	© CH INC	ADR			
1	Michael W. Sobol (State Bar No. 194857)	~ .			
2	Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260) Nicole D. Reynolds (State Bar No. 246255)	TEIN LLP APK 18 LUIS RICHARD W. WIEKING NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT SAN JOSE SAN JOSE RICHARD W. WIEKING SAN JOSE PAL PAL PAL PAL PAL PAL PAL PA			
3	LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNS 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor	TEIN LLP APR 10			
4	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 956-1000	RICHARD W			
5	E-mail: nreynolds@lchb.com msobol@lchb.com efastiff@lcbh.com	RICHARD W. WIEKING NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RICHARD W. WIEKING SAN JOSE CALIFORNIA			
6					
7	Daniel R. Karon (to be admitted pro hac vio GOLDMAN SCARLATO KARON	e) JR XX			
8	& PENNY, P.C. 700 W. St. Clair Avenue, Ste. 204	رخ ا			
9	Cleveland, OH 44113 Telephone: (216) 622-1851	*			
10	E-mail: karon@gskplaw.com				
11	Laura Killian Mummert (to be admitted pro GOLDMAN SCARLATO KARON				
12	& PENNY, P.C 101 E. Lancaster Ave., Ste. 204				
13	Wayne, PA 19087 Telephone: (484) 342-0700				
	E-mail: mummert@gskplaw.com				
14 15	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
16	UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT			
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
18					
1 9	$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{V}$	13-01751 HAL			
20	ADAM SAVETT, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No.			
21	Plaintiff,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT			
22	v.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
23	COUPONS.COM, INC.,				
24	,				
25	Defendant.				
26	Plaintiff Adam Savett, individually as	nd on behalf of all others similarly situated, alleges			
27	on personal knowledge, investigation of his of	ounsel, and on information and belief as follows:			
28		,			

FAXED

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. Coupons.com is an internet-based business that illegally and deceptively sold "Daily Deals" gift certificates for a wide variety of goods and services that included expiration dates in violation of California Civil Code § 1749.5, which prohibits selling gift certificates with any expiration date.
- 2. Coupons.com knew and profited from the fact that consumers were unlikely to redeem their gift certificates before they expired. When this occurred, Coupons.com refused to refund the purchase price of the gift certificates unless consumers requested a refund within 30 days of purchase. This practice violated California Civil Code § 1749.5, which requires the redemption of all gift certificates sold after January 1, 1997 at any time for their full cash value.
- 3. In an effort to avoid California gift-certificate law, Coupons.com misrepresented that its "Daily Deals" were "promotional certificates" or "coupons," thereby misrepresenting that its gift certificates were something other than gift certificates. But because Coupons.com sold its gift certificates for a specific price and issued them for a stated value or amount, they were unlike typical promotions or coupons and instead met the legal definition of gift certificates, subjecting them to California's prohibition on gift certificate expiration dates.
- 4. On behalf of himself and the Class, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit against Coupons.com for violating California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. ("UCL"); California's False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq. ("FAL"); and California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 et seq. ("CLRA") (injunctive relief only).
- 5. Plaintiff seeks restitution and other equitable relief on behalf of himself and the Class, including full refunds, injunctive relief, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, and any

additional relief that this Court determines to be necessary or appropriate to provide complete relief to Plaintiff and the Class.

<u>PARTIES</u>

- 6. Plaintiff resides in Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Coupons.com made offers to Plaintiff for discounted products and services, and Plaintiff purchased Coupons.com gift certificates based on Coupons.com's representations and claims. The Coupons.com gift certificates that Plaintiff purchased contained illegal expiration dates.
- 7. Coupons.com, Inc. is incorporated under Delaware law and has its corporate headquarters in Mountain View, California. Coupons.com marketed, sold, and issued its Coupons.com gift certificates to tens or hundreds of thousands of consumers throughout the U.S.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 8. This matter in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, as each member of the proposed Class, which is believed to number at least in the tens of thousands, is entitled to restitution of the purchase price of their gift certificates. In addition, Plaintiff alleges a national class, which will result in at least one Class member belonging to a different state. Accordingly, this Court has jurisdiction according to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2).
- 9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Coupons.com because Coupons.com is headquartered in California; is authorized to do business and regularly conducts business in California; and marketed, sold, and issued Coupons.com gift certificates in California. Also, Coupons.com's "Terms of Use" requires that the parties "submit to the exclusive jurisdiction" of state or federal courts located in Santa Clara County, California and adds that California law governs Plaintiff's claim against it.
- 10. Venue is proper under 18 U.S.C. § 1965(a) because Coupons.com is headquartered in Santa Clara County, California. Venue is also proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(a) and (b)

