

COPY

1 Scott A. Kamber (*pro hac vice* app. pending)
 2 skamber@kamberlaw.com
 3 David A. Stampley (*pro hac vice* app. pending)
 4 dstampley@kamberlaw.com
 5 KamberLaw, LLC
 6 100 Wall Street, 23rd Floor
 7 New York, New York 10005
 8 Telephone: (212) 920-3072
 9 Facsimile: (212) 920-3081
 10
 11 Avi Kreitenberg (SBN 266571)
 12 akreitenberg@kamberlaw.com
 13 KamberLaw, LLP
 14 1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 601
 15 Los Angeles, California 90035
 16 Telephone: (310) 400-1050
 17 Facsimile: (310) 400-1056
 18
 19 Attorneys for Plaintiff

BY: _____
 10 JUL 30 PM 4: 10
 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
 LOS ANGELES

FILED

13 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 14 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15 JENNIFER AGUIRRE,
 16 Individually, on Behalf of Herself
 17 and All Others Similarly Situated,

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 QUANTCAST CORPORATION,
 21 a Delaware Corporation,
 22 and HULU, LLC, a Delaware
 23 Corporation,

24 Defendants.

CASE NO. **CV 10 5716 GHK (RZx)**

JURY DEMAND

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Violation of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030;
2. Violation of the Cal. Uniform Trade Secrets Act, Civ. Code § 3426;
3. Violation of the Cal. Computer Crime Law, Penal Code § 502;
4. Violation of the Cal. Unfair Competition Law, Bus. and Prof. Code § 17200;
5. Violation of the Cal. Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Civ. Code § 1750;
6. Unjust Enrichment

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

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Jennifer Aguirre (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated individuals (each a “Class Member” of the putative “Class,” as further described herein), by and through her attorneys, KamberLaw, LLP and KamberLaw, LLC, as and for her complaint and demanding trial by jury, alleges as follows based on her personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and observations and, otherwise, upon information and belief based on the investigation of counsel, which Plaintiff believes further investigation and discovery will support with substantial evidence.

I. NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Plaintiff and Class Members are consumers in the United States who use their desktop and laptop computers to access websites on Internet, and including users who configured their web browser privacy settings to deny permission for third parties to set browser cookies on their computers.

2. Hulu, LLC (“Hulu”) streams television programs and other video content to users. Quantcast Corporation (“Quantcast”) is an Internet audience metrics company. Together, Quantcast and Hulu (“Defendants”) hacked the computers of millions of consumers’ computers rogue, cookie-like tracking code on users’ computers. With this tracking code, Defendants circumvented users’ controls for managing web privacy and security.

3. Defendants perpetrated this exploit so they could monitor users, help themselves to users’ personal information, and continue doing so for as long as Defendants’ liked without ever having to ask or take a user’s “no” for answer. In fact, users’ “no” answers were the reason Defendants devised the scheme in the first place.

4. The personal information Defendants misappropriated and compiled, through Quantcast’s other web affiliations and data sources, included details about users’ video viewing choices and personal characteristics such as gender,

1 age, race, number of children, education level, geographic location, and house-
2 hold income. Defendants use the resulting profiles to identify individual users and
3 track them on an ongoing basis, across numerous websites, even spotting and
4 tracking users when they accessed the web from different computers, at home or
5 at work.

6 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 5. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant
8 to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

9 6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because
10 defendant Hulu, LLC is a corporation headquartered in Los Angeles County,
11 California.

12 7. Venue is also proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) be-
13 cause Defendants' improper conduct alleged in this complaint occurred in, was
14 directed from, and/or emanated from this judicial district.

15 **III. PARTIES**

16 8. Plaintiff Jennifer Aguirre is a resident of Milwaukee County in the
17 State of Wisconsin.

18 9. Defendant Quantcast Corporation ("Quantcast") is a Delaware corpo-
19 ration with headquarters at 201 Third Street, Second Floor, San Francisco, Cali-
20 fornia 94103. Quantcast does business throughout the United States and, in par-
21 ticular, in the State of California and Los Angeles County.

22 10. Defendant Hulu, LLC ("Hulu") is a Delaware corporation with
23 headquarters at 12312 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90064.
24 Hulu does business throughout the United States and, in particular, in the State of
25 California and County of Los Angeles.

