and even if retired from the work force, consumers should be free of having to deal with the consequences of a credit reporting agency's slippage, as is the case here.

- 72. Equifax's wrongful actions and inaction directly and proximately caused the theft and dissemination into the public domain of Plaintiffs' and Class members' PII, causing them to suffer, and continue to suffer, economic damages and other actual harm for which they are entitled to compensation, including:
  - a. Theft of their personal and financial information;
  - b. Unauthorized charges on their debit and credit card accounts;
  - c. The imminent and certainly impending injury flowing from potential fraud and identity theft posed by their PII being placed in the hands of criminals and already misused via the sale of Plaintiffs' and Class members' information on the black market;
  - d. The untimely and inadequate notification of the Data Breach;
  - e. The improper disclosure of their PII;
  - f. Loss of privacy;
  - g. Ascertainable losses in the form of out-of-pocket expenses and the value of their time reasonably incurred to remedy or mitigate the effects of the Data Breach;
  - h. Ascertainable losses in the form of deprivation of the value of their PII and PCD, for which there is a well-established national and international market;
  - i. Ascertainable losses in the form of the loss of cash back or other benefits as a result of their inability to use certain accounts and

cards affected by the Data Breach;

- j. Loss of use of and access to their account funds and costs associated with the inability to obtain money from their accounts or being limited in the amount of money they were permitted to obtain from their accounts, including missed payments on bills and loans, late charges and fees, and adverse effects on their credit including adverse credit notations; and,
- k. The loss of productivity and value of their time spent to address attempt to ameliorate, mitigate and deal with the actual and future consequences of the data breach, including finding fraudulent charges, cancelling and reissuing cards, purchasing credit monitoring and identity theft protection services, imposition of withdrawal and purchase limits on compromised accounts, and the stress, nuisance and annoyance of dealing with all such issues resulting from the Data Breach.
- 73. Equifax has not offered customers any meaningful credit monitoring or identity theft protection services, despite the fact that it is well known and acknowledged by the government that damage and fraud from a data breach can take years to occur. As a result, Plaintiffs and Class members are left to their own actions to protect themselves from the financial damage Equifax has allowed to occur. The additional cost of adequate and appropriate coverage, or insurance, against the losses and exposure that Equifax's actions have created for Plaintiffs and Class members, is ascertainable and is a determination appropriate for the trier of fact. Equifax has also not offered to cover any of the damages sustained by Plaintiffs or Class members.
- 74. Experts are now recommending that all Americans whose PII is impacted by the Data Breach should freeze their credit with all three of the major credit reporting agencies, Equifax, Experian, and TransUnion. There are financial costs associated with

freezing and unfreezing a consumer's credit report, further compounding the actual and concrete damages that Plaintiffs and the Classes have and will sustain. Even if a less onerous lock is placed on the credit report, members of the Classes have been advised to regularly monitor activity on their credit reports to determine whether any nefarious conduct has occurred which would require a locking of their credit. *See* <a href="https://www.transunion.com/credit-freeze/place-credit-freeze2">https://www.transunion.com/credit-freeze/place-credit-freeze2</a> (last visited September 22, 2017).

75. While the PII of Plaintiffs and members of the Class has been stolen, Equifax continues to hold PII of consumers, including Plaintiffs and Class members. Particularly because Equifax and has demonstrated an inability to prevent a breach or stop it from continuing even after being detected, Plaintiffs and members of the Class have an undeniable interest in insuring that their PII is secure, remains secure, is properly and promptly destroyed and is not subject to further theft.

### **COUNT I**

# WILLFUL VIOLATION OF THE FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE NATIONWIDE CLASS, OR, ALTERNATIVELY, PLAINTIFFS AND THE SEPARATE STATEWIDE CLASSES)

- 76. Plaintiffs restate and reallege Paragraphs 1 through 74 as if fully set forth here.
- 77. This is a claim for relief under the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FRCA"), 11 U.S.C. § 1681, et seq.
  - 78. As individuals, Plaintiffs and Class members are consumers entitled to the

protections of the FCRA. 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(c).

- 79. Under the FCRA, a "consumer reporting agency" is defined as "any person which, for monetary fees, dues, or on a cooperative nonprofit basis, regularly engages in whole or in part in the practice of assembling or evaluating consumer credit information or other information on consumers for the purpose of furnishing consumer reports to third parties . . . ." 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(f).
- 80. Equifax is a consumer reporting agency under the FCRA because, for monetary fees, it regularly engages in the practice of assembling or evaluating consumer credit information or other information on consumers to furnish consumer reports to third parties evaluating the consumers' credit for varying purposes.
- 81. As a consumer reporting agency, the FCRA requires Equifax to "maintain reasonable procedures designed to . . . limit the furnishing of consumer reports to the purposes listed under section 1681b of this title." 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(a).
- 82. Under the FCRA, a "consumer report" is defined as "any written, oral, or other communication of any information by a consumer reporting agency bearing on a consumer's credit worthiness, credit standing, credit capacity, character, general reputation, personal characteristics, or mode of living which is used or expected to be used or collected in whole or in part for the purpose of serving as a factor in establishing the consumer's eligibility for -- (A) credit . . . to be used primarily for personal, family, or household purposes; . . . or (C) any other purpose authorized under section 1681b of this title." 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(d)(1).

- 83. The compromised data was a consumer report under the FCRA because it was a communication of information bearing on Class members' credit worthiness, credit standing, credit capacity, character, general reputation, personal characteristics, or mode of living used, or expected to be used or collected in whole or in part, for the purpose of serving as a factor in establishing the Class members' eligibility for credit.
- 84. As a consumer reporting agency, Equifax may only furnish a consumer report under the limited circumstances set forth in 15 U.S.C. § 1681b, "and no other." 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(a).
- 85. None of the purposes listed under 15 U.S.C. § 1681b permit credit reporting agencies to furnish consumer reports to unauthorized or unknown entities, or computer hackers such as those who accessed the Nationwide Class members' PII. Equifax violated § 1681b by furnishing consumer reports to unauthorized or unknown entities or computer hackers, as detailed above.
- 86. Equifax furnished the Nationwide Class members' consumer reports by disclosing their consumer reports to unauthorized entities and computer hackers; allowing unauthorized entities and computer hackers to access their consumer reports; knowingly and/or recklessly failing to take security measures that would prevent unauthorized entities or computer hackers from accessing their consumer reports; and/or failing to take reasonable security measures that would prevent unauthorized entities or computer hackers from accessing their consumer reports.
  - 87. The Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") has pursued enforcement actions

against consumer reporting agencies under the FCRA for failing to "take adequate measures to fulfill their obligations to protect information contained in consumer reports, as required by the" FCRA, in connection with data breaches.