because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred here. What's more, Coupons.com "Terms of Use" contains a venue-selection clause that requires "any action at law or in equity arising out of or relating to these Terms of Use shall be filed and adjudicated only in the federal or state courts located in Santa Clara County, California."

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. Coupons.com sold "Daily Deals" via e-mail to consumers who subscribed to receive these offers online. These Daily Deals required consumers to pay a purchase price for a voucher, in exchange for which consumers purportedly received a discount on a variety of goods and services. For example, for a \$50 purchase price, a consumer might have purchased a 60-minute massage purportedly "worth" \$80. Upon information and belief, tens of thousands of people nationwide purchased Daily Deals from Coupons.com.
- 12. Coupons.com represented to consumers that it was able to offer them discounts through the power of "collective buying." At the same time, Coupons.com convinced its retail partner businesses, with whom it shared revenues, that these Daily Deals would attract new customers.
- 13. The expiration dates on Coupons.com's Daily Deals were prohibited by California Civil Code § 1749.5 because Coupons.com issued the Daily Deals for a specific amount in exchange for a payment.
- 14. The Daily Deals did not constitute "awards, loyalty, or promotional program[s]" as described by California law because "money or other thing of value [was] given in exchange for the gift certificate by the consumer." Cal. Civ. Code § 1749.5(d)(1).
- 15. Nevertheless, Coupons.com illegally and deceptively sold its Daily Deals gift certificates with expiration dates and misrepresented to consumers that its Daily Deals were not gift certificates but were instead "promotional certificates" or "coupons."

1091023.2

- 16. If a consumer presented an unused gift certificate more than 30 days after purchase, Coupons.com refused to refund it. This practice violated California law that provides "any gift certificate sold after January 1, 1997, is redeemable in cash for its cash value" at any time Cal. Civ. Code § 1749.5(b)(1).
- 17. Coupons.com's practices harmed consumers. For example, consumers who were unable to redeem their gift certificates, perhaps because the retail business offering the products or services could not accommodate such large numbers of consumers seeking to redeem identical certificates, were left without any recourse after only a short time had lapsed.
- 18. Coupons.com relied on the fact that many consumers would not redeem their Daily Deals before these deals' short expiration dates and would instead either discard them or have the participating merchant decline them, despite having already paid for them.¹ As a result, Coupons.com reaped huge profits at their customers' expense.
- 19. As it did to thousands of other consumers, Coupons.com illegally and deceptively sold Plaintiff a Daily Deal certificate bearing an expiration date.
- 20. On or about March 27, 2011, Coupons.com sent a Plaintiff a Daily Deal e-mail offer for Finish Line Car Wash gift certificates.
- 21. Plaintiff does not recall Coupons.com informing him of any expiration date on the certificates in this offer.
- 22. Based on Coupons.com's offer, Plaintiff bought two certificates costing \$14.99 each, plus a shipping and handling fee of \$1.50, for a total of \$31.48. For this payment, Coupons.com promised to send Plaintiff two gift certificates, each redeemable for three full-

-5-

See Marcia Kaplan, Daily Deals: A Good Investment for Merchants?, Jan. 16, 2012, http://www.practicalecommerce.com/articles/3293-Daily-Deals-A-Good-Investment-for-Merchants (last visited on Apr. 3, 2013) ("One way merchants can make a profit is if a high percentage of people who buy the deals don't redeem them. Yipit estimates that about 20 percent of deals go unredeemed."); Kelli B. Grant, 10 Things Daily Deal Sites Won't Say, Mar. 29, 2011, https://www.smartmoney.com/spending/deals/10-thing-daily-deal-sites-won't-say-1301404072442 (last visited on Apr. 2, 2013) (estimating that about 40% of deals go unredeemed).

date on the certificates.