1 **IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

2 **A. Background**

3 11. In 1994, in the first web browser¹ to allow for the exchange of
 4 cookie values² between a web server and user's computer, the browser, by de-
 5 fault, first-party websites³ cookies and rejected third-party cookies. "HTTP
 6 Cookies: Standards, Privacy, and Politics," David M. Kristol, 2001, available at
 7 <http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0105018> (last accessed June 22, 2010) at 9-10. Third-party
 8 cookie transactions were considered "unverifiable transactions" and a threat to
 9 users' privacy and security; users had no way of knowing in advance whether
 10 third parties might be setting cookies on their computers, for what reason, and
 11 who the third parties were. The default configuration—rejection of third-party
 12 cookies—was retained when, in 2000, the Internet Engineering Task Force

13 _____
 14 ¹ A browser is software installed on a user's personal
 15 computer . . . and with which the user, by communicating
 16 through an electronic network such as the Internet, can
 17 access Web sites.

18 *In the Matter of Netscape Communications Corporation*, Assurance of
 19 Discontinuance, Attorney General of the State of New York (June 13, 2003).

20 ² A cookie is a small string of text transmitted to and from a user's com-
 21 puter in a communication between a server group and a particular instance of
 22 browser client software. For ease of reference in this complaint, this exchange is
 23 characterized a communication between a website and a user, or user's browser

24 ³ "First-party Web site" is the Web site a User affirmatively
 25 requests to visit, for example, by typing in the site's URL or
 26 by clicking on a hyperlink to the site.

27 *In the Matter of DoubleClick Inc.: Agreement Between the Attys. Gen. of the*
 28 *States of Arizona, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey,*
New Mexico, New York, Vermont, and Washington and Doubleclick Inc., Aug.
 26, 2002 at 2, available at [http://www.ag.ny.gov/media_center/2002/aug/-](http://www.ag.ny.gov/media_center/2002/aug/-aug26a_02_attach.pdf)
[aug26a_02_attach.pdf](http://www.ag.ny.gov/media_center/2002/aug/-aug26a_02_attach.pdf) (last accessed July 29, 2010).

1 (IETF) finalized the global standard for web servers and browsers to follow in ex-
2 changing cookies. *See* “RFC 2965, HTTP State Management Mechanism” [Kris-
3 tol and Montulli 2000], Internet Engineering Task Force, Oct. 7, 2000, available
4 at <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2695.txt.pdf> (last accessed July 27, 2010).

5 12. Nascent Internet advertising companies protested the standard. The
6 leading commercial browser vendors, Microsoft and Netscape, declined to im-
7 plement it. Kristol at 21. Thus, a *de facto* standard was propagated as browser
8 vendors engaged in mass distribution of their software: if a first-party website—
9 the site the user expressly chose to visit—chose to display a web page that in-
10 cluded a third-party advertisement or use a third-party-provided traffic counter,
11 the third party gained the ability to set cookies on users’ computers with no notice
12 to those users.

13 13. This development cleared the way for third-party advertising compa-
14 nies to engage in widespread “network advertising.” By assembling a client net-
15 work of many websites, advertising companies could recognize, track, and profile
16 users activities across many websites. As early as 2001, DoubleClick was deliver-
17 ing ads on a network of over 11,000 websites. *In re DoubleClick Inc. Privacy*
18 *Litigation*, 154 F.Supp.2d 497, 500 (S.D.N.Y. 2001). By 2009, Google, which ac-
19 quired DoubleClick, was serving ads on a network of millions of websites. Goo-
20 gle Inc., SEC Form 10-K for period ending Dec. 31, 2009 at 9. In 2009, advertis-
21 ing accounted for 97 percent of Google’s \$24 revenue in 2009. *Id.* at 19. At the
22 same time, it became more important to commercial entities to be able to measure
23 advertising activity and user traffic.

24 14. Meanwhile, browser vendors and other companies have distributed
25 software tools that offer users some measure of third-party cookie control. For
26 example, users can accept or refuse to accept all or certain third-party cookies or
27 to automatically delete them at intervals of users’ choosing. These software
28

1 tools—like other software owned or licensed by users, such as Adobe Flash
2 Player—are under the authority and control of those users.

3 15. One reason users employ tools to manage and delete cookies is dis-
4 taste for being profiled. According to PreferenceCentral, an online ad preference
5 management provider, 58 percent of U.S. Internet users expressed willingness to
6 receive behaviorally targeted ads in exchange for free content. However, when
7 told how behavioral targeting works, the number of willing users dropped to be-
8 low 38 percent, and 50 percent of users stated they would elect to receive a more
9 limited selection of free content and untargeted advertisements. “Consumer Per-
10 spectives on Online Advertising 2010,” PreferenceCentral, July 7, 2010, available
11 at <http://www.preferencecentral.com/consumersurvey/results/behavioral->
12 [targeting/](http://www.preferencecentral.com/consumersurvey/results/behavioral-) (last accessed July 28, 2010).