- 88. Equifax willfully and/or recklessly violated § 1681b and § 1681e(a) by providing impermissible access to consumer reports and by failing to maintain reasonable procedures designed to limit the furnishing of consumer reports to the purposes outlined under section 1681b of the FCRA. The willful and reckless nature of Equifax's violations is supported by, among other things, former employees' admissions that Equifax's data security practices have deteriorated in recent years, and Equifax's numerous other data breaches in the past. Further, Equifax touts itself as an industry leader in breach prevention; thus, Equifax was well aware of the importance of the measures organizations should take to prevent data breaches, and willingly failed to take them.
- known about its legal obligations regarding data security and data breaches under the FCRA. These obligations are well established in the plain language of the FCRA and in the promulgations of the Federal Trade Commission. *See, e.g.*, 55 Fed. Reg. 18804 (May 4, 1990), 1990 Commentary On The Fair Credit Reporting Act. 16 C.F.R. Part 600, Appendix to Part 600, Sec. 607 2E. Equifax obtained or had available these and other substantial written materials that apprised them of their duties under the FCRA. Any reasonable consumer reporting agency knows or should know about these

requirements. Despite knowing of these legal obligations, Equifax acted consciously in breaching known duties regarding data security and data breaches and depriving Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class of their rights under the FCRA.

- 90. Equifax's willful and/or reckless conduct provided a means for unauthorized intruders to obtain and misuse Plaintiffs' and members of Nationwide Class members' personal information for no permissible purposes under the FCRA.
- 91. Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class have been damaged by Equifax's willful or reckless failure to comply with the FCRA.
- 92. Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class are therefore entitled to recover "any actual damages sustained by the consumer . . . or damages of not less than \$100 and not more than \$1,000." 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1)(A).
- 93. Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class are also entitled to punitive damages, costs of the action, and reasonable attorneys' fees. 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(2) & (3).

#### <u>COUNT II</u>

# NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF THE FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE NATIONWIDE CLASS, OR, ALTERNATIVELY, PLAINTIFFS AND THE SEPARATE STATEWIDE CLASSES)

- 94. Plaintiffs restate and reallege Paragraphs 1 through 74 and 76 through 86 as if fully set forth herein.
- 95. This is a claim for relief under the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FRCA"), 11 U.S.C. § 1681, et seq.

- 96. Equifax was negligent in failing to maintain reasonable procedures designed to limit the furnishing of consumer reports to the purposes outlined under section 1681b of the FCRA.
- 97. Equifax's negligent conduct provided a means for unauthorized intruders to obtain Plaintiffs' and the Nationwide Class members' PII and consumer reports for no permissible purposes under the FCRA.
- 98. Plaintiffs and the Nationwide Class members have been damaged by Equifax's negligent failure to comply with the FCRA.
- 99. Plaintiffs and each of the Nationwide Class members are therefore entitled to recover "any actual damages sustained by the consumer." 15 U.S.C. § 1681o(a)(1).
- 100. Plaintiffs and the Nationwide Class members are also entitled to recover their costs of the action, as well as reasonable attorneys' fees. 15 U.S.C. § 1681o(a)(2).

#### COUNT III NEGLIGENCE

# (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE NATIONWIDE CLASS, OR, ALTERNATIVELY, PLAINTIFFS AND THE SEPARATE STATEWIDE CLASSES)

- 101. Plaintiffs restate and reallege Paragraphs 1 through 74 as if fully set forth herein.
  - 102. This is a claim for relief based on common law negligence.
- 103. Upon accepting and storing the PII of Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class in its computer systems and on its networks, Equifax undertook and owed a duty to Plaintiffs and Class members to exercise reasonable care to secure and

safeguard that information and to use commercially reasonable methods to do so. Equifax knew that the PII was private and confidential and should be protected as private and confidential.

- 104. Equifax owed a duty of care not to subject Plaintiffs, along with their PII, and Class members to an unreasonable risk of harm because they were foreseeable and probable victims of any inadequate security practices.
- 105. Equifax owed numerous duties to Plaintiffs and to members of the Nationwide Class, including the following:
  - a. To exercise reasonable care in obtaining, retaining, securing, safeguarding, deleting and protecting PII in its possession;
  - b. To protect PII using reasonable and adequate security procedures and systems that are compliant with industry-standard practices; and
  - c. To implement processes to quickly detect a data breach and to timely act on warnings about data breaches.
- adequately protect and safeguard PII by knowingly disregarding standard information security principles, despite obvious risks, and by allowing unmonitored and unrestricted access to unsecured PII. Furthering their dilatory practices, Equifax failed to provide adequate supervision and oversight of the PII with which they were and are entrusted, in spite of the known risk and foreseeable likelihood of breach and misuse, which permitted an unknown third party to gather PII of Plaintiffs and Class members, misuse the PII and intentionally disclose it to others without consent.

107. Equifax knew, or should have known, of the risks inherent in collecting and storing PII, the vulnerabilities of its data security systems, and the importance of adequate security. Equifax knew about numerous, well-publicized data breaches, including the breach at Experian.

- 108. Equifax knew, or should have known, that their data systems and networks did not adequately safeguard Plaintiffs' and Class members' PII.
- 109. Equifax breached its duties to Plaintiffs and Class members by failing to provide fair, reasonable, or adequate computer systems and data security practices to safeguard PII of Plaintiffs and Class members.
- 110. Because Equifax knew that a breach of its systems would damage millions of individuals, including Plaintiffs and Class members, Equifax had a duty to adequately protect their data systems and the PII contained thereon.
- 111. Equifax had a special relationship with Plaintiffs and Class members. Plaintiffs' and Class members' willingness to entrust Equifax with their PII was predicated on the understanding that Equifax would take adequate security precautions. Moreover, only Equifax had the ability to protect its systems and the PII it stored on them from attack.
- 112. Equifax's own conduct also created a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiffs and Class members and their PII. Equifax's misconduct included failing to: (1) secure its systems, despite knowing their vulnerabilities, (2) comply with industry standard security practices, (3) implement adequate system and event monitoring, and (4)

implement the systems, policies, and procedures necessary to prevent this type of data breach.

