1 2 3 4 5 6	JOHN H. DONBOLI (SBN: 205218) E-mail: jdonboli@delmarlawgroup.com JL SEAN SLATTERY (SBN: 210965) E-mail: sslattery@delmarlawgroup.com DEL MAR LAW GROUP, LLP 12250 El Camino Real, Suite 120 San Diego, CA 92130 Telephone: (858) 793-6244 Facsimile: (858) 793-6005 Attorneys for Plaintiff: LOUISE CLARE							
7	of all others similarly situated							
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
9								
10	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
11	LOUISE CLARK, an individual and on	CASE NO. '14CV1404 JLS WVG						
12	behalf of all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION						
13	Plaintiff,	<u>CLASS ACTION</u>						
14		COMPLAINT FOR:						
15	vs.	(1) VIOLATION OF CONSUMERS						
16	CITIZENS OF HUMANITY, LLC, a	(1) VIOLATION OF CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT						
17	Delaware Limited Liability Company;	(CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE						
	MACY'S, INC., a Delaware	SECTION 1750 ET SEQ.);						
18	Corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(2) VIOLATION OF BUSINESS &						
19	marasive,	PROFESSIONS CODE						
20	Defendants.	SECTIONS 17200 ET SEQ.						
21		(CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW); AND						
22								
23		(3) VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE						
24		SECTION 17533.7						
25		(CALIFORNIA FALSE "MADE						
26		IN USA" CLAIM).						
27		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL [FRCP 38]						
28) [FRCF 36]						
		1						
	COMPLAINT							

COMES NOW, plaintiff LOUISE CLARK ("Plaintiff"), as an individual and on behalf of the general public and all others similarly situated, by her undersigned attorneys, alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE CASE

- 1. This is a putative class action case brought on behalf of all purchasers of "Made in the U.S.A." labeled apparel products manufactured, distributed, marketed, and/or sold by defendants Citizens of Humanity, LLC ("COH") in California. The unlawfully labeled COH apparel products are sold in various stores in California, including Macy's, Inc. ("Macy's"). COH, Macy's, and the DOE defendants are collectively hereinafter referred to as the "Defendants." Through an unlawful, deceptive and unfair course of conduct, Defendants manufactured, marketed, and/or sold to California consumers a variety of COH apparel products with the false designation and representation that the COH apparel was "Made in the U.S.A."
- 2. As stated by the California Supreme Court in *Kwikset v. Superior Court* (January 27, 2011) 51 Cal.4th 310, 328-29:

Simply stated: labels matter. The marketing industry is based on the premise that labels matter, that consumers will choose one product over another similar product based on its label and various tangible and intangible qualities they may come to associate with a particular source. . . . In particular, to some consumers, the "Made in U.S.A." label matters. A range of motivations may fuel this preference, from the desire to support domestic jobs, to beliefs about quality, to concerns about overseas environmental or labor conditions, to simple patriotism. The Legislature has recognized the materiality of this representation by specifically outlawing deceptive and fraudulent "Made in America" representations. (§17533.7;

Plaintiff purchased the mislabeled COH apparel product, which in part is the subject matter of this lawsuit, from a San Diego Macy's store.

see also Civ.Code, §1770, subd. (a)(4) [prohibiting deceptive representations of geographic origin].) The object of section 17533.7 "is to protect consumers from being misled when they purchase products in the belief that they are advancing the interests of the United States and its industries and workers"

- 3. The "Made in the U.S.A." claim is prominently printed on the apparel products themselves.² The offending apparel products, however, are substantially made, manufactured, or produced from <u>component parts</u> that are manufactured *outside of the United States* in violation of California law and/or federal law.
- 4. On information and belief, major components of the apparel products, including but not limited to the fabric, thread, buttons, subcomponents of the zipper assembly, and/or rivets are manufactured *outside of the United States*.