13 **B. Quantcast’s Conduct**

14 16. User control over third-party cookies has created challenges for ad-
15 vertisers, online ad networks, as well as Internet metrics companies such as
16 Quantcast, that attempt to track and profile users over time and/or across multiple
17 websites. For online companies that rely on cookies to track users and measure
18 user activity, cookie deletion skews the numbers.

19 17. Quantcast, however, identified a way to work with its website affili-
20 ates to wrest control of browser cookies from users by installing, on users’ com-
21 puters, a tracking device that users could not easily detect, manage, or delete. In
22 cooperation with websites, Quantcast planted its own tracking code on users’
23 computers—but not in a cookie. Quantcast and participating websites, including
24 Hulu, stored tracking as an Adobe Flash Media Player local shared object (LSO).
25 Adobe Flash Media Player is software that enables users to view video content on
26 their computers, and Adobe . Quantcast then merged the tracking results with in-
27 formation from other sources to arrive at metrics for the site.

28

1 18. Quantcast and Hulu’s perpetration of this exploit was independently
2 confirmed in a report issued by academic researchers and titled, “Flash Cookies
3 and Privacy,” which found that:

4 a. A user visiting Hulu’s site would receive a standard, browser
5 cookie, and an identical “Flash cookie.”

6 b. If the user deleted the browser cookie, the Flash cookie would
7 be used to “re-spawn” the browser cookie.

8 c. These operations happened without any notice to the user and
9 without any consent from the user.

10 “Flash Cookies and Privacy,” A. Soltani, S. Canty, Q. Mayo, L. Thomas, C.J.
11 Hoofnagle, Univ. Cal., Berkeley, Aug. 10, 2009 at 3, available at
12 http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1446862 (last accessed July
13 28, 2010).

14 19. In a letter to the Federal Trade Commission earlier this year, Adobe
15 Systems Incorporated condemned the use of LSOs to back-up and re-spawn
16 browser cookies without express user consent. Letter to FTC, Adobe Systems
17 Inc., Jan. 27, 2010, available at [http://www.ftc.gov/os/comments/privacy-
18 roundtable/544506-00085.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/os/comments/privacy-roundtable/544506-00085.pdf) (last accessed July 27, 2010).

19 **C. Plaintiff’s Experience**

20 20. On or about late February, 2010, Plaintiff visited Hulu’s website at
21 <http://www.hulu.com>. She provided her name and email address to Hulu.

22 21. Subsequently, Plaintiff examined the contents of the local storage as-
23 sociated with the Adobe Flash Player application on her computer. She observed
24 that the objects in local storage included one object labeled “player.hulu.com”
25 and another labeled “www.hulu.com\com.quantserve.sol.” It is Plaintiff’s belief
26 that one or more of these objects is a tracking device used by Hulu and Quantcast,
27 without authorization, to monitor and profile her Internet activities.
28

1 22. Plaintiff did not receive notice of the installation of such a device,
2 did not consent to the installation of such a device, and did not want such a device
3 to be installed on her computer.

4 23. After visiting Hulu’s website, Plaintiff observed that her computer
5 tended to operate more slowly and sometimes froze when loading web pages.
6 Plaintiff spent several hundred dollars for maintenance on her computer, attempt-
7 ing to address this condition.

8 24. Plaintiff believes that, if she were to visit the Hulu site again, the
9 tracking device would be used as a substitute cookie or to re-spawn previously set
10 cookies.

11 25. Plaintiff considers information about her online activities to be in the
12 nature of confidential, trade secret information that she protects from disclosure,
13 including by controlling her browser settings for acceptance or rejection of cook-
14 ies.

15 26. After visiting Hulu, Plaintiff observed that her attempts to download
16 web pages were slower and sometimes caused the operation of her personal com-
17 puter to “freeze..”

18 27. Plaintiff’s experience is typical of the experiences of Class Members.

19 **D. User Consequences**

20 1. Defendants manipulated their “Flash cookies” in storage areas of
21 Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ computers, which were computers used in and af-
22 fecting interstate commerce and communication and were therefore protected
23 computers as defined in the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, Title 18, United
24 States Code, Section 1030(e)(2).

25 28. Defendants’ actions were surreptitious and without notice and so
26 were conducted without authorization and exceeding authorization.

27 29. Defendants’ conduct has caused economic loss to Plaintiffs and
28 Class Members in that, in barter economy in which users’ patronage (which is the

1 subject of Quantcast's traffic measurement activities) is the currency with which
2 users acquire ostensibly no-fee web services, and which constitutes independent
3 economic value.

4 30. In addition, inasmuch as Defendants' wrongfully acquired Plaintiff's
5 and Class Members' patronage, Plaintiffs and Class Member's were deprived of
6 the opportunity to contribute their patronage to web entities that did not engage in
7 such wrongful conduct.