- 113. Equifax also had independent duties under state and federal laws that required Equifax to reasonably safeguard Plaintiffs' and Class members' Personal Information and promptly notify them about the data breach.
- 114. Equifax breached its duties to Plaintiffs and Class members in numerous ways, including:
  - a. By failing to provide fair, reasonable, or adequate computer systems and data security practices to safeguard PII of Plaintiffs and Class members;
  - b. By creating a foreseeable risk of harm through the misconduct previously described;
  - c. By failing to implement adequate security systems, protocols and practices sufficient to protect Plaintiffs' and Class members' PII both before and after learning of the Data Breach;
  - d. By failing to comply with the minimum industry data security standards during the period of the Data Breach; and
  - e. By failing to timely and accurately disclose that Plaintiffs' and Class members' PII had been improperly acquired or accessed.
- 115. Through Equifax's acts and omissions described in this Complaint, including Equifax's failure to provide adequate security and its failure to protect PII of Plaintiffs and Class members from being foreseeably captured, accessed, disseminated, stolen and misused, Equifax unlawfully breached its duty to use reasonable care to adequately protect and secure PII of Plaintiffs and Class members during the time it was within Equifax's possession or control.

116. The law further imposes an affirmative duty on Equifax to timely disclose the unauthorized access and theft of the PII to Plaintiffs and the Class so that Plaintiffs and Class members can take appropriate measures to mitigate damages, protect against adverse consequences, and thwart future misuse of their PII.

- 117. Equifax breached its duty to notify Plaintiffs and Class members of the unauthorized access by waiting many months after learning of the breach to notify Plaintiff and Class members and then by failing to provide Plaintiffs and Class members information regarding the breach until September 2017. Instead, its executives disposed of at least \$1.8 million worth of shares in the company after Equifax learned of the data breach but before it was publicly announced. To date, Equifax has not provided sufficient information to Plaintiffs and Class members regarding the extent of the unauthorized access and continues to breach its disclosure obligations to Plaintiffs and the Class.
- 118. Through Equifax's acts and omissions described in this Complaint, including Equifax's failure to provide adequate security and its failure to protect PII of Plaintiffs and Class members from being foreseeably captured, accessed, disseminated, stolen and misused, Equifax unlawfully breached its duty to use reasonable care to adequately protect and secure PII of Plaintiffs and Class members during the time it was within Equifax's possession or control.
- 119. Further, through its failure to provide timely and clear notification of the Data Breach to consumers, Equifax prevented Plaintiffs and Class members from

taking meaningful, proactive steps to secure their financial data and bank accounts.

- 120. Upon information and belief, Equifax improperly and inadequately safeguarded PII of Plaintiffs and Class members in deviation of standard industry rules, regulations, and practices at the time of the unauthorized access. Equifax's failure to take proper security measures to protect sensitive PII of Plaintiffs and Class members as described in this Complaint, created conditions conducive to a foreseeable, intentional criminal act, namely the unauthorized access of PII of Plaintiffs and Class members.
- 121. Equifax's conduct was grossly negligent and departed from all reasonable standards of care, including, but not limited to: failing to adequately protect the PII; failing to conduct regular security audits; failing to provide adequate and appropriate supervision of persons having access to PII of Plaintiffs and Class members; and failing to provide Plaintiffs and Class members with timely and sufficient notice that their sensitive PII had been compromised.
- 122. Neither Plaintiffs nor the other Class members contributed to the Data Breach and subsequent misuse of their PII as described in this Complaint.
- 123. Equifax's Data Breach proximately caused Plaintiffs and Nationwide Class members to be exposed to fraud and to be harmed. The injuries suffered by the Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class are a direct result of Equifax's breach of its duties and include: theft of their PII and financial information; costs associated with the detection and prevention of identity theft and unauthorized use of their

28

financial accounts; costs associated with time spent and the loss of productivity from taking time to address and attempt to ameliorate, mitigate, and deal with the actual and potential consequences of the Data Breach, including closely reviewing and monitoring their credit reports and accounts for unauthorized activity, finding fraudulent charges, cancelling and reissuing cards, closing or modifying financial accounts, purchasing credit monitoring and identity theft protection services, placing "freezes" and "alerts" with credit reporting agencies, contacting their financial institutions, imposition of withdrawal and purchase limits on compromised accounts, and the stress, nuisance, and annoyance of dealing with all issues resulting from the Data Breach, which may take months if not years to discover and detect, given the far-reaching, adverse and detrimental consequences of identity theft and loss of privacy; the imminent and certainly impending injury flowing from potential fraud and identify theft posed by their PII and financial information being placed in the hands of hackers; damages to and diminution in value of their PII and financial information entrusted to Equifax for the sole purpose of Equifax's credit-reporting services and with the mutual understanding that Equifax would safeguard Plaintiffs' and Nationwide Class members' data against theft and not allow access and misuse of their data by others; money paid to Equifax for their services during the period of the Data Breach in that Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class would not have obtained, or permitted others to obtain, Equifax's credit-reporting services had Equifax disclosed that it lacked adequate systems and procedures to reasonably safeguard consumers' PII and financial

27

28

information and had Equifax provided timely and accurate notice of the Data Breach; payments made to Equifax for credit reporting services in that a portion of the price paid by Plaintiffs and the Nationwide Class, or others on their behalf, to Equifax was for the costs of Equifax providing reasonable and adequate safeguards and security measures to protect customers' PII and financial data and, as a result, Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class did not receive what was bargained and paid for; and continued risk to Plaintiffs and members of the Nationwide Class that their PII and financial information, which remains in the possession of Equifax and which is subject to further breaches so long as Equifax fails to undertake appropriate and adequate measures to protect it; damages arising from the unauthorized charges on their debit or credit cards or on cards that were fraudulently obtained through the use of the PII of Plaintiffs and Class members; damages from lost time and effort to mitigate the actual and potential impact of the Data Breach on their lives including, inter alia, by placing "freezes" and "alerts" with credit reporting agencies, contacting their financial institutions, closing or modifying financial accounts, closely reviewing and monitoring their credit reports and accounts for unauthorized activity, and filing police reports and damages from identity theft, which may take months if not years to discover and detect, given the far-reaching, adverse and detrimental consequences of identity theft and loss of privacy. The nature of other forms of economic damage and injury may take years to detect, and the potential scope can only be assessed after a thorough investigation of the facts and events surrounding the theft mentioned above.

