1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	NEWPORT TRIAL GROUP Scott J. Ferrell (SBN 202091) sferrell@trialnewport.com Richard H. Hikida (SBN 196149) rhikida@trialnewport.com Victoria C. Knowles (SBN 277231) vknowles@trialnewport.com 4100 Newport Place Drive, Suite 800 Newport Beach, CA 92660 Telephone: (949)706-6464 Facsimile: (949)706-6469 Counsel for Plaintiff and all others similarly situated	
9	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
10	DISTRICT OF SOUT	HERN CALIFORNIA
11	DISTRICT OF SOCI	HERI CALIFORNIA
12	ISABELLA JANOVICK, on behalf of	Case No. '13CV2697 DMS KSC
13	herself and all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:
14	Plaintiffs,	1. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S
15	V.	FALSE ADVERTISING LAWS ("FAL"); Bus. & Prof. Code §17500 et seq.; and
16	AMERICAN BREAST CANCER FOUNDATION, INC., a Maryland	2. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S
17	Corporation; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	UNFAIR COMPETITION LAWS ("UCL"); Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 et
18	Defendants.	seq.
19		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
20	Plaintiff Isabella Janovick on behalf	of herself and all others similarly situated,
21	alleges the following upon information and	belief based upon investigation of counsel,
22	except as to her own acts, which she alleges	upon personal knowledge:
23	///	
24	///	
25	///	
26	///	
27	///	
28	///	

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Isabella Janovick is a resident of California who donated money to Defendant American Breast Cancer Foundation, Inc. ("Defendant ABCF") in 2013. Plaintiff donated to Defendant ABCF after reviewing Defendant ABCF's website, http://www.abcf.org/, and relying on the representations contained therein.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant ABCF is a Maryland corporation and a charitable organization subject to tax exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States. Defendant ABCF's mission statement is as follows: "to provide financial assistance for breast cancer screenings and diagnostic tests for uninsured and underserved individuals, regardless of age or gender."¹
- 3. The true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when such identities become known.
- 4. At all relevant times, each and every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants and was acting within the course and/or scope of said agency and/or employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the Defendants. Each of the acts and/or omissions complained of herein were alleged and made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants (Defendant ABCF and DOE Defendants will hereafter collectively be referred to as "Defendant").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. A Court has diversity jurisdiction over this class action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 as amended by the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs, and is a

¹ See http://www.abcf.org/ABCF-Mission.htm (last visited August 29, 2013).

class action in which some members of the class are citizens of different states than the Defendant. *See* 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2)(A).

- 6. This Court also has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant currently does business in this state.
- 7. Venue is proper in this jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District and a substantial portion of the conduct complained of herein occurred in this District.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. Defendant ABCF, dubbed America's fourth worst charity by the Tampa Bay Times, the Center for Investigative Reporting, and Cable News Network (*i.e.*, CNN), is a tax exempt, 501(c)(3) Charitable Organization that claims to be dedicated "to provid[ing] financial assistance for breast cancer screenings and diagnostic tests for uninsured and underserved individuals, regardless of age or gender." Defendant claims to raise funds through donations "relentlessly" so it may "Continue to partner with medical clinics across the nation to provide affordable breast cancer screening and treatment services, especially for those who are usually not eligible to receive funding assistance because of their age and gender"; "Further reduce screening and treatment costs for those in need"; "Increase the number of persons who will receive funding assistance toward the provision of vital screening and diagnostic testing"; and "Continue its efforts to educate the public on the importance of breast self examinations for early detection and treatment of breast cancer."
- 9. Defendant ABCF claims to use the charitable donations collected from the public to help people in need with breast cancer screenings and diagnostic tests; however, *a mere fraction* of the donations received from concerned donors all over the country actually reaches the people for which Defendant ABCF supposedly operates.

| | / / /

 2 Id.

³ See http://www.abcf.org/ABCF-What-We-Do.htm (last visited August 29, 2013).