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is an individual residing in San Diego, California.
- 6. Defendant Citizens of Humanity, LLC is a limited liability company that is organized and exists under the laws of the State of Delaware. COH may be served with process in this matter by serving its registered agent for service of process as follows: National Registered Agents, Inc., 2875 Michelle Drive, Irvine, CA 92606.
- 7. COH is a leading designer and manufacturer of denim jean products. On information and belief, COH designs, markets, and produces more than one million pairs of jeans annually. COH is distributed in over 1,300 retailers in more than 35 countries including high-end specialty boutiques such as Curve, Fred Segal, Scoop, Madison, and Anthropologie; online at Shopbop.com and MyTheresa.com; as well as in

Plaintiff intends to seek class wide relief on behalf of all California purchasers of any COH apparel product labeled as "Made in the U.S.A." that incorporated foreign-made component parts (in violation of California and/or federal law) and not just the specific brand of jeans purchased by Plaintiff.

luxury department stores Barneys New York, Bergdorf Goodman, Neiman Marcus and Bloomingdale's. One of the products COH manufacturers and sells in California (either directly or through California retailers) is the "BOYFRIEND" brand of jeans purchased by Plaintiff at a San Diego Macy's store on or about May 31, 2014.

- 8. Defendant Macy's, Inc. (hereinafter "Macy's") is a Delaware corporation doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California. Macy's principal place of business is 7 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202. Macy's may be served with process in this matter by serving its registered agent for service of process at: Corporation Service Company, 2711 Centerville Road, Suite 400, Wilmington, DE 19808.
- 9. Macy's is a high-end fashion retailer that offers apparel, shoes, cosmetics, and accessories for women, men, and children in the United States.
- 10. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1-100, inclusive; therefore, Plaintiff sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitious named defendants are legally responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, assisted in and about the wrongs complained herein by providing financial support, advice, resources, or other assistance. Plaintiff will amend the complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
- 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes that all defendants were agents, servants, and employees of their co-defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter mentioned, were acting within the scope of their authority as such agents, servants, and employees with the permission and consent of their co-defendants.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to CAFA because the amount in controversy in this matter exceeds \$5,000,000.00 as to all Class

11

9

12 13

15 16

17

14

18

20 21

19

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

Members, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, and injunctive relief. 28 U.S.C. Sections 1332(d), 1453, and 1711-1715.

13. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1391(c) in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 14. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 13, inclusive, of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 15. Defendants manufacture, market, and/or sell COH apparel products that have printed on the product itself and the product packaging that the products are "Made in the U.S.A."
- 16. Contrary to the representation, the COH apparel products are substantially and/or partially made, manufactured, or produced with component parts that are manufactured outside of the United States. Based upon information and belief, the foreign component parts included in the BOYFRIEND jeans (and presumably all other offending COH apparel products) are the fabric, thread, buttons, and/or rivets. For other models of jeans, Plaintiff is informed and believes that the fabric, thread, buttons, rivets, and/or certain subcomponents of the zipper assembly are made outside of the United States as well.
- 17. Defendants market, and continue to market, and represent to the general public that COH apparel products are "Made in the U.S.A." In addition, Defendants fraudulently concealed the material facts at issue herein by failing to disclose 100% of the truth to the California general public regarding the country of origin of COH apparel products. The disclosure of this information was necessary in order to make Defendants' representation not misleading. Defendants possess superior knowledge of the true facts which were not disclosed, thereby tolling the running of any applicable statute of limitations.

- 18. Consumers are particularly vulnerable to these deceptive and fraudulent practices. Most consumers possess very limited knowledge of the likelihood that products, including the component parts therein, claimed to be made in the United States are in fact made in foreign countries. This is a material factor in many individuals' purchasing decisions, as they believe they are supporting American companies and American jobs.
- 19. Consumers generally believe that "Made in the U.S.A." products are of higher quality than their foreign-manufactured counterparts. Due to Defendants' scheme to defraud the market, members of the general public were fraudulently induced to purchase Defendants' products at inflated prices. On information and belief, and during the entirety of the relevant four-year statutory time period, Defendants charged excess monies for COH apparel products, in comparison to their competitors, based on the false "Made in the U.S.A." designation. California and federal laws are designed to protect consumers from this type of false representation and predatory conduct. Defendants' scheme to defraud consumers is ongoing and will victimize consumers each and every day until altered by judicial intervention.

