1	California Bar No. 181547 TYCKO & ZAVAREEI LLP 2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 808 Washington, DC 20036 hzavareei@tzlegal.com					
2						
3						
4	1 ux. 202 373 0330					
5						
6						
7						
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
10	IRA GROSSMAN, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,	Case No. <u>'13CV0736 L JMA</u>				
11	Plaintiff,					
12	VS.	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT				
13	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, INC. and AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION PRACTICE ORGANIZATION,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL				
14	Defendants, jointly and severally.					
15						
16	Plaintiff Ira Grossman, Ph.D, through his undersigned attorneys, on behalf of					
17	himself and all others similarly situated, complain against Defendants American					
18	Psychological Association, Inc. ("APA") and American Psychological Association					
19	Practice Organization ("APAPO") (collectively "Defendants") as follows:					
20						
21						

#### **INTRODUCTION**

- 1. This is a class action lawsuit brought on behalf of current and former APA members who have paid special or practice assessment fees as part of their annual dues. The APA falsely and deceitfully misled its members into thinking that payment of the special or practice assessment was mandatory and required for membership in the APA, when in fact that was not true.
- 2. The APA, a Washington, D.C. based non-profit corporation organized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, is the world's largest association of licensed psychologists with thousands of members throughout the country.
- 3. The APAPO is a separate organization operated by the same leadership as APA from the same address in Washington, D.C. The APAPO conducts professional advocacy and lobbying on behalf of members.
- 4. Since at least 2001, the APA had falsely represented to its members that a "mandatory" practice or special assessment over and above the annual dues was required for membership in the APA. In fact, payment of that assessment (which as of 2011 amounted to approximately \$140.00 per member per year) was completely voluntary, and solely required for membership in the APA's 501(c)(6) organization, the APAPO.
- 5. The APAPO is organized under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, ostensibly as an organization that is separate from APA, for purposes of

3

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

conducting lobbying and advocacy activities. Such activities could not be lawfully conducted by the APA, which is a 501(c)(3) organization.

Recognizing that many of its members would not voluntarily pay to fund 6. this lobbying and advocacy organization, APA deliberately sought to maximize lobbying funds outside of the proper lawful function of a 501(c)(3) entity. The APA misrepresented to its members that as part of annual membership renewal there was a "mandatory" assessment, which it then allocated to the APAPO.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has original jurisdiction over this class action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). Plaintiff and members of the class have suffered aggregate damages exceeding \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and this a class action in which any member of the class of plaintiffs is a citizen of a state different from any defendant.
- Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) because it is 8. a district in which any Defendant resides and all Defendants are residents of the State in which this district is located. Pursuant to 28 U.C.S. § 1391(c)(2), the Defendants are residents of this District and the State of California because they are entities with the capacity to sue and be sued in their common names under applicable law and because they are subject to this Court's personal jurisdiction with respect to the civil action in question. Venue is also proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this case took place

2

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

20

21

17 18

19

in this District. Specifically, the deception of Plaintiff occurred in this District.

Defendant made its misrepresentations and omissions to Plaintiff in this District.

#### **PARTIES**

- Plaintiff Dr. Ira Grossman is a resident of San Diego County, California, 9. who during the relevant time period paid special or practice assessment fees as part of his annual APA dues.
- 10. The APA and the APAPO are related Washington, D.C. nonprofit corporations with their principal places of business in Washington, D.C. They conduct business throughout the United States, including in this District. The APA and APAPO share the same board of directors, the same physical address, the same server hosting company, the same membership list, and the same accounting and billing systems. The governance responsibilities for both the APA and the APAPO are conducted by the Committee for the Advancement of Professional Practice ("CAPP"). CAPP has responsibility to exercise general governance supervision in the management of the 501(c)(6) companion organization.
- 11. At all times herein mentioned, each of the Defendants was the agent, servant, representative, officer, director, partner or employee of the other. At all times, each of the Defendants was acting within the scope and course of his/her/its authority as such agent, servant, representative, officer, director, partner or employee, and with the permission and consent of each Defendant. Additionally, at all times herein mentioned, Defendants were members of, and engaged in, a joint venture,