- 10. Indeed, it has been recently reported that an average of **only 5.3% of the approximately \$80 million** raised by Defendant ABCF since its existence actually made it to people in need in direct cash aid.⁴
- 11. Instead of the millions of dollars raised in the name of protecting underserved populations from breast cancer, the vast majority of the millions raised goes to Defendant ABCF's operators and the for-profit companies Defendant ABCF hires to solicit donations, *i.e.*, corporate fundraisers. This means that **a mere fraction from every dollar raised actually goes to people in need**. Defendant fails to disclose this fact to its donors.
- 12. Aside from Defendant ABCF's payment of approximately \$59.8 million in cash to solicitors and for-profit fundraisers, Defendant ABCF has collected approximately \$21 million in cash which went directly to the charity but was not passed on to the people they purportedly serve. Indeed, direct cash aid to those in need totaled approximately \$4.2 million since its inception. Perhaps even more egregious, during founder Phyllis Wolf's tenure with ABCF, corporate fundraisers received 75 cents of every dollar raised and between 2003 and 2010, and Ms. Wolf's son's telemarketing company was paid nearly \$18 million to raise donations for Defendant ABCF. It was further reported by the Tampa Bay Times, the Center for Investigative Reporting, and CNN that "In June 2010, after negative publicity about the Wolf contract, the charity's board forced Phyllis Wolf to resign and terminated the contract with her son. Wolf received \$126,500 in salary that year; her son's company got \$134,733. Cancer patients got [only] \$20,000 in mammogram assistance that year."

23 || / / /

24 | / / /

^{4 &}quot;America's Worst Charities" is a report created by the collaboration of the Tampa Bay Times, the California-based Center for Investigative Reporting, and CNN. Available at www.tampabay.com/americas-worst-charities (last updated June 22, 2013).

⁵ *Id*.

⁶ *Id*.

⁷ *Id*.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
- 13 14
- 16

18

19

17

20

21

22 23

24

25

18.

26

27

28

http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/health/american-breast-cancer-foundation-in-baltimore-md-See 1394/conclusions (last visited August 29, 2013).

- Plaintiff reasonably relied on Defendant ABCF's rhetoric about donors' charitable gifts going to assist underserved populations' fight against breast cancer. After reviewing Defendant ABCF's website, Plaintiff made a donation, expecting that her contribution would directly aid those in need.
- 15. Defendant fraudulently induces consumers and donors in making sizable charitable donations amounting to millions of dollars a year by misleading donors into believing that their donations, or at least a majority thereof, are directly aiding populations in need. In reality, Defendant uses the majority of donations to pay forprofit companies hired by Defendant to solicit more donations, i.e., corporate fundraisers.

CLASS DEFINITIONS AND CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 16. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated as members of the class (referred to hereafter as the "Class") defined as follows:
 - "All persons who are citizens or residents of California who donated money to Defendant American Breast Cancer Foundation, Inc. within the four years prior to the filing of the initial complaint in this action through the date of trial in this action."
- 17. This action is brought and may be properly maintained as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(1)-(4) and 23(b)(1)-
- This action satisfies the numerosity, typicality, adequacy, predominance and superiority requirements of those provisions.
- is impractical. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). While the exact number and identities of

The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its members

28 | / / /

Class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes the Class includes tens of thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that the Class may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

- 19. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of the Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2). These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary from class member to class member, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any class member, include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - (a) Whether Defendant's advertising, marketing and solicitation is false or misleading;
 - (b) Whether Defendant has misled donors to profit therefrom;
 - (c) Whether Defendant's conduct is "unlawful" under Bus. & Prof. Code Section 17200;
 - (d) Whether Defendant's conduct is "unfair" under Bus. & Prof. Code Section 17200;
 - (e) Whether Defendant's conduct is "fraudulent" under Bus. & Prof. Code Section 17200;
 - (f) Whether, as a result of Defendant's misconduct, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to damages, restitution, equitable relief and other relief, and the amount and nature of such relief.
- 20. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3). Plaintiff and all members of the Class have sustained injury and are facing irreparable harm arising out of Defendant's common course of conduct as complained of herein. The losses of each member of the Class were caused directly by Defendant's wrongful conduct as alleged herein.

///

- 21. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions, including complex consumer and mass tort litigation.
- 22. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims of all Class members is impracticable. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). Even if every Class member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments, and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action, with respect to some or all of the issues presented herein, presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Class member.
- 23. The prosecution of separate actions by thousands of individual Class members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to, among other things, the need for and the nature of proper notice, which Defendant must provide to all Class members. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1)(A).
- 24. The prosecution of separate actions by individual class members would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to such adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-party Class members to protect their interests. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1)(B).
- 25. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief with regard to the members of the Class as a whole. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2).