(up to a \$42.00 maximum value), four discounted wash packages at 25% off (up to a \$21 maximum value), and two discounted detail services at 25% off.

23. Coupons.com sent Plaintiff an e-mail confirming his purchase and explaining that it would ship the certificates via USPS. Coupons.com did not inform Plaintiff of any expiration

service car washes (up to a \$63.00 maximum value), four discounted wash packages at 50% off

- 24. The Finish Line Car Wash gift certificates that Coupons.com issued and sent to Plaintiff purported to expire on April 1, 2012.
- 25. Plaintiff gave one of the gift certificates to a friend as a gift and kept the other certificate for himself. But he was unable to redeem the gift certificate he kept for himself before Coupons.com's April 1, 2012 purported expiration date. After this expiration date, Plaintiff reasonably believed that his gift certificate was no longer valid and that he could not redeem it.
- 26. In the aforementioned manner, Coupons.com's actions harmed Plaintiff by causing him to lose money or property.

CLASS-ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 27. Plaintiff brings this class-action lawsuit on behalf of himself and the proposed Class members under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 28. Plaintiff seeks certification of the following Class: All people in the U.S. who purchased or acquired a Coupons.com gift certificate with an expiration date. Specifically excluded from the Class are Coupons.com and any entities in which Coupons.com has a controlling interest, Coupons.com's agents and employees, the judge to whom this action is assigned, members of the judge's staff, and the judge's immediate family.
- 29. Numerosity. Plaintiff does not know the exact number of Class members but believes that the Class comprises tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of consumers

throughout the U.S. As such, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

- 30. Commonality and predominance. Well-defined, nearly identical legal or factual questions affect all Class members. These questions predominate over questions that might affect individual Class members. These common questions include, but are not limited to, the following:
- a. Whether Coupons.com's Daily Deals were gift certificates under California law:
- b. Whether Coupons'com sold gift certificates with expiration dates in violation of California law;
- c. Whether Coupons.com engaged in deceptive and unfair business and trade practices by including expiration dates on its gift certificates and by refusing to provide refunds for these gift certificates' cash value unless requested within 30 days of purchase;
- d. Whether Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to restitution and other equitable relief; and
- e. Whether Coupons.com should be enjoined from engaging in this type of conduct.
- 31. *Typicality*. Plaintiff's claims are typical of class members' claims. Plaintiff and the class members all sustained injury as a direct result of Coupons.com's illegal imposition of expiration dates on its Daily Deal gift certificates.
- 32. Adequacy. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect class members' interests.

 Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to Class members' interests, and he has retained counsel that has considerable experience and success in prosecuting complex class-action and consumer-protection cases.

- 33. Superiority. A class action is the superior method for fairly and efficiently adjudicating this controversy for the following reasons without limitation:
- a. Class members' claims are relatively small compared to the burden and expense required to litigate their claims individually, so it would be impracticable for Class members to seek individual redress for Coupons.com's illegal and deceptive conduct;
- b. Even if Class members could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. Individual litigation creates the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments and increases the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system. By contrast, a class action presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court; and
 - c. Plaintiff anticipates no unusual difficulties in managing this class action.

COUNT I Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.,

- 34. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as though alleged in this Count.
- 35. Section 17200 of the California Business & Professions Code ("UCL") prohibits any "unlawful," "unfair," or "fraudulent" business practice.
- 36. Coupons.com violated the "unlawful" prong of the UCL by selling and issuing gift certificates with expiration dates prohibited by California law, Cal. Civ. Code § 1749.5.
- 37. Coupons.com's illegal and deceptive conduct was additionally "unlawful" in that it violated the CLRA, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.
- 38. Coupons.com's practice of selling and issuing gift certificates with illegal and deceptive expiration dates violated the "unfair" prong of the UCL because it was immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, unconscionable, and/or substantially injurious to Plaintiff

and Class members. Coupons.com's practice was also contrary to legislatively declared and public policy and the harm it caused to consumers outweighed its utility.

- 39. Coupons.com violated the "fraudulent" prong of the UCL by making material misrepresentations and by failing to disclose material information regarding the true nature of its Daily Deals gift certificates and the illegality of the expiration dates on its gift certificates.