#### COUNT IV

#### NEGLIGENCE PER SE

## (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE NATIONWIDE CLASS, OR, ALTERNATIVELY, PLAINTIFFS AND THE SEPARATE STATEWIDE CLASSES)

- 124. Plaintiffs restate and reallege Paragraphs 1 through 74 and 101 through123 as if fully set forth herein.
  - 125. This is a claim for relief based on common law negligence per se.
- 126. Section 5 of the FTC Act prohibits "unfair . . . practices in or affecting commerce," including, as interpreted and enforced by the FTC, the unfair act or practice by businesses, such as Equifax, of failing to use reasonable measures to protect PII. The FTC publications and orders described above also form part of the basis of Equifax's duty in this regard.
- 127. Equifax violated Section 5 of the FTC Act by failing to use reasonable measures to protect PII and not complying with applicable industry standards, as described in detail herein. Equifax's conduct was particularly unreasonable given the nature and amount of PII it obtained and stored, and the foreseeable consequences of a data breach at a corporation such as Equifax, including, specifically, the immense damages that would result to Plaintiffs and Class members.
- 128. Equifax's violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act constitutes negligence per se.
- 129. Plaintiffs and Class members are within the class of persons that the FTC Act was intended to protect.

of harm the FTC Act was intended to guard against. The FTC has pursued enforcement actions against businesses, which, as a result of their failure to employ reasonable data security measures and avoid unfair and deceptive practices, caused the same harm as that suffered by Plaintiffs and the Class members.

# COUNT V VIOLATION OF STATE DATA BREACH STATUTES (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE SEPARATE STATEWIDE CLASSES)

- 131. Plaintiffs restate and reallege Paragraphs 1 through 74 as if fully set forth herein.
- 132. This is a claim for relief based on violations of various states' data breach statutes as enumerated below.
- 133. Legislatures in the states and jurisdictions listed below have enacted data breach statutes. These statutes generally require that any person or business conducting business within the state that owns or licenses computerized data that includes personal information shall disclose any breach of the security of the system to any resident of the state whose personal information was acquired by an unauthorized person, and further require that the disclosure of the breach be made in the most expedient time possible and without unreasonable delay.
- 134. The Equifax data breach constitutes a breach of the security system of Equifax within the meaning of the below states' data breach statutes and the data

breached is protected and covered by the below data breach statutes.

- 135. Plaintiffs' and Class members' names, social security numbers, phone numbers, driver's license numbers, birth dates, credit card numbers and email addresses constitute personal information under and subject to the below state data breach statutes.
- 136. Equifax unreasonably delayed in informing the public, including Plaintiffs and members of the Class about the breach of security of Plaintiffs' and Class members' confidential and non-public personal information after Equifax knew or should have known that the data breach had occurred.
- 137. Equifax failed to disclose to Plaintiffs and Class members without unreasonable delay and in the most expedient time possible, the breach of security of Plaintiffs' and Class members' personal and financial information when Equifax knew or reasonably believed such information had been compromised.
- 138. Plaintiffs and members of the Class suffered harm directly resulting from Equifax's failure to provide and the delay in providing Plaintiffs and Class members with timely and accurate notice as required by the below state data breach statutes. Plaintiffs suffered the damages alleged above as a direct result of Equifax's delay in providing timely and accurate notice of the data breach.
- 139. Had Equifax provided timely and accurate notice of the Equifax data breach, Plaintiffs and Class members would have been able to avoid and/or attempt to ameliorate or mitigate the damages and harm resulting in the unreasonable delay by

Equifax in p	providi	ng notice. Plaintiffs and Class members could have contacted their		
banks to cancel their cards, or could otherwise have tried to avoid the harm caused by				
Equifax's d	elay in	providing timely and accurate notice.		
140.	Equif	ax's failure to provide timely and accurate notice of the Equifax data		
breach viola	ated the	e following state data breach statutes:		
	a.	Alaska Stat. Ann. § 45.48.010(a), et seq.;		
	b.	Ark. Code Ann. § 4-110-105(a), et seq.;		
	c.	Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(a), et seq.;		
	d.	Colo. Rev. Stat. Ann § 6-1-716(2), et seq.;		
	e.	Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 36a-701b(b), et seq.;		
	f.	Del. Code Ann. Tit. 6 § 12B-102(a), et seq.;		
	g.	D.C. Code § 28-3852(a), et seq.;		
	h.	Fla. Stat. Ann. § 501.171(4), et seq.;		
	i.	Ga. Code Ann. § 10-1-912(a), et seq.;		
	j.	Haw. Rev. Stat. § 487N-2(a), et seq.;		
	k.	Idaho Code Ann. § 28-51-105(1), et seq.;		
	1.	Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 530/10(a), et seq.;		
	m.	Iowa Code Ann. § 715C.2(1), et seq.;		
	n.	Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-7a02(a), et seq.;		
	0.	Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 365.732(2), et seq.;		
	p.	La. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 51:3074(A), et seq.;		
	banks to car Equifax's d	banks to cancel the Equifax's delay in  140. Equif breach violated the  a.  b.  c.  d.  e.  f.  g.  h.  i.  j.  k.  1.  m.  n.  o.		