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Business & Professions Code § 17500

(Violation of the False Advertising Law)

(By Plaintiff and the Class Against All Defendants)

- 26. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the preceding paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
- 27. California Business and Professions Code (the "Code") § 17500 provides that "[i]t is unlawful for any . . . corporation . . . with intent directly or indirectly to dispose of . . . personal property or to perform services, professional or otherwise, or anything of any nature whatsoever or to induce the public to enter into any obligation relating thereto, to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated before the public in this state, or to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated from this state before the public in any state, in any newspaper or other publication, or any advertising device, or by public outcry or proclamation, or in any other manner or means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement . . . which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading"
- 28. Defendant intended to dispose of property, perform services, or induce the public to enter into an obligation relating thereto, and misled consumers by making untrue or misleading statements and failing to disclose what is required as stated in the Code, as alleged above, with knowledge that the statements made were untrue or misleading or which, by the exercise of reasonable care, should be known to be untrue or misleading.
- 29. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's misleading and false advertising, marketing, and solicitation, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have each suffered an injury in fact and have lost money or property.

27 | | / / /

28 || / / /

1	30. The misleading and false advertising, marketing, and solicitation described							
2	herein presents a continuing threat to Plaintiff and the Class in that Defendant persists							
3	and continues to engage in these practices, and will not cease doing so unless and until							
4	forced to do so by this Court. Defendant's conduct will continue to cause irreparable							
5	injury to consumers unless enjoined or restrained.							
6	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION							
7	Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.							
8	(Violation of the Unfair Competition Law)							
9	(By Plaintiff and the Class Against All Defendants)							
10	31. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the preceding paragraphs above as if fully set							
11	forth herein.							
12	32. California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq., (the "Unfair							
13	Competition Law" or "UCL") authorizes private lawsuits to enjoin acts of "unfair							
14	competition" which includes any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business practice.							
15	33. Government Code § 12599.6 deems it unlawful to "misrepresent the							
16	purpose of the charitable organization or the nature or purpose or beneficiary of a							
17	solicitation." Cal. Gov't Code § 12599.6(a). Further, "A misrepresentation may be							
18	accomplished by words or conduct or failure to disclose a material fact." Id.							
19	"Regardless of injury, the following acts and practices are prohibited in the planning,							
20	conduct, or execution of any solicitation or charitable sales promotion:							
21	((1) O							
22	"(1) Operating in violation of, or failing to comply with, any of the requirements of this act							
23	(2) Using any unfair or deceptive acts or practices or engaging in any							
24	fraudulent conduct that creates a likelihood of confusion or misunderstanding .							
25	misunder standing.							
26	(3) Using any name, symbol, emblem, statement, or other material stating ,							
27	suggesting, or implying to a reasonable person that the contribution is to or for the benefit of a particular charitable organization when that							
28	is not the fact.							

3

4

56

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15 16

1718

20

21

19

22

24

23

2526

27

28 | /

(4) Misrepresenting or misleading anyone in any manner to believe that the person on whose behalf a solicitation or charitable sales promotion is being conducted is a charitable organization or that the proceeds of the solicitation or charitable sales promotion will be used for charitable purposes when that is not the fact.

. . .

(8) Representing directly or by implication that a charitable organization will receive an amount greater than the actual net proceeds reasonably estimated to be retained by the charity for its use."

Cal. Gov't Code § 12599.6(f)(1)-(4), (8) (emphasis added).

- 34. The UCL imposes strict liability. Plaintiff need not prove that Defendant intentionally or negligently engaged in unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices—but only that such practices occurred.
- 35. The material misrepresentations, concealment, and non-disclosures by Defendant as part of its marketing, solicitation and advertising for its charitable practices constitutes unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices prohibited by Indeed, Defendant's conduct violates Government Code § 12599.6 as the UCL. detailed above as Defendant: (1) misrepresented the purpose of American Breast Cancer Foundation, Inc. as well as the nature, purpose, and beneficiary of their solicitation; (2) created an extreme likelihood of, and did cause, confusion amongst Plaintiff and the Class about the nature, purpose, and beneficiaries of American Breast Cancer Foundation, Inc.; (3) made material statements suggesting and implying to reasonable persons, i.e., Plaintiff and the Class, that their contributions were for the benefit of a particular charitable organization when that is not the fact; (4) made material misrepresentations that the proceeds of the solicitations would be used for charitable purposes when that was not the fact; and (5) represented directly or by implication that American Breast Cancer Foundation, Inc. will receive an amount greater than the actual net proceeds reasonably estimated to be retained by the charity for its use.