 Coupons.com's material misrepresentations and failure to disclose were likely to mislead the public.
- 40. Plaintiff relied on Coupons.com's material misrepresentations and nondisclosures, and would not have purchased the gift certificates had he known the truth.
- 41. As a direct and proximate result of Coupons.com's unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent conduct Plaintiff lost money or property, including the money that he paid to purchase his Coupons.com gift certificates and the stated monetary value of those gift certificates.
- 42. Coupons.com's conduct caused substantial injury to Plaintiff and Class members. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks an order enjoining Coupons.com from committing such unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices and requiring Coupons.com to return the full amount of money that Class members paid for their gift certificates. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees and costs under Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5.

COUNT II Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17500 et seq.,

- 43. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as though alleged in this Count.
- 44. Coupons.com committed acts of untrue and misleading advertising likely to deceive the public, as defined in Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, et seq., by:
- a. Falsely representing its Daily Deal gift certificates as "promotional certificates" or "coupons";

and

- b. Failing to disclose that its gift certificates' expiration dates were illegal;
- c. Falsely representing that consumers could obtain a cash refund for their gift certificates only if presented to Coupons.com within 30 days of purchase.
- 45. Coupons.com's untrue and misleading advertising was objectively material, in that a reasonable consumer would have acted differently in the face of the truth.
- 46. Plaintiff relied on Coupons.com's untrue and misleading advertising and would not have purchased the gift certificates had he known the truth.
- 47. As a result of Coupons.com's untrue and misleading advertising, Plaintiff lost money or property, including the money he paid to purchase his Coupons.com gift certificates and the stated monetary value of those gift certificates.
- 48. Coupons.com's conduct caused substantial injury to Plaintiff and Class members. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks an order enjoining Coupons.com from such untrue and misleading advertising and requiring Coupons.com to return the full amount of money that Class members paid for the gift certificates. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees and costs as permitted by Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5.

COUNT III Violations of the Consumer Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code §1750 et seq.

- 49. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as though alleged in this Count.
 - 50. Coupons.com is a "person," as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1761(c).
 - 51. Plaintiff and the Class are "consumers," as defined by Cal. Civ. Code §1761(d).
- 52. The gift certificates that Coupons.com sold constitute "goods" and "services," as defined by Cal. Civ. Code §1761(a) and (b).

- 53. Plaintiff's and Class members' purchases of Coupons.com gift certificates constitute "transactions," as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1761(e).
- 54. Plaintiff and Class members purchased Coupons.com's gift certificates for personal, family, and household purposes as meant by Cal. Civ. Code § 1761(d).
- 55. Venue is proper under Cal. Civil Code § 1780(c) because Coupons.com has its principal place of business in this District. Plaintiff's Declaration establishing that this Court has proper venue for this action is attached as Exhibit A.
- 56. Coupons.com's actions deceived consumers in that these actions misrepresented, failed to disclose, or actively concealed (a) the true nature of Coupons.com's Daily Deals (by describing them as "promotional certificates" rather than as "gift certificates") and (b) the illegality of the expiration dates that Coupons.com imposed on its gift certificates.
- 57. Coupons.com's misrepresentations, active concealment, and failure to disclose violated the CLRA in the following manner:
- a. Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates had characteristics, benefits, or uses that they did not have (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5));
- b. Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates were of a particular standard, quality, and/or grade when they were of another (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7));
- c. Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates conferred or involved rights, remedies, or obligations that they did not have, and Coupons.com failed to disclose that its gift certificates imposed expiration dates and other illegal and/or onerous terms (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(14));
- d. Coupons.com inserted unconscionable provisions in its contract for purchasing gift certificates—specifically, illegal expiration dates and illegal requirements that consumers request refunds within 30 days of purchase (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(19)).