	1		
1		q.	Md. Code Ann., Commercial Law § 14-3504(b), et seq.;
2		r.	Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. Ch. 93H § 3(a), et seq.;
3 4		S.	Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 445.72(1), et seq.;
5		t.	Minn. Stat. Ann. § 325E.61(1)(a), et seq.;
6		u.	Mont. Code Ann. § 30-14-1704(1), et seq.;
7			
8		V.	Neb. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 87-803(1), et seq.;
9		W.	Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 603A.220(1), et seq.;
10		Χ.	N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 359-C:20(1)(a), et seq.;
11 12		y.	N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-163(a), et seq.;
13		Z.	N.C. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 75-65(a), et seq.;
14			N.D. Cont. Code Ann. 8 51 20 02 et sea.
15		aa.	N.D. Cent. Code Ann. § 51-30-02, et seq.;
16		bb.	Okla. Stat. Ann. Tit. 24 § 163(A), et seq.;
17		cc.	Or. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 646A.604(1), et seq.;
18		dd.	R.I. Gen. Laws Ann. § 11-49.2-3(a), et seq.;
19 20		ee.	S.C. Code Ann. § 39-1-90(A), et seq.;
21		ff.	Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-18-2107(b), et seq.;
22		11.	Tellii. Code Allii. § 47-18-2107(0), ct seq.,
23		gg.	Tex. Bus. & Com. Code Ann. § 521.053(b), et seq.;
24		hh.	Utah Code Ann. § 13-44-202(1), et seq.;
25		ii.	Va. Code. Ann. § 18.2-186.6(B), et seq.;
26		jj.	Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 19.255.010(1), et seq.;
27		n.	,, asii. 1001. Code 1 iiii. y 17.255.010(1), ot soq.,
28		kk.	Wis. Stat. Ann. § 134.98(2), et seq.; and
	1		

11. Wyo. Stat. Ann. § 40-12-502(a), et seq.

141. Plaintiffs and members of each of the statewide Data Breach Statute Classes seek all remedies available under their respective state data breach statutes, including but not limited to a) damages suffered by Plaintiffs and Class members as alleged above, b) equitable relief, including injunctive relief, and c) reasonable attorney fees and costs, as provided by law.

#### **COUNT VI**

## VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW – UNLAWFUL BUSINESS PRACTICES (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE CALIFORNIA SUBCLASS)

- 142. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 1 through 74 above.
- 143. This is a statutory claim for relief based on Equifax's violations of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 for Unlawful Business Practices.
- 144. Equifax has violated Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §17200 et seq. by engaging in unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business acts and practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising that constitute acts of "unfair competition" as defined in Cal. Bus. Prof. Code §17200. Equifax engaged in unlawful acts and practices with respect to its services by establishing the sub-standard security practices and procedures described herein; by soliciting and collecting Plaintiffs' and California Subclass members' PII with knowledge that the information would not be adequately protected; and by gathering Plaintiff's and California Subclass members' PII in an unsecure

electronic environment in violation of California's data breach statute, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.81.5, which requires Equifax to take reasonable methods of safeguarding the PII of Plaintiffs and California Subclass members.

- 145. In addition, Equifax engaged in unlawful acts and practices with respect to its services by failing to discover and then disclose the data breach to Plaintiffs and California Subclass members in a timely and accurate manner, contrary to the duties imposed by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.82. To date, Equifax has still not provided such sufficient information to Plaintiffs and the California Subclass members.
- 146. As a direct and proximate result of Equifax's unlawful acts and practices, Plaintiffs and California Subclass members were injured and lost money or property, including but not limited to the loss of their legally protected interest in the confidentiality and privacy of their PII, and additional losses described above.
- 147. Equifax knew or should have known that its system had been breached and data security practices were inadequate to safeguard California Subclass members' PII and that the risk of a data breach or theft was highly likely. Equifax's actions in engaging in the above-named unlawful practices and acts were negligent, knowing and willful, and/or wanton and reckless with respect to the rights of California Subclass members.
- 148. Plaintiffs and California Subclass members seek relief under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et. seq.*, including, but not limited to, restitution to Plaintiffs and California Subclass members of money or property that Equifax may have acquired by

means of its unlawful, and unfair business practices, restitutionary disgorgement of all profits accruing to Equifax because of its unlawful and unfair business practices, declaratory relief, attorney's fees and costs (pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5), and injunctive or other equitable relief.

#### COUNT VII

## VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW – UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE CALIFORNIA SUBCLASS)

- 149. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 1 through 74 above.
- 150. This is a statutory claim for relief based on Equifax's violations of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 for Unfair Business Practices.
- 151. Equifax engaged in unfair acts and practices by soliciting and collecting Plaintiffs' and California Subclass members' PII with knowledge that the information would not be adequately protected; while Plaintiffs' and California Subclass members' PII would be processed in an unsecure electronic environment. These unfair acts and practices were immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, unconscionable, and/or substantially injurious to Plaintiffs and California Subclass members. They were likely to deceive the public into believing their PII was secure, when it was not. The harm these practices caused to Plaintiffs and California Subclass members outweighed their utility, if any.
  - 152. Equifax engaged in unfair acts and practices with respect to the provision

of its services by failing to enact adequate privacy and security measures and protect California Subclass members' PII from further unauthorized disclosure, release, data breaches, and theft, and failing to timely discovery and give notice of the Data Breach. These unfair acts and practices were immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, unconscionable, and/or substantially injurious to Plaintiffs and California Subclass members. They were likely to deceive the public into believing their PII was secure, when it was not. The harm these practices caused to Plaintiffs and California Subclass members outweighed their utility, if any.

- 153. As a direct and proximate result of Equifax's acts of unfair practices and acts, Plaintiffs and California Subclass members were injured and lost money or property, including but not limited to the loss of their legally protected interest in the confidentiality and privacy of their PII, and additional losses described above.
- 154. Equifax knew or should have known that its systems and data security practices were inadequate to safeguard California Subclass members' PII and that the risk of a data breach or theft was highly likely. Equifax's actions in engaging in the above-named unlawful practices and acts were negligent, knowing and willful, and/or wanton and reckless with respect to the rights of California Subclass members.
- 155. The Plaintiffs and California Subclass members seek relief under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et. seq.*, including, but not limited to, restitution of money or property that Equifax may have acquired by means of its unfair business practices, restitutionary disgorgement of all profits accruing to Equifax because of its unfair

business practices, declaratory relief, attorney's fees and costs (pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §1021.5), and injunctive or other equitable relief.