THE PLAINTIFF TRANSACTION

- 20. On or about May 31, 2014, Plaintiff purchased the BOYFRIEND brand jeans at a Macy's store in San Diego. At the time of purchase, the product itself was marked with a "Made in the U.S.A." country of origin designation when the product actually contains component parts made outside of the United States. Accordingly, Defendants are not entitled to lawfully make a "Made in the U.S.A." representation on the product.
- 21. In each case when Plaintiff, and Class Members, purchased a Class Product³, they relied upon Defendants' "Made in the U.S.A." representation in

The term "Class Products" is defined as any COH manufactured or labeled product that was sold in California during the past four years with a "Made in the U.S.A" or equivalent country of origin label but that incorporated foreign-made

8

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24 25

26 27

28

their purchasing decision, which is typical of most U.S. consumers, and they were deceived as a result of Defendants' actions. These purchasing decisions were supported by the "Made in the U.S.A." representation made by Defendants, which is absent from most of Defendants' competitors. Plaintiff believed at the time she purchased the BOYFRIEND jeans that she was supporting U.S. jobs and the U.S. economy.

- 22. Plaintiff suffered an "injury in fact" because Plaintiff's money was taken by Defendants as a result of Defendants' false "Made in the U.S.A." claims set forth on the BOYFRIEND jeans. Furthermore, she suffered an "injury in fact" by paying for something she believed was genuinely manufactured in the USA, when it was not.
- 23. U.S. made component parts are subject to strict regulatory requirements, such as environmental, labor, and safety standards. Foreign made component parts are not subject to the same U.S. manufacturing standards and are often inherently of lower quality than their U.S. made counterparts. Foreign made component parts are also routinely less reliable and durable than their U.S. made counterparts. As such, the BOYFRIEND brand of jeans are of inferior quality due to COH's decision to include foreign made component parts within.
- 24. As such, and on information and belief, the offending COH apparel products, made with foreign-made component parts, are of inferior quality, less reliable, and fail more often than if the product was truly made from 100% American made component parts. Essentially, the BOYFRIEND brand of jeans are not worth the purchase price paid. The precise amount of damages will be proven at time of trial, in large part, by expert testimony.
- 25. Plaintiff and Class Members were undoubtedly injured as a result of Defendants' false "Made in the U.S.A." representations that are at issue in this litigation.

component p	arts.
-------------	-------

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 26. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive, of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 27. Plaintiff brings this action, as set forth below, against Defendants, pursuant to Rules 23(a), 23(b)(1), 23(b)(2), and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("Fed. R. Civ. P."), individually and on behalf of a class consisting of all persons in the United States who purchased one or more of Defendants' COH apparel products during the relevant four-year statutory time period that bore a "Made in the U.S.A." country of origin designation but that contained foreign-made component parts (the "Class"). Excluded from the Class are the Court and its employees; Defendants; any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of Defendants; and all employees and directors who are or have been employed by Defendants during the relevant time period.

Definition of the Subclass

28. Subclass members are all of Defendants' California customers who purchased COH apparel products that were labeled as "MADE IN U.S.A. OF IMPORTED FABRIC" that contained foreign-made component parts beyond the fabric (e.g., rivets, thread, buttons, and/or subcomponents of the zipper assembly) during the relevant four-year statutory time period (hereinafter the "Sub-Class Products").

Class Action Requirements

29. The numerosity requirement of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1) is satisfied for each of the foregoing Classes because the members of each Class are so numerous and geographically dispersed that joinder of all Class members is impracticable. Plaintiff currently believes that there are hundreds of thousands of members of each Class located in the State of California.