- 58. The facts and information regarding Coupons.com's gift certificates and their expirations dates that Coupons.com misrepresented, failed to disclose, and actively concealed to Plaintiff and Class members were material because a reasonable person would have considered them important in deciding whether or not to purchase the gift certificates and because Coupons.com had a duty to disclose the truth.
- 59. Plaintiff and Class members relied upon Coupons.com's misrepresentations and nondisclosures regarding its gift certificates and their expiration dates and had Plaintiff and Class members known the truth, they would have acted differently.
- 60. As a direct and proximate result of Coupons.com's misrepresentations and nondisclosures, Plaintiff and the Class have been irreparably harmed.
- 61. On behalf of the Class, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief in the form of an order enjoining Coupons.com from imposing illegal expiration dates on gift certificates in the future as well as attorneys' fees and costs.
- 62. In accordance with Cal. Civ. Code § 1782(a), on April 17, 2013 Plaintiffs' counsel served Coupons.com with notice of its CLRA violations by certified mail, return receipt requested. A true and correct copy of that notice is attached as Exhibit B.
- 63. If Coupons.com fails to provide appropriate relief for its CLRA violations within 30 days of Plaintiffs' April 17, 2013 notification letter, Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to seek compensatory and exemplary damages as permitted by Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1780 and 1782(b).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- On behalf of himself and the Class, Plaintiff requests that the Court order relief and enter judgment against Coupons.com as follows:
- 2. An order certifying Plaintiff's proposed Class and appointing Plaintiff and his counsel to represent the Class;

1	3. An order that Coup	ons.com is permanently enjoined from its improper conduct				
2	and practices as alleged;					
3	4. A judgment awarding Plaintiff and Class members restitution, including, withou					
4	limitation, restitutionary disgorgement of all profits and unjust enrichment that Coupons.com					
5	obtained as a result of its unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices and conduct;					
6						
7	5. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;					
8	6. Attorneys' fees, expenses, and the costs of this action; and					
9	7. All other and further relief as this Court deems necessary, just, and proper.					
10		JURY DEMAND				
11	Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.					
12	16					
13	Dated: April 18, 2013	Respectfully submitted,				
14		LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP				
15		- Mann				
16		By: Nicole D. Reynolds				
17 18		Michael W. Sobol				
19		msobol@lchb.com Eric B. Fastiff				
20		efastiff@lcbh.com				
21		Nicole D. Reynolds nreynolds@lchb.com				
22		LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN LLP 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor				
23		San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 956-1000				
24		Daniel R. Karon				
25		karon@gskplaw.com GOLDMAN SCARLATO KARON				
26		& PENNY, P.C.				
27		700 W. St. Clair Avenue, Ste. 204 Cleveland, OH 44113				
28		Telephone: (216) 622-1851				
ľ						

Laura Killian Mummert

mummert@gskplaw.com

GOLDMAN SCARLATO KARON
& PENNY, P.C

101 E. Lancaster Ave., Ste. 204

Wayne, PA 19087

Telephone: (484) 342-0700

Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT A

1	Michael W. Sobol (State Bar No. 194857)	1				
2	Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260)					
3	LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN LLD					
3	San Francisco, CA 94111					
4	Telephone: (415) 956-1000					
5	E-mail: nreynolds@lchb.com msobol@lchb.com					
6	efastiff@lcbh.com					
7	Daniel R. Karon (to be admitted pro hac v GOLDMAN SCARLATO KARON	ice)				
8	& PENNY, P.C. 700 W. St. Clair Avenue, Ste. 204					
	Cleveland, OH 44113					
9	Telephone: (216) 622-1851 E-mail: karon@gskplaw.com					
10						
11	Laura Killian Mummert (to be admitted pro hac vice) GOLDMAN SCARLATO KARON & PENNY, P.C 101 E. Lancaster Ave., Ste. 204 Wayne, PA 19087					
12						
13	Telephone: (484) 342-0700 E-mail: mummert@gskplaw.com					
14						
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs					
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
18	SAN JOSE DIVISION					
19						
20	ADAM SAVETT, individually and on	Case No.				
21	behalf of all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT				
	Plaintiff,					
22	v.	DECLARATION OF ADAM SAVETT				
23	COUPONS.COM, INC.,					
24	Defendant.					
25	Delemant.					
26						
27						
28						
·	1092383.1	DBCLARATION OF ADAM SAVETI				

I, Adam Savett, hereby declare and state as follows:

- 1. I am over the age of 18, and a Plaintiff in this action. The facts contained in this declaration are based on my personal knowledge, and if called upon to do so, I could and would testify competently hereto.
- 2. The complaint in this action, filed concurrently with this declaration, is filed in the proper place for trial under California Civil Code § 1780(d), because Coupons.com, Inc.'s principal place of business is in this District.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on April 16th, 2013, in Solon, Ohio