- 36. In carrying out such marketing, advertising, and solicitation, Defendant has additionally violated the False Advertising Law, and/or common law duties, which necessarily violates the UCL. Defendant's business practices alleged herein, therefore, are unlawful within the meaning of the UCL.
- 37. The harm to Plaintiff and members of the public, the Class, outweighs the utility of Defendant's practices and, consequently, Defendant's practices, as set forth fully above, constitute an unfair business act or practice within the meaning of the UCL.
- 38. Defendant's practices are additionally unfair because they have caused Plaintiff and the Class substantial injury, which is not outweighed by any countervailing limited benefits to consumers, and is not an injury the consumers themselves could have reasonably avoided.
- 39. Defendant's practices, as set forth above, have misled the general public in the past and will mislead the general public in the future. Consequently, Defendant's practices constitute an unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business practice within the meaning of the UCL.
- 40. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17204, an action for unfair competition may be brought by any "person . . . who has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of such unfair competition." Defendant's wrongful misrepresentations and omissions have directly and seriously injured Plaintiff and the Class by causing them to pay to Defendant ABCF what they thought were charitable contributions because they relied on the false and misleading marketing, solicitation and advertising statements of Defendant ABCF.
- 41. The unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices of Defendant are ongoing and present a continuing threat to members of the public because they will continue to be misled by Defendant's false and misleading marketing, advertising, and solicitation statements.
- 42. Pursuant to the UCL, Plaintiff is entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief ordering Defendant to cease this unfair competition, as well as

disgorgement and restitution to Plaintiff and the Class of all of Defendant's revenues associated with Defendant's unfair competition, or such portion of those revenues as the Court may find equitable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class, prays for relief and judgment as follows:

- 1. For preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining Defendant, its agents, servants and employees, and all persons acting in concert with them, from engaging in, and continuing to engage in, the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices alleged above and that may yet be discovered in the prosecution of this action;
 - 2. For certification of the putative class;
- 3. For restitution and disgorgement of all money or property wrongfully obtained by Defendant by means of their herein-alleged unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices;
- 4. For an accounting by Defendant for any and all profits derived by Defendant from its herein-alleged unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent conduct and/or business practices;
 - 5. An award of statutory damages according to proof;
 - 6. An award of general damages according to proof;
- 7. For attorneys' fees and expenses pursuant to all applicable laws including, without limitation, Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 and the common law private attorney general doctrine;
 - 9. For costs of suit; and

25 | / / /

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26 | / / /

27 | / / /

28 | / / /

For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 10. Dated: November 8, 2013 NEWPORT TRIAL GROUP VICTORIA C. KNOWLES Counsel for Plaintiff and all others similarly situated

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Isabella Janovick (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego, CA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) NEWPORT TRIAL GROUP 4100 Newport Place Drive, Suite 800 Newport Beach, CA 92660 (949) 706-6464				DEFENDANT American Breast	S Cancer Fo	undation, Inc.	·		**	
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Maryland (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known) 13 CV2697 DMS KSC						
										II. BASIS OF JURISD
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)		(Fo	r Diversity Cases Only) F	TF DEF	Incorporated or Pr	and One Box for incipal Place			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant				Citizen of Another State						
			Citizen or Subject of a						□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT										
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosture □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product	☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage	Y	LABOR ir Labor Standards ct bor/Management elations ilway Labor Act mily and Medical ave Act her Labor Litigation uployee Retirement come Security Act	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUTS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609		OTHER STATUTES ☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes			
	Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	☐ 462 Na ☐ 465 Ot	IMIGRATION turalization Application her Immigration tions						
	noved from 🗖 3	Remanded from	4 Reinstate Reopene		erred from r District	6 MultidistriLitigation	ct			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N Brief description of ca	tute under which you are f ; 28 U.S.C. § 1331- F use: alms under California	ederal Q	<i>t cite jurisdictional stat</i> uestion			Practicos			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMA		CH	IECK YES only in RY DEMAND:	f demanded in c	•	:	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY		JUDGE		**		NUMBER	∑d 1 c2	□ No		
DATE 11/08/2013		SIGNATURE OF ATTOR		To the same of the	5	5	`			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		zata di zation, L	<u>- ч</u> .							
RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDO	GE			

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 12/12)

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.