8 31. Plaintiff and Class Members incurred the costs of repairing their
9 computers to remediate the impaired operability caused by Defendants.

10 32. Further, the personal information misappropriated by Defendants,
11 the "Flash cookies" copied from Plaintiff and Class Members' browser cookies
12 and populated with their actual user data constitute assets with discernable values.
13 Certainly given Defendants' conduct, Defendants associate economic value with
14 the users' cookies. In addition, cookies even have specific valuations in criminal
15 markets. For example, Symantec reported that, in 2007, the illicit market value of
16 a valid Hotmail or Yahoo cookie was three dollars, though other sources have re-
17 ported the prices have since dropped due to a current oversupply.

18 33. The aggregated loss and damage sustained by Subscribers set forth
19 above includes economic loss with an aggregated value of at least \$5,000 during a
20 one-year period.

21 34. Defendants perpetrated the acts and omissions set forth in this com-
22 plaint through an organized campaign of deployment, which constituted a single
23 act.

24 35. Plaintiff and Class Members sought to maintain the secrecy and con-
25 fidentiality of their personal information assets acquired by Defendants, which as-
26 sets were trade secrets, particularly Plaintiff's and Class Members' Internet
27 browsing activities.

28

1 36. The means by which Defendants obtained such information, and the
2 reasons Quantcast engaged in its campaign (user deletion of cookies) demonstrate
3 the confidential character of such information and users' efforts to protect it.

4 **V. CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

5 37. Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a), (b)(1), (b)(2),
6 and (b)(3), Plaintiff brings this action as a class action on behalf of herself and all
7 others similarly situated as members of the Class, defined as follows:

8 All individuals or entities in the United States who, from June
9 1, 2008 through the date of class certification (the "Class Pe-
10 riod"), used web browsers on their home or laptop computers
11 to access one or more web pages owned, controlled, and/or
12 operated, in whole or in part, by Hulu, LLC and/or Quantcast
13 Corporation, and during which access Hulu, LLC and/or
14 Quantcast Corporation stored or caused to be stored an Adobe
15 Flash Player local stored object on such persons' computers
16 for purposes other than using Adobe Flash Player to display
17 video content to such persons.

18 38. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, their legal representatives,
19 assigns, and successors, and any entity in which a Defendant has a controlling in-
20 terest. Also excluded is the judge to whom this case is assigned and the judge's
21 immediate family.

22 39. Plaintiff reserves the right to revise this definition of the Class based
23 on facts learned in the course of litigation of this matter.

24 40. The Class consists of millions of individuals and other entities, mak-
25 ing joinder impractical.

26 41. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of all other Class
27 Members

28

1 42. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the other
2 Class Members. Plaintiff has retained counsel with substantial experience in
3 prosecuting complex litigation and class actions. Plaintiff and her counsel are
4 committed to prosecuting this action vigorously on behalf of Class Members and
5 have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiff nor her counsel has any in-
6 terests adverse to those of the other Class Members.

7 43. Absent a class action, most Class Members would find the cost of
8 litigating their claims to be prohibitive and will have no effective remedy.

9 44. The class treatment of common questions of law and fact is superior
10 to multiple individual actions or piecemeal litigation in that it conserves the re-
11 sources of the courts and the litigants, and promotes consistency and efficiency of
12 adjudication.

13 45. Defendants have acted and failed to act on grounds generally appli-
14 cable to Plaintiff and the other Class Members, requiring the Court's imposition
15 of uniform relief to ensure compatible standards of conduct toward the Class
16 Members.

17 46. The factual and legal bases of Defendants' liability to Plaintiff and
18 other Class Members are the same, resulting in injury to Plaintiff and all of the
19 other Class Members. Plaintiff and the other Class Members have all suffered
20 harm and damages as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

21 47. There are many questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and
22 the Class Members and those questions predominate over any questions that may
23 affect individual Class Members. Common questions for the Class include, but
24 are not limited to the following, regarding Defendants' conduct described herein:

25 a. whether Defendants, without authorization, created and/or
26 manipulated Adobe Flash Player local stored objects on computers to which Class
27 Members' enjoyed rights of possession superior to those of Defendants;

28

- b. for what purposes Defendants created and/or manipulated Adobe Flash Player local stored objects on Class Members’ computers;
- c. whether Defendants violated:
 - i. the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030;
 - ii. the California Uniform Trade Secrets Act, Civil Code § 3426;
 - iii. the California Computer Crime Law, Penal Code § 502;
 - iv. the California Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code § 17200;
 - v. the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code § 1750; and
- d. whether Defendants misappropriated valuable information assets of Class Members;
- e. whether Defendants continue to retain valuable information assets from and about Class Members;
- f. what uses of such information were exercised and continue to be exercised by Defendants; and
- g. whether Defendants have been unjustly enriched.