Adam Savett

EXHIBIT B

Lieff Cabraser Heimann& Bernstein Attorneys at Law Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 t 415.956.1000 f 415.956.1008

April 17, 2013

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REOUESTED

Steven R. Boal, President and CEO Richard Hornstein, General Counsel and CFO Coupons.com, Inc. 400 Logue Avenue Mountain View, CA 94043

Registered Agent for Service of Process C T Corporation System 818 W Seventh St Los Angeles CA 90017

Re: Notice of Violation of California Consumer Legal Remedies Act

Dear Mr. Boal and Mr. Hornstein:

We represent Adam Savett, who purchased two Coupons.com "Daily Deals" gift certificates with purported expiration dates on March 27, 2011. We send this letter under the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code Section 1750 et seq. ("CLRA"), to notify Coupons.com that its sale of Daily Deals gift certificates with illegal expiration dates violated the CLRA and to demand that Coupons.com rectify its violations within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Coupons.com sold to Ms. Savett and other consumers Daily Deal gift certificates with expiration dates prohibited by California Civil Code § 1749.5. On or about March 27, 2011, Coupons.com sent Mr. Savett a Daily Deal e-mail offer for Finish Line Car Wash gift certificates. Mr. Savett bought two certificates (one of which he gave to a friend) costing \$14.99 each, plus a shipping and handling fee of \$1.50, for a total of \$31.48. The Finish Line Car Wash gift certificates that Coupons.com issued and sent to Mr. Savett purported to expire on April 1, 2012. Mr. Savett was unable to redeem the gift certificate he kept for himself before the purported expiration date.

Coupons.com misrepresented to Mr. Savett and consumers that its Daily Deals were "promotional certificates" or "coupons," but because they were sold in exchange for a payment, and because they were issued for a specified value, they were "gift certificates" under California law and thus subject to California's gift certificate law. See Cal. Civ. Code § 1749.5(d)(1).

San Francisco

New York

Nashville

www.lieffcabraser.com

April 17, 2013 Page 2

Coupons.com also misrepresented to Mr. Savett and consumers that they could not obtain refunds for any unused Daily Deal, unless the refund was requested within 30 days of purchase, even though California law requires that gift certificates be redeemable for their full cash value at any time. See Cal. Civ. Code § 1749.5(b)(1). Mr. Savett reasonably believed that he could not obtain a refund for his Daily Deal after its expiration, and was thus harmed by Coupons.com's misrepresentations.

Coupons.com's material misrepresentations and failures to disclose violated the CLRA in the following manner:

- Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates had characteristics, benefits, or uses that they did not have (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5));
- Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates were of a particular standard, quality, and/or grade when they were of another (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7));
- 3. Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates conferred or involved rights, remedies, or obligations that they did not have, and Coupons.com failed to disclose that its gift certificates imposed expiration dates and other illegal and/or onerous terms (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(14));
- 4. Coupons.com inserted unconscionable provisions in its contract for purchasing gift certificates; specifically, illegal expiration dates and illegal requirements that consumers request refunds within 30 days of purchase (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(19)).

We demand that within thirty (30) days of receiving this letter, Coupons.com agree to (1) refrain from engaging in the deceptive practices described above at any time in the future; and (2) return all money Coupons.com's customers paid for unredeemed, expired Daily Deals. If Coupons.com refuses to provide the demanded relief within thirty (30) days, we will seek compensatory and punitive damages, restitution, and any other appropriate equitable relief.

We sincerely hope to confer with you to resolve these violations without the need for litigation. I invite you to contact me to discuss this demand at any time. I can be reached at (415) 956-1000 ext. 2230 or nreynolds@lchb.com. I look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

Nicole D. Reynolds

April 17, 2013 Page 2

Coupons.com also misrepresented to Mr. Savett and consumers that they could not obtain refunds for any unused Daily Deal, unless the refund was requested within 30 days of purchase, even though California law requires that gift certificates be redeemable for their full cash value at any time. See Cal. Civ. Code § 1749.5(b)(1). Mr. Savett reasonably believed that he could not obtain a refund for his Daily Deal after its expiration, and was thus harmed by Coupons.com's misrepresentations.