partnership and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of, and in pursuance of, the joint venture, partnership and common enterprise.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- psychologists—both clinical and teaching and research psychologists (and many other types too numerous to mention here). Recognizing that it was illegal for a 501(c)(3) organization like the APA to engage in lobbying and lobbying fundraising (beyond certain relatively small limits), APA leadership created a 501(c)(6) lobbying entity in 2001 known as APAPO. However, the APA has been assessing clinicians—those psychologists who actually practice clinical psychology and do psychotherapy—a special fee with their annual APA dues, which is represented to those clinicians on their billing statements as a mandatory practice assessment, and which is then allocated by APA leadership to the APAPO. In this manner, the APA simply skirted the rules applicable to tax-exempt non-profit entities.
- 13. The special or practice assessment fee came pre-printed on annual membership dues statement which deceptively created the impression that the fee was actually required as part of annual APA dues. Moreover, the dues statement instructions disseminated to members stated that any members who provide "ANY" health related services "MUST PAY" the Practice Assessment.

O

- 14. The APA's website in 2002 stated that members "... must pay the Special Assessment..." This wording found on the APA's website continued for a period of years.
- 15. In 2004, the APA announced that it was changing its practice of exempting new practitioners from paying the practice assessment. Beginning in 2005, "all APA members who are licensed psychologists will be billed the assessment, regardless of their length of APA membership, albeit at a reduced fee for newly licensed psychologists." M. Greer, *Monitor*, "Practitioners' annual assessment is changing with the times", September 2004, Vol. 35, No. 8, at 22.
- 16. Through 2010, the APA's website never made any indication that the practice assessment was voluntary, and never used any language stating or even suggesting that APA members were not required to pay the assessment. Instead, the website repeatedly stated that all APA members who are licensed psychologists providing services in the health or mental health fields, or who supervise those who do, "must pay the practice assessment." And when APA members tried to pay their dues online, the APA website did not allow them to pay the APA dues without also paying the APAPO assessment.
- 17. The website likewise referred members with questions about the mandatory nature of the practice assessment to the APA dues instructions, which "have more comprehensive guidelines, including the exemptions that would allow removal of the assessment from member dues statements." Accordingly, the APA's

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

website made clear that the dues statements and the instructions contained therein governed whether payment of the practice assessment was required as part of a member's annual APA dues. And the dues statements and instructions made clear that all practicing members "MUST PAY" the practice assessment as part of their annual APA dues, unless they fell within certain categories of members that were specifically exempted from payment.

18. In April of 2010, the APAPO's "Practice Central" website (<u>www.apapracticecentral.org</u>) published a statement entitled, "The Practice Assessment: What You Need To Know." That statement purports to provide "Answers to common member questions about the annual payment supporting the work of the APA Practice Organization." That statement does not indicate or suggest in any way that the payment of the practice assessment is voluntary. To the contrary, the statement makes clear that all APA members who practice are required to pay the assessment: "In addition to APA dues, members who are licensed practitioners pay the annual 'Practice Assessment' that supports the Work of the APA Practice Organization (APAPO)." The final question on the statement is "Why Isn't The Practice Assessment Part of My APA Dues?" Instead of making clear that the assessment is not part of the APA dues because it is voluntary, the statement explains that the assessment is broken out from the APA dues for tax reasons: "As noted earlier, the Practice Assessment monies support the work of the APA Practice Organization, a legally separate entity with a different IRS status than APA. As a

1	result, Practice Assessment payments are not part of your APA membership dues,				
2	although they are billed on your APA dues statement."				
3	19. The APAPO practice assessment is not trivial. It amounts to over 50%				
4	of the amount of the APA dues. In 2009, for example, this assessment was \$137 per				
5	person, while the total annual APA dues themselves were \$238.				
6	20. Until discovered and announced by some APA members in a list-serve				
7	discussion in 2010, it was unknown by the membership, and not reasonably capable of				
8	being known due to fraudulent concealment by Defendants, that the purportedly				
9	mandatory APAPO special or practice assessment fee was purely voluntary.				
10	21. The APA board has now <i>admitted</i> to the deceptive nature of the special				
11	or practice assessment fee. A newsletter issued by a division of the APA, stated:				
12 13	The manner in which the APA, APAPO, and Division dues have been combined on past due statements does not make clear that the mandatory practice assessment payment is required for APAPO membership but not for APA membership. The 2011 dues statement instructions will be modified to clarify this point.				
14	May 5, 2010 Memo from APA/APAPO Board of Directors to Members of the				
15	APAPO, "The APAPO Practice Assessment."				
16	22. Days later, on May 8, 2010, one of the nine members of CAPP, Glenn				
17	Ally, Psy.D., made a statement on an official APA list-serve purporting to justify the				
18	imposition of a mandatory practice assessment for a lobbying arm of the APA.				
19	According to Dr. Ally, the APA decided to make the assessment mandatory because				
20					
21					

the APA members would not make sufficient voluntary contributions to fund the APAPO's activities:

I'm assuming you know the statistics that psychologist are at the bottom (AT THE BOTTOM) of the list of professions regarding voluntary contributions, even political advocacy contributions. What you are suggesting here is to make the primary and largest advocacy arm of our organization dependent on the voluntary contributions of the cheapest profession around. . . Again, I don't mean to be offensive, but try running your practice on voluntary contributions and see if your family gets everything they want and deserve to have. The PO is a business and they are in the business of advocating for practice. WE have decided we need this, and we decided long ago that we were not getting enough advocacy when we had to depend on the larger "APA." We wanted our own practice advocacy for a variety of reasons. That "business" has to depend on a relatively stable revenue source. Would the lobbyist for your state organization represent you if you told him/her that you were going to pay him/her differently each year based on "voluntary donations?"

May 8, 2010 Post by Glenn Ally, List for APA members interested in discussing practice related issues, "Re: [PRACTICE] ... and it gets nastier still. (Long)."

- 23. After making these admissions, Defendants changed the dues statement in an apparent effort to be less deceptive. Originally, the dues statement described the Practice Assessment in one column. In the next column, entitled "Action Required," the statement directed the members to "Pay \$137 Practice Assessment." On the 2011 statement, the APA removed the "Action Required" column. They also removed the words "MUST PAY" from the instructions, which now state that non-payment of the practice assessment does not affect membership in APA.
- 24. The APA, however, initially did not change the portion of the 2011 dues statement instructions entitled "Five Year Dues Step-Down" that describes how senior

- 25. Despite these changes, the APA continued to indicate that all of its members must pay the practice assessment—while at the same time claiming they are "voluntary." For instance, APA Executive Director for Public and Member Communications, Rhea K. Farberman, stated that "all APA members who are licensed to provide health care services are billed the practice assessment." And she confirmed that, "[i]n general, licensed providers are expected to pay the assessment." In the same communication, Ms. Farberman admitted that despite the fact that the Practice Assessment is billed to every APA member and payment was expected of every member, it was not in fact mandatory: "Non-payment of the practice assessment will not affect your APA membership status." January 11, 2011 Letter from Rhea Farberman, "Your refund request."
- 26. In response to recent complaints that members cannot pay their APA dues online without also paying the practice assessment, the APA did not change its

- 27. The wrongful conduct at issue here occurred in California, where Defendants reached out and provided Plaintiff and members of the Class with the false and misleading information regarding the mandatory nature of the practice assessment and where, based upon this false and misleading information, Plaintiff and members of the Class paid the practice assessment.
- 28. During the time frame relevant to this action, Plaintiff Dr. Ira Grossman paid special or practice assessment fees as part of his annual APA dues.
- 29. In or around the Fall of each year that he was an APA member, Dr. Grossman received his annual APA Membership Dues Statement. The statement was sent by the APA via U.S. Mail to his office in San Diego, California. All the dues statements received by Dr. Grossman contained the same misrepresentations regarding the mandatory nature of the practice or special assessment mentioned above.
- 30. Dr. Grossman typically paid his annual dues, including the practice assessment, with a personal check or credit card verification that he mailed back to the APA in Washington, D.C. from his office in San Diego, California. In return, Dr.

- Grossman received a membership card from the APA extending his APA membership through the next year. This membership was mailed to Dr. Grossman at his office in San Diego, California.
- 31. Dr. Grossman first learned that the practice assessment was not mandatory after reading a December 2010 article on the website <a href="https://www.nationalpsychologist.com">www.nationalpsychologist.com</a> entitled "APA's practice assessment not mandatory," which cited the May 5, 2010 statement released by the APA/APAPO Board of Directors.
- 32. Dr. Grossman has refused to pay the practice assessment ever since he learned that it was not mandatory for membership in the APA.

#### **TOLLING**

33. Plaintiff and members of the proposed Class did not discover, and could not have discovered through the exercise of reasonable diligence, the existence of Defendants' conduct. Because Defendants' conduct was hidden by them, Plaintiff and proposed Class members were unaware of it. The acts of Defendants alleged herein were wrongfully concealed and carried out in a manner that precluded detection. A reasonable person under the circumstances would not have been alerted to investigate Defendants' conduct. As a result of Defendants' fraudulent concealment, the running of any statute of limitations has been tolled with respect to Plaintiff and the Class members' claims.