### **COUNT VIII**

# VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW – FRAUDULENT/DECEPTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE CALIFORNIA SUBCLASS)

- 156. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 1 through 74 above.
- 157. This is a statutory claim for relief based on Equifax's violations of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 for Fraudulent/Deceptive Business Practices.
- 158. Equifax has violated Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §17200 et seq. by engaging in unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business acts and practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising that constitute acts of "unfair competition" as defined in Cal. Bus. Prof. Code §17200. Equifax engaged in unlawful acts and practices with respect to its services by establishing the sub-standard security practices and procedures described herein; by soliciting and collecting Plaintiffs' and California Subclass members' PII with knowledge that the information would not be adequately protected; and by gathering Plaintiffs' and California Subclass members' PII in an unsecure electronic environment in violation of California's data breach statute, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.81.5, which requires Equifax to take reasonable methods of safeguarding the PII of Plaintiffs and the California Subclass Members.
- 159. In addition, Equifax engaged in unlawful acts and practices with respect to its services by failing to discover and then disclose the data breach to Plaintiffs and California Subclass members in a timely and accurate manner, contrary to the duties imposed by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.82. To date, Equifax has still not provided such sufficient information to Plaintiffs and the California Subclass members.

including but not limited to the loss of their legally protected interest in the confidentiality and privacy of their PII, and additional losses described above.

161. Equifax knew or should have known that its system had been breached and data security practices were inadequate to safeguard California Subclass members' PII and that the risk of a data breach or theft was highly likely. Equifax's actions in

Plaintiffs and California Subclass members were injured and lost money or property,

160. As a direct and proximate result of Equifax's unlawful acts and practices,

willful, and/or wanton and reckless with respect to the rights of California Subclass

engaging in the above-named unlawful practices and acts were negligent, knowing and

members.

162. Plaintiffs and California Subclass members seek relief under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et. seq., including, but not limited to, restitution of money or property that Equifax may have acquired by means of its unlawful, and unfair business practices, restitutionary disgorgement of all profits accruing to Equifax because of its unlawful and unfair business practices, declaratory relief, attorney's fees and costs (pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5), and injunctive or other equitable relief.

# COUNT IX DECLARATORY JUDGMENT (ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS AND THE NATIONWIDE CLASS, OR, ALTERNATIVELY, PLAINTIFFS AND THE SEPARATE STATEWIDE CLASSES)

- 163. Plaintiffs restate and reallege Paragraphs 1 through 74 as if fully set forth herein.
- 164. As previously alleged, Plaintiffs and Class members entered into an implied contract that required Equifax to provide adequate security for the PII it collected from their payment card transactions. As previously alleged, Equifax owes duties of care to Plaintiffs and Class members that require it to adequately secure PII.

- 165. Equifax still possesses PII pertaining to Plaintiffs and Class members.
- 166. Equifax has made no announcement or notification that it has remedied the vulnerabilities in its computer data systems, and, most importantly, its systems.
- 167. Accordingly, Equifax has not satisfied its contractual obligations and legal duties to Plaintiffs and Class members. In fact, now that Equifax's lax approach towards data security has become public, the PII in its possession is more vulnerable than previously.
- 168. Actual harm has arisen in the wake of the Equifax Data Breach regarding Equifax's contractual obligations and duties of care to provide data security measures to Plaintiffs and Class members.
- 169. Plaintiffs, therefore, seek a declaration that (a) Equifax's existing data security measures do not comply with its contractual obligations and duties of care, and (b) in order to comply with its contractual obligations and duties of care, Equifax must implement and maintain reasonable security measures, including, but not limited to:
  - a. Engaging third-party security auditors/penetration testers as well as internal security personnel to conduct testing, including simulated attacks, penetration tests, and audits on Equifax's systems on a periodic basis, and ordering Equifax to promptly correct any problems or issues detected by such third-party security auditors;
  - b. Engaging third-party security auditors and internal personnel to run automated security monitoring;
  - c. Auditing, testing, and training its security personnel regarding any new or modified procedures;
  - d. Segmenting PII by, among other things, creating firewalls and access controls so that if one area of Equifax is compromised,

1		d.	For equitable relief enjoining Equifax from engaging in the
2			wrongful conduct complained of herein pertaining to the misuse
3			
4			and/or disclosure of Plaintiffs' and Class members' PII, and from
5			refusing to issue prompt, complete and accurate disclosures to the
6			Plaintiffs and Class members;
7 8		e.	For equitable relief compelling Equifax to use appropriate cyber
9			security methods and policies with respect to consumer data
10			collection, storage and protection and to disclose with specificity to
11			
12			Class members the type of PII compromised;
13		f.	For an award of attorneys' fees costs and litigation expenses, as
14			allowable by law;
15		g.	For pre-judgment and postjudgment interest as prescribed by law;
16   17		U	
18			and
19		h.	Such other and further relief as this court may deem just and
20			proper.
21	///		
22	///		
23	///		
24	///		
25	///		
26	///		
27	///		
28	///		

1	JURY TRIA	AL DEMAND
2	Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all	issues so triable as a matter of right.
3	Dated: November 1, 2017	
4	Buted: 1(0 veinoer 1, 2017	
5	GIRARDI ‰ KEESE	RUSSOMANNO & BORRELLO, P.A.
6	By: /s/ Christopher T. Aumais	By:/s/ Herman J. Russomanno Museum Tower – Penthouse 2800
7	Thomas V. Girardi	150 West Flagler Street
8	California Bar No. 36603	Miami, Florida 33130
9	Robert W. Finnerty California Bar No. 119775	Telephone: (305) 373-2101 Facsimile: (305) 373-2103
10	Christopher T. Aumais	Herman J. Russomanno (Fla. Bar No.
11	California Bar No. 249901	240346)
12	1126 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90017	hrussomanno@russomanno.com Robert J. Borrello (Fla Bar No 764485)
13	Telephone: (213) 977-0211	rborrello@russomanno.com
14	Facsimile: (213) 481-1554 Email: tgirardi@girardikeese.com	Herman J. Russomanno III (FlaBarNo. 21249)
15	Email: rfinnerty@girardikeese.com	herman2@russomanno.com
16	Email: <u>caumais@girardikeese.com</u>	
17	Edward G. Rubinoff	David A. Nunez
18	Fla. Bar No. 97785 Andrew Moss	Fla. Bar No. 646776 Motion for PHV Admission to Be Filed
19	Florida Bar No. 0170259	MEYER & NUNEZ, P.A.
	Motion for PHV Admission to Be Filed	150 W. Flagler Street, Ste. 2700
20	KUTNER, RUBINOFF & MOSS 2665 S. Bayshore Drive, Ste. 30 I	Miami, FL 33130 Tel: 305-722-9898
21	Coconut Grove, FL 33133	Fax: 305-3 71-9197
22	Tel: 305-358-6200	Email: <u>david@nunez-law.com</u>
23	Fax: 305-577-8230 Email: rubinoff@krmlegal.com	
24	Email: moss@krmlegal.com	
25		
26	Attorneys for Plain	ntiff and the Classes
27		
28		