48. The questions of law and fact common to Class Members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and a class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

COUNT I

Violation of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030 et. seq.

49. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

50. Defendants’ conduct was in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1030(a)(4) in that: Defendants knowingly and with intent to de-

1 fraud accessed Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ protected computers; Defendants
2 did so without authorization and exceeding any authorization; Defendants, by
3 means of such conduct, furthered the intended fraud and created and used unau-
4 thorized LSOs.

5 51. Defendants’ conduct was in violation of Title 18, United States
6 Code, Section 1030(a)(5)(C) in that Defendants intentionally accessed Plaintiff’s
7 and Class Members’ protected computer systems and, as a result of such conduct,
8 caused damage and loss.

9 52. As a result of Defendants’ conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members suf-
10 fered damages and loss exceeding an aggregate value of \$5,000 over a one-year
11 period.

12 53. In addition, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered consequences
13 for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

14 54. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to compensa-
15 tory damages, injunctive relief, and such other equitable relief and further relief
16 as the Court deems just and proper under Title 18, United States Code, Section
17 1030(g).

18 **COUNT II**

19 **Violation of the California Uniform Trade Secrets Act (“CUTSA”)**

20 **Civil Code § 3426**

21 55. Plaintiff incorporates the above allegations by reference as if set
22 forth herein at length.

23 56. Defendants acquired information assets of Plaintiffs and Class
24 Members, and which information assets were trade secrets in that Plaintiff and
25 Class Members derived independent, actual and potential economic value from
26 the assets’ not being generally known to the public and to other persons who
27 could obtain economic value from disclosure or use of the assets, and regarding
28

1 which Plaintiffs and Class Members engaged and engage in reasonable efforts
2 under the circumstances to maintain secrecy.

3 57. Defendants' misappropriation of these assets has caused in actual
4 economic loss to Plaintiff and Class Members' and has also caused them eco-
5 nomic loss in the form of opportunity costs imposed on Plaintiffs and Class
6 Members by Defendants' misappropriation.

7 58. Defendants' taking of Plaintiff's and Class Members' information
8 assets was misappropriation of trade secrets inasmuch as Defendants knew and
9 had reason to know such information was acquired by improper means and with-
10 out Plaintiff's and Class Members' consent, express or implied.

11 59. Defendants used improper means to acquire Plaintiff's and Class
12 Members trade secret information inasmuch as Defendants' used theft, misrepre-
13 sentation, and electronic espionage.

14 60. Defendants' conduct was wrongful, intentional, and is a direct,
15 proximate cause of harm suffered by Plaintiff and Class Members, as set forth
16 above.

17 61. In addition, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered irreparable
18 injury from these unauthorized acts of misappropriation and use of their informa-
19 tion assets, which Defendants still possess. Due to the ongoing misappropriation
20 and continuing threat of injury, Plaintiff and Class Members have no adequate
21 remedy at law, entitling Plaintiff to injunctive relief.

22 62. Therefore, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to: compensatory
23 damages in an amount to be proven at trial; injunctive relief; punitive and exem-
24 plary damages pursuant to Section 3294 of the California Civil Code; reasonable
25 attorneys' fees; and such other equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper.

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

COUNT III

Violation of the California Computer Crime Law (“CCCL”)

Penal Code § 502

63. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

64. Defendants violated Sections 502(c)(1), (2), and (7) of the California Penal Code in that: Defendants knowingly, willfully, and without permission accessed and used Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ computer systems and the Adobe Flash Player local area storage on those computer systems, wrongfully using and controlling Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ computer resources and information assets, wrongfully circumventing Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ privacy and security controls, and doing so in order to execute a scheme to defraud Plaintiff and Class Members through misappropriation and, further, to use misappropriated information assets to Defendants’ financial advantage and to Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ material detriment.

65. Defendants’ conduct is a direct, proximate cause of harm suffered by Plaintiff and Class Members, as set forth above.

66. In addition, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered irreparable injury from these unauthorized acts of misappropriation and use of their information assets, which Defendants still possess. Due to the ongoing misappropriation and continuing threat of injury, Plaintiff and Class Members have no adequate remedy at law, entitling Plaintiff to injunctive relief.

67. Therefore, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to: compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial; injunctive relief; punitive and exemplary damages pursuant to Section 3294 of the California Civil Code; reasonable attorneys' fees; and such other equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper.

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

COUNT IV

Violation of the California Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”)

Business and Professions Code § 17200

68. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

69. In violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, Defendants’ conduct in this regard is ongoing and includes, but is not limited to, unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent conduct.