34. The running of the statute of limitations was further tolled by the filing of a putative class action alleging these same claims in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 1:10-CV-01780 (D.D.C. filed Oct. 21, 2010).

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

- 35. Plaintiff brings this suit as a class action, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of himself and a class (the "Class") composed of and defined as follows: All persons in California who paid a "special" or "practice" assessment fee as part of their APA annual dues after 2000.
- 36. Subject to additional information obtained through further investigation and discovery, the foregoing definitions of the Class may be expanded or narrowed by amendment or amended complaint. Specifically excluded from the Class are any affiliate, parent, or subsidiary of Defendants; any entity in which Defendants have a controlling interest; any officer, director, or employee of Defendants; any successor or assign of Defendants; and any Judge to whom this case is assigned as well as his or her immediate family.
- 37. Numerosity. (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1)). Members of the Class are so numerous that their individual joinder is impracticable. Defendants have thousands of members in the State of California who have been wrongfully charged the "mandatory" fees at issue. The precise number of the class members is unknown to Plaintiff. Class members are known by Defendants, however, and thus, may be

notified of the pendency of this action by direct mail, email, and supplemented by published notice.

- 38. Existence and Predominance of Common Questions of Law and Fact (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2) & (b)(3)). Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common questions of law and fact include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Whether Defendants omitted, misrepresented, concealed or manipulated material facts from Plaintiff and the Class regarding the special or practice assessment fee.
  - b. The nature and extent of Defendants' prior knowledge of the material facts relating to the manner of billing for and collection of special or practice assessment fees.
  - c. Whether Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to damages and/or restitution, plus costs, interest, and attorney fees.
  - d. Whether Defendants' conduct as described herein violatesCalifornia Business and Professions Code Sections 17200 and 17500 *et seq*.
  - e. Whether Defendants were unjustly enriched as a result of misleading its members into thinking that payment of the practice or special assessment was required for APA membership, when that was not true.

4

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

- f. Whether Defendants should be ordered to disgorge all or part of the moneys it received from the special or practice assessment paid by its members.
- Whether Defendants fraudulently or negligently represented that g. payment of the practice or special assessment was required for APA membership, when that was not true.
- 36. Defendants' defenses, to the extent that any such defenses apply, are applicable generally to Plaintiff and the entire Class and are not distinguishable as to Class members.
- 39. Typicality (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)). Plaintiff is a member of the Class with claims which are typical of the claims of other Class Members. Like all Class Members, Plaintiff has been injured by Defendants' common wrongful billing practice of misrepresenting voluntary fees as mandatory annual dues fees and collecting these fees through deceptive practices. Plaintiff and all Class members were subjected to the same course of conduct.
- 40. Adequacy of Representation (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4)). Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Their interests are coincident and not antagonistic to those of Class Members. Plaintiff has retained Counsel that are highly experienced in the prosecution of complex class action 20 litigation and have no conflicts in undertaking this litigation. Plaintiff intends to prosecute this action vigorously.

# 41. Class Certification Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(1), (2), (3):

- (b)(3) Due to the uniformity of the injuries experienced by Class Members

  (wrongful assessment of monetary fees) and the predominance over

  individual issues of common issues of fact and law, a class action is

  superior to all other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication

  of the controversy;
- (b)(1) Adjudication of individual claims would be prohibitively expensive for individual Class Members and for the court system as a whole.
  Individualized litigation would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudication that could establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants and would create the risk of adjudications that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of Class Members not parties to the adjudications. By contrast, the class action device provides the benefits of a single adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court; and
- (b)(2) Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to all members of the Class regarding final injunctive and declaratory relief barring future improper billing practices.

#### 

#### COUNT I

#### (Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust)

- 42. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth above as if fully written herein.
- 43. As a direct result of their conduct set forth in this Complaint, Defendants voluntarily accepted and retained the benefits of millions of dollars in total payments from Plaintiff and the Class that they would not have otherwise have had. As such Defendants have been unjustly enriched.
- 44. Defendants caused Plaintiff and the Class to pay additional moneys that were not mandatory, despite Defendants' representations and/or misleading statements, and as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Class paid special or practice assessment fees that were not mandatory as part of APA membership. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to a restoration of their moneys.
- 45. Defendants voluntarily accepted and retained the benefit of Plaintiff's and Class members' payments with knowledge and awareness that, as a result of their wrongdoing, Plaintiff and the Class paid special or practice assessment fees they would not have otherwise paid.
- 46. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled in equity to seek restitution and disgorgement from Defendants' wrongful profits, revenues or other financial benefits to the extent and in the amount to be proven at trial.