### Case 2:17-cv-07991 Document 1-1 Filed 11/01/17 Page 1 of 3 Page ID #:53

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

		01114 0	OVER OTHER		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS (Chec Amanda Janaye W individually an similarly situt	hite, and Rob d on behalf o	ert Honanian	DEFENDANTS , EQUIFAX, IN	(Check box if you are rep C., a Georgia c	
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintif	f <u>Riverside</u>	County of Residen	ce of First Listed Defend	ant
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ASES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	SES ONLY)	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, representing yourself, provide Thomas V. Girare	de the same informatio	n.		me, Address and Telephon If, provide the same inform	
Robert W. Finne Christopher T.	rty, SBN: 119 Aumais, SBN:	9775			
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC		,,		RINCIPAL PARTIES-For x for plaintiff and one for de F DEF	fendant) PTF DEF
1.U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3. Federal Qu Government N	Not a Party)	itizen of This State	1 Incorporated or of Business in the 2 Incorporated and	nis State d Principal Place 5 5
2. U.S. Government Defendant	4. Diversity (Ir of Parties in It		itizen or Subject of a preign Country	of Business in A  3 Soreign Nation	notner State 6 6 6
14	temoved from 3.1	Remanded from 4.	Tromotatou of	nsferred from Another Grict (Specify)	Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer  8. Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File
V. REQUESTED IN COM	IPLAINT: JURY DE	MAND: X Yes	No (Check "Yes"	only if demanded in com	plaint.)
CLASS ACTION under I	F.R.Cv.P. 23: 🕱	Yes No	MONEY DEMA	NDED IN COMPLAINT:	\$ 10,000,000.
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION COA: WILLFUL VI				of cause. Do not cite jurisdicti	onal statutes unless diversity.)
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (	Place an X in one bo	x only).			
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CONT	. IMMIGRATION	PRISONER PETITIONS	PROPERTY RIGHTS
375 False Claims Act	110 Insurance	240 Torts to Land	462 Naturalization	Habeas Corpus:	820 Copyrights
376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))	120 Marine	245 Tort Product Liability	Application	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate	830 Patent
400 State	130 Miller Act	290 All Other Real	465 Other Immigration Actions	Sentence	840 Trademark
Reapportionment	140 Negotiable	Property	TORTS	530 General 535 Death Penalty	SOCIAL SECURITY
410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking	Instrument 150 Recovery of	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL PROPERTY  370 Other Fraud	Other:	861 HIA (1395ff)
450 Commerce/ICC	Overpayment &	310 Airplane	371 Truth in Lending	540 Mandamus/Other	862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405 (g))
Rates/Etc.	Enforcement of Judgment	315 Airplane	380 Other Personal	550 Civil Rights	864 SSID Title XVI
460 Deportation	151 Medicare Act	Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	Property Damage	555 Prison Condition	
470 Racketeer Influ-	152 Recovery of	Slander	385 Property Damage	560 Civil Detainee Conditions of	FEDERAL TAX SUITS
enced & Corrupt Org.  x 480 Consumer Credit	Defaulted Student	330 Fed. Employers' Liability	Product Liability  BANKRUPTCY	Confinement	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or
490 Cable/Sat TV	Loan (Excl. Vet.) 153 Recovery of	340 Marine	422 Appeal 28	FORFEITURE/PENALTY 625 Drug Related	Defendant)
850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange	Overpayment of Vet. Benefits	345 Marine Product Liability  350 Motor Vehicle	USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609
890 Other Statutory Actions	160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	CIVIL RIGHTS	690 Other	
891 Agricultural Acts	190 Other	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	440 Other Civil Rights		
893 Environmental	Contract	Injury	441 Voting	710 Fair Labor Standards Act	
Matters	195 Contract	362 Personal Injury- Med Malpratice	L 442 Employment	720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	
895 Freedom of Info.	Product Liability  196 Franchise	365 Personal Injury-	443 Housing/ Accomodations	740 Railway Labor Act	
896 Arbitration	REAL PROPERTY	367 Health Care/	445 American with	740 Railway Labor Act	
899 Admin. Procedures	210 Land	Pharmaceutical	Disabilities- Employment	Leave Act	
Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision	Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	Personal Injury Product Liability	446 American with Disabilities-Other	790 Other Labor Litigation	
950 Constitutionality of	230 Rent Lease &	368 Asbestos Personal Injury		791 Employee Ret. Inc.	
State Statutes	Ejectment	Product Liability	448 Education	Security Act	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Case Number:

### Case 2:17-cv-07991 Document 1-1 Filed 11/01/17 Page 2 of 3 Page ID #:54

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII. VENUE: Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

QUESTION A: Was this case removed from state court?	STATE CASE WAS PENDING IN	THE COL	INTY OF:	INITIAL DIVIS	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:	
Yes X No	Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo			w	Western	
If "no, " skip to Question B. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the				So	Southern	
corresponding division in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.	Riverside or San Bernardino		4-	E	astern	
	1			***************************************		
QUESTION B: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a PLAINTIFF in this action?	B.1. Do 50% or more of the defendants who the district reside in Orange Co.?  check one of the boxes to the right	o reside in  YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Southern Division.  Enter "Southern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.				
Yes X No			NO. Continue to Question B.2.			
If"no,"skip to Question C. If"yes,"answer Question B.1, at right.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Eastern Division.  Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.			
	check one of the boxes to the right		NO. Your case will initially be assigned to the Western Division.  Enter "Western" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.			
QUESTION C: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a DEFENDANT in this action?	C.1. Do 50% or more of the plaintiffs who residestrict reside in Orange Co.?  check one of the boxes to the right	side in the		hern" in response to Ques	ed to the Southern Division tion E, below, and continue	
Yes X No		NO. Continue to Question C.2.				
If "no, " skip to Question D. If "yes," answer Question C.1, at right.	C.2. Do 50% or more of the plaintiffs who reside in the district reside in Riverside and/or San Bernardino Counties? (Consider the two counties together.)		YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Eastern Division.  Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.			
	check one of the boxes to the right	NO. Your case will initially be assigned to a Enter "Western" in response to Question E from there.				
QUESTION D: Location of plain	ntiffs and defendants?	Oran	A. ge County	B. Riverside or San Bernardino County	C. Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo County	
Indicate the location(s) in which 50% or reside. (Check up to two boxes, or leave	more of <i>plaintiffs who reside in this district</i> e blank if none of these choices apply.)					
Indicate the location(s) in which 50% or district reside. (Check up to two boxes, apply.)	more of defendants who reside in this or leave blank if none of these choices					
арруу.					•	
D.1. Is there at least one a			D.2. Is there	at least one answer in	Column B?	
	X No	Yes X No  If "yes," your case will initially be assigned to the  EASTERN DIVISION.  Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below.  If "no," your case will be assigned to the WESTERN DIVISION.				
If "yes," your case will initial! SOUTHERN DI						
Enter "Southern" in response to Question I						
If "no," go to question I						
ii iio, go to question i	52 to the right.	•	-	rn" in response to Questi	1	
QUESTION E: Initial Division?			TINI	TAL DIVISION IN CAC	D	
Enter the initial division determined by Q	uestion A, B, C, or D above: West	tern				
QUESTION F: Northern Counties?						
Do 50% or more of plaintiffs or defendan	ts in this district reside in Ventura, Santa Ba	arbara, or	San Luis Obisp	oo counties?	Yes X No	