70. By engaging in the above-described acts and practices, Defendants have committed one or more acts of unfair competition within the meaning of the UCL and, as a result, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury-in-fact and have lost money and/or property—specifically, valuable personal information; the economic value of their patronage; the economic value of their right to patronize and right of denial; and damage to their personal computers.

71. Defendants’ business acts and practices are unlawful, in part, because they violate California Business and Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.*, which prohibits false advertising, in that they were untrue and misleading statements relating to Defendants’ performance of services and with the intent to induce consumers to enter into obligations relating to such services, and regarding statements Defendants knew were false or by the exercise of reasonable care Defendants should have known to be untrue and misleading.

72. Defendants’ business acts and practices are also unlawful in that they violate the federal Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030, the California Uniform Trade Secrets Act, Civil Code § 3426, the California Computer Crime Law, Penal Code § 401, and the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code § 1750. Defendants are therefore in violation of the “unlawful” prong of the UCL.

1 73. Defendants’ business acts and practices are unfair because they
2 cause harm and injury-in-fact to Plaintiff and Class Members and for which De-
3 fendants have no justification other than to increase, beyond what Defendants
4 would have otherwise realized, its profit in fees from advertisers and its informa-
5 tion assets through the acquisition of consumers’ personal information. Defen-
6 dants’ conduct lacks reasonable and legitimate justification in that Defendants
7 have benefited from such conduct and practices while Plaintiff and the Class
8 Members have been misled as to the nature and integrity of Defendants’ services
9 and have, in fact, suffered material disadvantage regarding their interests in the
10 privacy and confidentiality of their personal information. Defendants’ conduct of-
11 fends public policy in California tethered to the Consumer Legal Remedies Act,
12 the state constitutional right of privacy, and California statutes recognizing the
13 need for consumers to obtain material information that enables them to safeguard
14 their own privacy interests, including California Civil Code, Section 1798.80.

15 74. In addition, Defendants’ *modus operandi* constitutes a sharp practice
16 in that Defendants knew and should have known, that consumers care about the
17 security, integrity, and operability of their personal computers; the privacy of
18 their online activities, and the confidentiality of their personal information assets
19 and, at the same time, knew Plaintiff and Class Members were unlikely to be
20 aware of the manner in which Defendants’ conduct violated those such interests.
21 Defendants are therefore in violation of the “unfair” prong of the UCL.

22 75. Defendants’ acts and practices were fraudulent within the meaning
23 of the UCL because they are likely to mislead the members of the public to whom
24 they were directed.

25 76. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and each Class Member, seeks individ-
26 ual restitution, injunctive relief, and other relief allowed under the UCL as the
27 Court deems just and proper.

28

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

COUNT V

**Violation of the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”)
Civil Code § 1750**

77. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

78. In violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.* (the “CLRA”), Defendants have engaged and are engaging in unfair and deceptive acts and practices in the course of transactions with Plaintiff, and such transactions are intended to and have resulted in the sales of services to consumers.

79. Plaintiff and the Class Members are “consumers” as that term is used in the CLRA because they sought or acquired Defendants’ good or services for personal, family, or household purposes. Defendants’ past and ongoing acts and practices include but are not limited to:

a. Defendants’ representations that its services have characteristics, uses, and benefits that they do not have, in violation of Civil Code § 1770(a)(5);

b. Defendants’ representations that their services are of a particular standard, quality and grade but are of another standard quality and grade, in violation of Civil Code § 1770(a)(7); and

c. Defendants’ advertisement of services with the intent not to sell those services as advertised, in violation of Civil Code § 1770(a)(9).

80. Defendants’ violations of Civil Code § 1770 have caused damage to Plaintiff and the other Class Members and threaten additional injury if the violations continue. This damage includes the losses set forth above.

81. At this time, Plaintiff seeks only injunctive relief under this cause of action. Pursuant to California Civil Code, Section 1782, Plaintiff will notify Defendants in writing of the particular violations of Civil Code, Section 1770 and

1 demand that Defendants rectify the problems associated with its behavior detailed
2 above, which acts and practices are in violation of Civil Code § 1770.

3 82. If Defendants fail to respond adequately to Plaintiff's above-
4 described demand within 30 days of Plaintiff's notice, pursuant to California
5 Civil Code, Section 1782(b), Plaintiff will, with the Court's permission, amend
6 the complaint to request damages and other relief, as permitted by Civil Code,
7 Section 1780.

8 **COUNT VI**

9 **Unjust Enrichment**

10 83. Plaintiff incorporates the above allegations by reference as if set
11 forth herein at length.