47. Plaintiff seeks the imposition of a constructive trust upon all unlawful or inequitable sums received by Defendants identified and traceable through payment of special or practice assessment fees paid by Plaintiff and the Class.

#### COUNT II

(Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.—Commission Of Unfair Business Act Or Practice)

- 48. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth above as if fully written herein.
- 49. The practice by APA of representing an assessment dedicated to APAPO as being required for membership in APA when, in truth, APA membership renewal did not require payment of the APAPO practice assessment was an unfair business act or practice because the practice was unconscionable, immoral, deceptive, unfair, illegal, unethical, oppressive, and/or unscrupulous.
- 50. Moreover, whatever utility could be associated with Defendants' conduct is outweighed by the gravity of the consequences to Plaintiff and other Class members.
- 51. Plaintiff and the Class members have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' unfair business acts or practices.
- 52. The above-described unfair business acts or practices present a threat and likelihood of harm and deception to members of the Class in that Defendants has systematically perpetrated the unfair conduct upon members of the public by engaging in the conduct described herein.

53. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 and 17203 Plaintiff seeks an order providing restitution and disgorgement of all profits relating to the above-described unfair business acts or practices, and injunctive and declaratory relief as may be appropriate.

#### **COUNT III**

(Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.—Commission Of Unlawful Business Act Or Practice)

- 54. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth above as if fully written herein.
- 55. The practice by APA of representing an assessment dedicated to APAPO as being required for membership in APA when, in truth, APA membership renewal did not require payment of the APAPO practice assessment, was an unlawful business act or practice because it was part of a subterfuge to defeat the restrictions on lobbying and lobbying fund raising for a 501(c)(3) organization like APA in violation of the Internal Revenue Code.
- 56. Plaintiff and the Class members have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' unlawful business acts or practices.
- 57. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 and 17203 Plaintiff seeks an order providing restitution and disgorgement of all profits relating to the above-described unlawful business acts or practices, and injunctive, and declaratory relief as may be appropriate.

#### **COUNT IV**

2

(Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.—Commission Of Fraudulent Business Act Or Practice)

3 4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

58. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth above as if fully written herein.

- The practice by APA of representing an assessment dedicated to APAPO 59. as being required for membership in APA, when, in truth, APA membership renewal did not require payment of the APAPO practice assessment, was a fraudulent business act or practice because it was likely to deceive, and did in fact deceive, Plaintiff and members of the Class.
- 60. Plaintiff and the Class members have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' fraudulent business acts or practices.
- 61. The above-described fraudulent business acts or practices present a threat and likelihood of harm and deception to members of the Class in that Defendants has systematically perpetrated the fraudulent conduct upon members of the public by engaging in the conduct described herein.
- 62. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 and 17203 Plaintiff seeks an order providing restitution and disgorgement of all profits relating to the above-described fraudulent business acts or practices, and injunctive, and declaratory relief as may be appropriate, and injunctive and declaratory relief as may be appropriate.

#### COUNT V

## (Violation of California's False Advertising Law, Business and Professions Code, §§ 17500, et seq.)

- 63. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth above as if fully written herein.
- 64. California Business and Professions Code § 17500 prohibits "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising."
- 65. Defendants caused to be made or disseminated throughout California advertising, publications, statements, and/or other materials that were untrue or misleading, and which were known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should have been known to Defendants, to be untrue and misleading to consumers and Plaintiff.
- 66. Defendant has violated section 17500 because the affirmative misrepresentations and omissions regarding the mandatory nature of the special or practice assessment fees were material and likely to deceive a reasonable consumer.
- 67. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered an injury in fact, including the loss of money, as a result of Defendants' false advertising. In paying special or practice assessment fees during the relevant time period, Plaintiff relied on the misrepresentations and/or omissions of Defendants regarding the mandatory nature of the fees. Defendants' material representations and/or omissions were false, as the special or practice assessment fees have been voluntary throughout the relevant time

period. Had Plaintiff and the Class members known true facts concerning the voluntary nature of the assessment fees, they would not have paid them.