Coupons.com's material misrepresentations and failures to disclose violated the CLRA in the following manner:

- Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates had characteristics, benefits, or uses that they did not have (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5));
- Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates were of a particular standard, quality, and/or grade when they were of another (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7));
- 3. Coupons.com represented that its gift certificates conferred or involved rights, remedies, or obligations that they did not have, and Coupons.com failed to disclose that its gift certificates imposed expiration dates and other illegal and/or onerous terms (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(14));
- 4. Coupons.com inserted unconscionable provisions in its contract for purchasing gift certificates; specifically, illegal expiration dates and illegal requirements that consumers request refunds within 30 days of purchase (Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(19)).

We demand that within thirty (30) days of receiving this letter, Coupons.com agree to (1) refrain from engaging in the deceptive practices described above at any time in the future; and (2) return all money Coupons.com's customers paid for unredeemed, expired Daily Deals. If Coupons.com refuses to provide the demanded relief within thirty (30) days, we will seek compensatory and punitive damages, restitution, and any other appropriate equitable relief.

We sincerely hope to confer with you to resolve these violations without the need for litigation. I invite you to contact me to discuss this demand at any time. I can be reached at (415) 956-1000 ext. 2230 or nreynolds@lchb.com. I look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

Nicole D. Reynolds





U.S. Postal Service To CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT (Domestic Mail Only: No Insurance Coverage Providec)

For delivery Information visit our website at www.usps.com

OFFICIAL USE

Postage
Certified Fee

Service (Endorsement Required)

Total Postage & Fees

Steven R. Boal, President and CEO

Richard Hornstein, General Counsel and CFO

City, & 400 Logue Avenue

Mountain View, CA 94043

Steven R. Boal, President and CEO
Richard Hornstein, General Counsel and CFO
Coupons.com, Inc.
400 Logue Avenue
Mountain View, CA 94043

Lieff Cabraser Heimann8 Bernstein

2. Article Number 7012 2920 0002 2940 3933 (Manufort from service label)

in nailw ii Ineserq bins taceigs and "YATHOTMI THOG-000-SC-CET M29 (serevelt) 2005 impua ,0085 impi 29

If a postment on the Certified MeB receipt is desired, plude at the post office for postmenting, if a postment is receipt is not needed, detach and sink label with posts.

Ecr. an additional fee, delivery may be restricted addresses's authorized agent. Advice the clerk or mark endorsement. Restricted Delivery.

Mentages or to be used.

For an additional lee, a . Fatum Receipt may be nequeed delivery. To obtain Receipt service, please compite of the compite service and additional receipt service. The compite service and separate of the Endorse return receipt, a USPSe postmant on your Disquired.

■ NO INSURANCE COVERAGE IS PROVIDED with valuables, please consider insured or Registered Mail.

Ampovient Reminders:

Certified Mell may CNLY be combined with First-Class

Certified Mell is not available for any class of internation

■ A record of delivery kept by the Postal Service for two

A unique identifier for your mailpiece

sqiecen gnilliam A =

Certified Mail Provides:



Registered Agent for Service of Process CT Corporation System 8₁8 W Seventh St. Los Angeles CA 90017

Lieff Cabraser Heimann& Bernstein

SENDER: COMPUETE THIS STOTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
S. Complete Name 1, 2, and 3. Also complete Nam 4 If Pestitional Delivery is desired.	A Signature
e other we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the malipiace, or on the front if apace permits.	B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery
1. Article Addressed to:	D. Is delivery extranse critiseent from 10th 11th 11th 10th 11th 11th 11th 11th
Registered Agent for Service of Process	- lore
818 W Seventh St Los Angeles CA 90017	3. Servide Type Courtied Mail D Express Mail D Registered D Thetam Receipt for Merchandlee D Insured Mail D CO.D.
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) 🔲 Ves
2. Article Number 701.2	701.2 2920 0002 2340 3926
904	Domestic Return Receipt 102595-02-M-1540

Certified Wall Provides:

A mailing receipt

A mindue identifier to your mailpiece

A unique identifier to your mailpiece

A unique identifier to your mailpiece

Moverant Reminder VIII be combined with First-Ciese Melia

Certified Meli Is not available for any cless of international marginals for a complete and receipt for Form 3811) to the service, please or required to the actual and applicate mailplace of the service, please or additional feet, delivery may be restricted boats and a countries actually and applicated and applicated and applicated actual countries and in the countries of the service, please or mark the mail is postinated on the Certifier Meli marking is a postinated on the control of the control of the countries of the postination of the certifier and affix is a postinated on the certifier of the postinated on the control of the certifier of the postinated on the certifier of the post office for postinated with postsege and necessity is not meaded, detect and affix is any post office of the postinated on the certifier and affix is any post office.