CV-71 (07/16) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 3

### Case 2:17-cv-07991 Document 1-1 Filed 11/01/17 Page 3 of 3 Page ID #:55

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

If yes, list case number(s):  IX(b). RELATED CASES: Is this case related (as defined below) to any civil or criminal case(s) previously filed in this court?    X NO			
If yes, list case number(s):	If yes, list case number(s):		
Civil cases are related when they (check all that apply):  A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  Note: That cases may involve the same patent, trademark, or copyright is not, in itself, sufficient to deem cases related.  A civil forfeiture case and a criminal case are related when they (check all that apply):  A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  (OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):  Christopher T. Admais  Notice to Counsel/Parties: The submission of this Civil Cover Sheet is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and the information contains neither replaces nor supplements the fling and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court more detailed instructions, see separate instruction sheet (CV-071A).  Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:  Nature of Suit Code Abbreviation  All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment of the programment in the programment in the programment in the content of the programment in the programment in the programment in the programment in the content in the programment in the programment in the content in the programment in the programment in the content in the content in the programment in the programment in the content in the content in the content in the co	). RELATED CASES: Is this case related (as		YES
A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  Note: That cases may involve the same patent, trademark, or copyright is not, in itself, sufficient to deem cases related.  A civil forfeiture case and a criminal case are related when they (check all that apply):  A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  (OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):  Notice to Counsel/Parties: The submission of this Civil Cover Sheet is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and the information containe neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or of ther papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court more detailed instructions, see separate instruction sheet (CV-071A).  Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:  Nature of Suit Code Abbreviation  All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment of cause of Action.	If yes, list case number(s):		
B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  Note: That cases may involve the same patent, trademark, or copyright is not, in itself, sufficient to deem cases related.  A civil forfeiture case and a criminal case are related when they (check all that apply):  A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  (OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):  Christopher 1 Admais  Notice to Counsel/Parties: The submission of this Civil CoverSheer is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and the information containe neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court more detailed instructions, see separate instruction sheet (CV-071A).  Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:  Nature of Sult Code Abbreviation  All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment of the content of the social Security Act, as amended. Include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment.	Civil cases are related when they (check a		
C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  Note: That cases may involve the same patent, trademark, or copyright is not, in itself, sufficient to deem cases related.  A civil forfeiture case and a criminal case are related when they (check all that apply):  A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  (OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):  Christopher 1 Admais  Notice to Counsel/Parties: The submission of this Civil Cover. Sheef is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and the information containe neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or of their papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court more detailed instructions, see separate instruction sheet (CV-071A).  Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:  Nature of Sult Code Abbreviation  All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment.	A. Arise from the same or a clos		
Note: That cases may involve the same patent, trademark, or copyright is not, in itself, sufficient to deem cases related.  A civil forfeiture case and a criminal case are related when they (check all that apply):  A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  (OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):  Christopher T. Admais  Notice to Counsel/Parties: The submission of this Civil Cover. Sheet is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and the information contains neither replaces nor supplements the filling and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court more detailed instructions, see separate instruction sheet (CVI-071A).  Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:  Nature of Suit Code Abbreviation  All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment.	B. Call for determination of the s	I fact; or	
A civil forfeiture case and a criminal case are related when they (check all that apply):  A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  (OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):  Christopher T Aumais  Notice to Counsel/Parties: The submission of this Civil Cover Sheet is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and the information containe neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court more detailed instructions, see separate instruction sheet (CV-071A).  Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:  Nature of Suit Code Abbreviation  All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment of the claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment of the content of the c	C. For other reasons would enta	S.	
A. Arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.  X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  (OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):  Christopher T. Admais  Notice to Counsel/Parties: The submission of this Civil Cover Sheet is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and the information containe neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court more detailed instructions, see separate instruction sheet (CV-071A).  Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:  Nature of Suit Code Abbreviation  Substantive Statement of Cause of Action  All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment.	Note: That cases may involve the same pa	em cases related.	
Nature of Suit Code Abbreviation Substantive Statement of Cause of Action All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment.	A. Arise from the same or a clos  B. Call for determination of the s  C. Involve one or more defendant labor if heard by different judges.  BIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY R SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):  Character Counsel/Parties: The submission of this her replaces nor supplements the filing and ser	DATE: Noember	n contained hereir
Nature of Suit Code Abbreviation Substantive Statement of Cause of Action All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the programment.			
All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended.  861 HIA include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the prog	to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases		
	. All claim 861 HIA include	the Social Security Act, as s providers of services und	amended. Also, der the program.
862 BL All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (3 923)		Mine Health and Safety Ac	t of 1969. (30 U.S.C
All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amount all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	863 DIWC All claim	tle 2 of the Social Security 405 (g))	Act, as amended; p
All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))		ity under Title 2 of the Soci	al Security Act, as
864 SSID All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security filed un		y filed under Title 16 of the	Social Security Act
All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended.  (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))		ie Social Security Act, as a	ımended.

Page 3 of 3