68. Plaintiff requests that this Court enter such orders or judgments as may be necessary to restore to Plaintiff and the Class all moneys Defendants acquired by their false advertising, including restitution and/or disgorgement, and for such other relief set forth below.

#### COUNT VI (Fraud & Deceit)

- 69. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth above as if fully written herein.
- 70. By way of the false representations, concealment, and nondisclosure described above, Defendants falsely and deceitfully represented that payment of the special or practice assessment was required for membership in the APA, even though that was not true.
- 71. Defendants knowingly engaged in these false representations and acts of concealment and nondisclosure and with the intent to defraud Plaintiff and the Class members.
- 72. Plaintiff and the Class members were induced to rely, and justifiably relied, on Defendants' false representations, concealment, and nondisclosure.
- 73. Plaintiff and the Class members suffered damages as a result of Defendants' false representations, concealment, and nondisclosure because they paid

1	special or practice assessments that they otherwise would not have paid had they					
2	known that payment of these assessments was not required for membership in the					
3	APA.					
4	<u>COUNT V</u> (Negligent Misrepresentation)					
5	74. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth					
6	above as if fully written herein.					
7	75. By way of the false representations, concealment, and nondisclosure					
8	described above, Defendants misrepresented that payment of the special or practice					
9	assessment was required for membership in the APA, even though that was not true.					
10	76. Such misrepresentations were material and Defendants made them					
11	without reasonable grounds for believing they were true.					
12	77. Defendants made these misrepresentations with the intent to induce					
13	Plaintiff and the Class members to rely on the misrepresentations. And Plaintiff and					
14	the Class members justifiably relied on Defendants' misrepresentations.					
15	78. Plaintiff and the Class members suffered damages as a result of					
16	Defendants' misrepresentations because they paid special or practice assessments that					
17	they otherwise would not have paid had they known that payment of these					
18	assessments was not required for membership in the APA.					
19	PRAYER FOR RELIEF					
20	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:					

A.	An order certifying the Class and appointing Plaintiff and their counsel to				
represent the Class;					
В.	Monetary relief and/or equitable relief (including without limitation				
damages and/or restitution to Plaintiff and the Class) payable into a common fund in					
an amount to be determined at trial;					
C.	. Statutory damages, including double and/or treble damages;				
D.	Exemplary damages;				
E.	Punitive damages;				
F.	Interest;				
G.	Attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including costs of notice,				
administration, and expert witness fees; and					
H.	Such other legal or equitable relief, including injunctive and/or				
declaratory relief, as the Court may deem appropriate.					
JURY DEMAND					
Plaintiff demands trial by jury of all issues so triable.					
Respectfully submitted,					
DATED: N	March 27, 2013 TYCKO & ZAVAREEI LLP				
	By <u>s/Hassan A. Zavareei</u> Hassan A. Zavareei				
	California Bar No. 181547 TYCKO & ZAVAREEI LLP 2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 808				
	Washington, DC 20036 hzavareei@tzlegal.com Tel.: 202-973-0900				
	Fax: 202-973-0900 Fax: 202-973-0950				
	represent the B. damages are an amount C. D. E. F. G. administrate H. declaratory Plair Respectfull				

1	
2	Edward A. Wallace Amy E. Wexler WEXLER WALLACE LLP
3	55 Monroe Street, Suite 3300 Chicago, IL 60603 Tel.: 312-589-6272
4	Fax: 312-346-0033
5	E. Powell Miller Ann L. Miller THE MILLER LAW FIRM
6	950 W. University Drive, Suite 300 Rochester, MI 48307 Tel.: 248-841-2200
7	Fax: 248-652-2852
8	Gregory F. Coleman Greg Coleman Law PC 550 Main Avenue, Suite 600
9	Knoxville, TN 37902 Tel.: 865-247-0080 Fax: 865-522-0049
10	Gary E. Mason
11	WHITFIELD BRYSON & MASON LLP 1625 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Suite 605
12	Washington, DC 20036 Tel.: 202-429-2290 Fax: 202-429-2294
13	
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

#### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

'13CV0736 L

**JMA** 

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

<ul> <li>(a) PLAINTIFFS</li> <li>RA GROSSMAN, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated</li> </ul>			ated	DEFENDANTS AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, INC. and AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION PRACTICE ORGANIZATION					
(b) County of Residence of	First Listed Plaintiff S	an Diego		County of Residence	of First Liste	d Defendant			
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)					
					ONDEMNATION OF LAND IN	ON CASES, USE TI VOLVED.	HE LOCATION (	)F	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Address, and Telephone Numbe	r)		Attorneys (If Known)					
lassan Zavareei, Tycko	& Zavareei LLP								
2000 L Street NW, Suite ( 202) 973-0900	808, Washington, DC	20036							
I. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place on "X" in O	ne Rox Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box	for Plaintiff
				(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)					
J U.S. Government	Sederal Question	W . D . I	Ov.		F DEF	1	indicat Diag	PTF	DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government i	Noi a Pa <del>r</del> iy)	Citize	n of This State		Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		□ 4	<b>□</b> 4
3 2 U.S. Government Defendant	2 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 5 of Business In Another State					<b>⊠</b> 5
				n or Subject of a ☐ eign Country	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation		<b>1</b> 6	□ 6
V. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box On	dy)							
CONTRACT		RTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUT	ES
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR	Y 🗖 62:	5 Drug Related Seizure		al 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False C		
J 120 Marine J 130 Miller Act	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product	<ul> <li>365 Personal Injury - Product Liability</li> </ul>	□ 690	of Property 21 USC 881 O Other	423 Withd	irawal SC 157	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust		
J 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	367 Health Care/		o other	20 0.30 137		☐ 430 Banks and Banking		
150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical				RTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Comme		
& Enforcement of Judgment J 151 Medicare Act	Slander  330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			☐ 820 Copyr		☐ 460 Deporta☐ 470 Rackete		aced and
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	368 Asbestos Persona	ı			: :mark		Organiza	
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product			<u> </u>		☐ 480 Consun		t
(Excludes Veterans)  J 153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product	Liability PERSONAL PROPEI	TV G 31	LABOR  Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL □ 861 HIA (	SECURITY	490 Cable/S		.a.litica/
of Veteran's Benefits	Liability  350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud	ייי טן אוי	Act	☐ 862 Black		☐ 850 Securiti Exchan		iodities/
J 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	☐ 371 Truth in Lending	<b>II</b> 726	0 Labor/Management		C/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 890 Other S		Actions
1 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	☐ 380 Other Personal		Relations	☐ 864 SSID		☐ 891 Agricul		
195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage  385 Property Damage		0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical	□ 865 RSI (4	4U5(g))	☐ 893 Environ ☐ 895 Freedor		
	☐ 362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability		Leave Act			Act		
na 14 na Opanasi	Medical Malpractice	L'antooking aperento		Other Labor Litigation	FFD PART A	1 01 11 011 000	896 Arbitrat		
REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS  440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus:	10 /9	I Employee Retirement Income Security Act		L TAX SUITS  (U.S. Plaintiff	□ 899 Admini	istrative P view or A	
220 Foreclosure	441 Voting	463 Alien Detainee		modific Scourity Act		efendant)		Decision	• •
3 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment	☐ 510 Motions to Vacat	e		☐ 871 IRS—		☐ 950 Constitu		
240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence	- 1		26 U	SC 7609	State St	atutes	
3 245 Tort Product Liability 3 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations  3 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	530 General	0.01341	MIMMIGRATION 35 12 13	-				
2 2- v	Employment	Other:		☐ 462 Naturalization Application					
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Oth	ier 🔯 46.	5 Other Immigration					
	Other  448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Actions					
	C 110 Dilatilation	560 Civil Detainee -					1		
		Conditions of Confinement							
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" ii	n One Box Only)	Commement			.L				
【 I Original □ 2 Re	••	Remanded from Appellate Court	☐ 4 Rein: Reop		erred from er District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation			
				(specify)	)				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	N 28 U.S.C. § 1332		re ming (L	o not cite jurisdictional stat	lutes untess div	ersity):			
	Differ description of ca	ause: leading reoresenta	tions ma	de by defendants th	at caused	plaintiffs to su	iffer monetar	v dam:	ages
VII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTIO		EMAND \$		HECK YES only			
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2		•	50,000,000.00		URY DEMAND:		□ No	
VIII. RELATED CASI		_							
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE Unassigne	ed		DOCKE	T NUMBER 1:1	10-cv-017 <u>80</u>		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY C	F RECORD		*			
03/27/2013				{ }	$\sim$	<b>7</b>			
OR OFFICE USE ONLY				<del></del>	16				
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		ALDOR		MAG. JUI	DGE		