In postinate on needed, detect and affix is any postsege and in the certifier and affix is any postsege and in the certifier and affix any action of the certifier and action of the certifier and action of the certi

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12) Cand rev (1/15/13)

CIVIL COVER SHEET



The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by Jaw, a cepta 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 Impose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

Adam Savett				Coupons.com, I		E-FILINU				
	(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Cuyahoga County, Ohio (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Santa Clara County (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
Nicole D. Reynolds (1 Lieff, Cabraser, Heim 275 Battery Street, 29 San Francisco, CA 94		CV	13	Attorneys (If Kn -0.1	7 5			ings ty facts to the state of		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	OICTION (Place on "X" ii	One Box Only)	III. CITI	ZENSHIP OF For Diversity Cases O	PRINC	IPAL PARTIES (P	lace an "X" in One and One Box fo	Bux for Plat	n/ff	
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government No.	n a Party)		n of This State	PTF	DEF I Incorporated or P of Business in	rincipal Place	PTF C	ĎEF Z 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant		of Parties in Item III)	Citize	n of Another State	X 12	2 Incorporated and of Business In	Principal Place Another State	□ 5 [] 5	
	+ CIASS ACH FAIRLESS A	·		n or Subject of a eign Country	□ 3	3 Foreign Nation		□ 6 [□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						·		
CONTRACT		1986年 - 1986年		READILY OF STATE	1	BASESUPTCY	OTHER 8	TATUTES		
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Liability	PERSONAL INJU 365 Personal Injury Product Liabil 367 Health Care/ Pharmaccutical Personal Injury Product Liabil 368 Asbestos Personal	y - ity □ 690 I ty	Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC : Other	881 43 	22 Appeal 28 USC 158 23 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 20 Copyrights 30 Patent 40 Trademark	☐ 375 False Cla ☐ 400 State Res ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks an ☐ 450 Commen ☐ 460 Deportat ☐ 470 Racketee Corrupt (apportionme d Banking ce ion	l and	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpracice	Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROP 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lendin 360 Other Personal Proporty Dama Product Liability	ERTY 710 ng 720 ge 751 by 790	Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation		51 HIA (1395m) 52 Black Lung (923) 53 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 54 SSID Title XVI 55 RSI (405(g))	480 Consume 490 Cable/Sa 850 Securitie Exchang 890 Other Sts 891 Agricultu 893 Environn 895 Freedom Act	er Credit t TV s/Commodit e stutory Actio gral Acte mental Matte of Informati	nies/ ons rs ion	
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other 448 Education	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vac Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other:	other 465	Employee Retirement Income Security Act Income Security Act Naturalization Applic Other Immigration Actions	□ 87 □ 87	70 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 71 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	■ 899 Administ Act/Revie Agency D 950 Constituti State State	ow or Appeal Decision ionality of		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Bax Only) 1 Original										
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Cite the U.S. Civil Statu Brief description of caus Unlawful, unfair, and fr	e:	 -	<u></u> .			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		A CLASS ACTION	DE	MANDS INJUM A Rhuhum hr all Class memo	Chian 1			omplaint:		
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		- Inchia		OCKET NUMBER			_	
IX. DIVISIONAL ASSI (Place an "X" in One Box Only		•	J ED ANC	ISCO/OAPI A	NID.	YX CAN LOCE	() priper			
DATE April 18, 2013		SIGNATURE OF ATTO		ISCO/OAKLA CORD	מאו	SAN JOSE	() EUREK	<u>.A</u>	—	
•		_/UUU/I	yvy			FAX	ED			

Case5:13-cv-01751-HRL Document1-1 Filed04/18/13 Page2 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

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

- I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

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

 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

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

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

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

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

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

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

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

```
Figure 1. The second of the se
```