12 84. Plaintiff asserts this claim against each and every Defendant named
13 herein in this complaint on behalf of herself and the Class.

14 85. A benefit has been conferred upon all Defendants by Plaintiff and
15 the Class. On information and belief, Defendants, directly or indirectly, have re-
16 ceived and retain the financial gains they have acquired through their use of mis-
17 appropriated information. In addition, Defendants retain Plaintiff's and Class
18 Members' information assets, which are private, confidential, and not of public
19 record.

20 86. Defendants appreciate or have knowledge of said benefit.

21 87. Under principles of equity and good conscience, Defendants should
22 not be permitted to retain the information assets and/or revenue that they acquired
23 by virtue of their unlawful conduct. All funds, revenues, Class Member informa-
24 tion, derivatives of such information, and other related benefits acquired by De-
25 fendants have been acquired through Defendants' unjust actions and rightfully be-
26 long to Plaintiff and the Class.

27 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

28 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Class, respectfully

1 prays that the Court enter judgment in their favor as follows::

2 1. With respect to all counts, declaring the action a proper class action
3 and designating Plaintiff and her counsel as representatives of the Class;

4 2. As applicable to the Class *mutatis mutandis*, awarding injunctive and
5 equitable relief including, *inter alia*:

6 a. prohibiting Defendants from engaging in the acts alleged
7 above;

8 b. requiring Defendants to disgorge all ill-gotten gains to Plain-
9 tiff and the other Class Members or to whomever the Court deems appropriate;

10 c. requiring Defendants to delete all data misappropriated
11 through the acts alleged above;

12 d. requiring Defendants to provide Plaintiff and the other Class
13 Members a means to easily and permanently purge their membership data and
14 address book information from Defendants;

15 e. awarding Plaintiff and Class Members full restitution of all
16 benefits wrongfully acquired by Defendants by means of the wrongful conduct al-
17 leged herein; and

18 f. ordering an accounting and constructive trust imposed on the
19 data, funds, and other assets obtained by unlawful means as alleged above, to
20 avoid dissipation, fraudulent transfers, and/or concealment of such assets by De-
21 fendants;

22 3. For a preliminary and permanent injunction restraining Defendants,
23 their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and those in active con-
24 cert or participation with any of them from:

25 a. transmitting any information about Plaintiff or Class Mem-
26 bers' activities on the Internet for advertising purposes to any other websites or
27 entities, without fair, clear and conspicuous notice of the intent to transmit infor-
28

1 mation, including a full description of all information potentially and/or actually
2 available for transmission;

3 b. transmitting any information about Plaintiff or Class Mem-
4 bers' activities on the Internet for advertising purposes to any other websites or
5 entities, without fair, clear and conspicuous opportunity to decline the transmittal
6 prior to any transmission of data or information;

7 4. A permanent injunction enjoining and restraining Defendants, and all
8 persons or entities acting in concert with them during the pendency of this action
9 and thereafter perpetually, from:

10 a. initiating or procuring transmission of unsolicited commercial
11 electronic messages on or through Class Members' computers, Class Members'
12 email services and networks, or to Defendants users;

13 b. accessing or attempting to access Class Members' email serv-
14 ices and networks, data, information, user information, profiles, computers and/or
15 computer systems;

16 c. soliciting, requesting, or taking any action to induce Hulu visi-
17 tors to provide identifying information, or representing that such solicitation, re-
18 quest, or action is being done with any Class Member's authorization or approval;

19 d. retaining any copies, electronic or otherwise, of any Class
20 Members' information assets obtained through illegitimate and/or unlawful ac-
21 tions;

22 e. engaging in any activity that alters, damages, deletes, destroys,
23 disrupts, diminishes the quality of, interferes with the performance of, or impairs
24 the functionality of Class Members' computers, computer systems, computer
25 networks, data, websites, and email or other services;

26 f. engaging in any unlawful activities alleged in this complaint;

27 and
28

1 g. entering or accessing any of the physical premises or facilities
2 of Class Members or their counsel.

3 5. An order requiring Defendants to account for, hold in constructive
4 trust, pay over to Class Members, and otherwise disgorge all profits derived by
5 Defendants from their unlawful conduct and unjust enrichment, as permitted by
6 law;

7 6. An award to Class Members of damages, including but not limited
8 to, compensatory, statutory, exemplary, aggravated, and punitive damages, as
9 permitted by law and in such amounts to be proven at trial;

10 7. Award restitution against Defendants for all money to which Plain-
11 tiff and the Class are entitled in equity;

12 8. An award to Class Members of reasonable costs, including reason-
13 able attorneys' fees;

14 9. For pre-and post-judgment interest as allowed by law; and

15 88. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.
16

17 Respectfully, submitted

18 DATED: July 30, 2010

KAMBERLAW, LLC

KAMBERLAW, LLP

21 
22 By: Avi Kreitenberg

23 Attorneys for Jennifer Aguirre,
24 individually and on behalf of a class
25 of similarly situated individuals
26
27
28

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

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable.

Respectfully, submitted

DATED: July 30, 2010

KAMBERLAW, LLC

KAMBERLAW, LLP



By: Avi Kreitenberg

Attorneys for Jennifer Aguirre,
individually and on behalf of a class
of similarly situated individuals

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge George King and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Ralph Zarefsky.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV10 - 5716 GHK (RZx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

=====

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

Western Division
312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Southern Division
411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

Eastern Division
3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134
Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

NAME & ADDRESS.

Avi M. Kreitenberg (SBN 266571)
KAMBERLAW, LLP
1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 601
Los Angeles, California 90035
Telephone: (310) 400-1050

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JENNIFER AGUIRRE, Individually, on Behalf of
Herself and All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFF(S)

v.

QUANTCAST CORPORATION, a Delaware
Corporation, and HULU, LLC, a Delaware Corporation

DEFENDANT(S).

CASE NUMBER

CV10 5716 GHK (RZx)

SUMMONS

TO: DEFENDANT(S): _____

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it), you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint _____ amended complaint counterclaim cross-claim or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, Avi M. Kreitenberg, whose address is KamberLaw, LLP, 1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 601, Los Angeles, California 90035. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Clerk, U.S. District Court

CHRISTOPHER POWERS

JUL 30 2010

Dated: _____

By: _____

Deputy Clerk

(Seal of the Court)

[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].

11 COPY

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself <input type="checkbox"/>) JENNIFER AGUIRRE, Individually, on Behalf of Herself and All Others Similarly Situated	DEFENDANTS QUANTCAST CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation, and HULU, LLC, a Delaware Corporation
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing yourself, provide same.) Avi M. Kreitenberg, KamberLaw, LLP 1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 601, Los Angeles, California 90035 Telephone: (310) 400-1050	Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.) <input type="checkbox"/> 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) <input type="checkbox"/> 2 U.S. Government Defendant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only (Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.) <table style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>PTF</th> <th>DEF</th> <th></th> <th>PTF</th> <th>DEF</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Citizen of This State</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td>Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen of Another State</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td>Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 5</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td>Foreign Nation</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 6</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF	Citizen of This State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF																				
Citizen of This State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4																				
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5																				
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6																				

IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)

1 Original Proceeding
 2 Removed from State Court
 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
 4 Reinstated or Reopened
 5 Transferred from another district (specify): _____
 6 Multi-District Litigation
 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judge

V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: Yes No (Check 'Yes' only if demanded in complaint.)

CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes No **MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$** _____

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)

Violation of (1) 18 U.S.C. § 1030; (2) California Civil Code § 3426; (3) California Penal Code § 502; See Attachment A for additional causes of action

VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)

OTHER STATUTES <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Act <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Info. Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	CONTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Fed. Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury-Med Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury-Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Habeas Corpus-Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	TORTS PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage-Product Liability BANKRUPTCY <input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input type="checkbox"/> 445 American with Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 American with Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIONS <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus/Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition FORFEITURE / PENALTY <input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety /Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609
--	--	--	---	--	---

VIII(a). **IDENTICAL CASES:** Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? No Yes
 If yes, list case number(s): _____

VIII(b). **RELATED CASES:** Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? No Yes
 If yes, list case number(s): CV10-05484 GW (JCGx)

Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:

- (Check all boxes that apply) A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or
 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; or
 D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.

IX. VENUE: (When completing the following information, use an additional sheet if necessary.)

(a) List the County in this District; California County outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which **EACH** named plaintiff resides.
 Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).

County in this District:*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
Los Angeles	California Counties Outside of this District: San Diego County Other States: Texas; New Mexico

(b) List the County in this District; California County outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which **EACH** named defendant resides.
 Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).

County in this District:*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
Los Angeles	California Counties outside of this district: San Francisco; Palo Alto; San Carlos Other States: New York; Connecticut; Washington

(c) List the County in this District; California County outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which **EACH** claim arose.
Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land involved.

County in this District:*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
Los Angeles	

* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties
Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land involved

X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER):  Date July 28, 2010

Notice to Counsel/Parties: The CV-71 (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)

Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))

ATTACHMENT A
Attachment to Civil Cover Sheet
Case Number: _____

Additional Causes of Action:

- (4) California Penal Code § 630; (5) California Bus and Prof. Code § 17200;
- (6) California Civil Code §1750; (7) Unjust Enrichment