- 30. Common questions of fact and law exist here, satisfying the requirement of Rule 23(a)(2), including but not limited to:
 - a. whether Defendants participated in, or committed the wrongful conduct alleged herein;
 - b. whether Defendants' acts, transactions, or course of conduct constitute the violations of law alleged herein;
 - c. whether the members of the Class and the Sub-Class sustained and/or continue to sustain damages by reason of Defendants' conduct, and, if so, the proper measure and appropriate formula to be applied in determining such damages; and
 - f. whether the members of the Class and the Sub-Class are entitled to injunctive or other equitable relief.
- 31. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of all other members of the Class and the Sub-Class and involve the same violations of law by Defendants as other Class members' claims. Plaintiff and members of the Class and Sub-Class also sustained damages arising out of Defendants' common course of conduct complained herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff satisfies the "typicality" requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3) with respect to the Class and Sub-Class.
- 32. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other members of the Class and Sub-Class, and has no interests that are antagonistic to or which conflict with those of the other members of those Classes. Plaintiff is committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action and has retained competent counsel experienced in litigation of this nature to represent her and the other members of the Class and Sub-Class; as such, the requirements of Rule 23(a)(4) are satisfied.
- 33. Absent a representative class action, members of the Class and the Sub-Class would continue to suffer the harm described herein, for which they

would have no remedy. Even if separate actions could be brought by individual purchasers, the resulting multiplicity of lawsuits would cause undue hardship and expense for both the Court and the litigants, as well as create a risk of inconsistent rulings and adjudications that might be dispositive of the interests of similarly situated purchasers, substantially impeding their ability to protect their interests, while establishing incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants. The proposed Class, and, respectively, the members of the Sub-Class, thus satisfy the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1).

- 34. Defendants acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to Plaintiff and the other members of the Class, and, respectively, the members of the Sub-Class, thereby rendering class certification and injunctive relief with respect to the Class as a whole and the Sub-Class appropriate. Certification under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) is proper in this regard.
- 35. As discussed above, numerous common questions of fact and law exist. These questions predominate over the individual questions presented in this action. The predominance requirement of Rule 23(b)(3) is thus satisfied.
- 36. A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, because joinder of all members of the Class, and, respectively, the Sub-Class, is impracticable. Because the damages suffered by individual members of the Class, and, respectively, the Sub-Class, may be relatively small, the expense and burden of litigation would prevent class members from individually redressing the wrongs done to them. Where, as here, the size and nature of individual Class members' claims would allow few, if any, members of those Classes to seek legal redress against Defendants for the wrongs complained of herein, a representative class action is both the appropriate vehicle by which to adjudicate these claims and is essential to the interests of justice. Furthermore, a class action regarding the issues in this action creates no significant

9 10

8

12

11

13 14

16

15

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27 28 problems of manageability. The superiority and manageability requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) are thus satisfied.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Violation of California Consumers Legal Remedies Act Against All Defendants)

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 36, inclusive, of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 38. California Civil Code Section 1750 et seq. (entitled the Consumers Legal Remedies Act) provides a list of "unfair or deceptive" practices in a "transaction" relating to the sale of "goods" or "services" to a "consumer." The Legislature's intent in promulgating the Consumers Legal Remedies Act is expressed in Civil Code Section 1760, which provides, inter alia, that its terms are to be:

[C]onstrued liberally and applied to promote its underlying purposes, which are to protect consumers against unfair and deceptive business practices and to provide efficient and economical procedures to secure such protection.

- 39. COH apparel products constituted "goods" as defined in Civil Code Section 1761(a).
- Plaintiff, and Class members, are each a "Consumer" as defined in 40. Civil Code Section 1761(d).
- 41. Each of Plaintiff's and Class members' purchases of COH apparel products constituted a "transaction" as defined in Civil Code Section 1761(e).
- 42. Civil Code Section 1770(a)(4) and (9) provides that "[t]he following unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices undertaken by any person in a transaction intended to result or which results in the sale or lease of goods or services to any consumer are unlawful: Using deceptive representations or designations of geographic origin in connection with goods or

services [and] [a]dvertising goods or services with intent not to sell them as advertised."

- 43. Defendants violated Civil Code Section 1770(a)(4) and (9) by marketing and representing that their COH apparel products are "Made in the U.S.A." when they actually contain component parts that are manufactured outside of the United States.
- 44. It is alleged on information and belief that Defendant's violations of the Consumer's Legal Remedies Act set forth herein were done with awareness of the fact that the conduct alleged was wrongful and were motivated solely for increased profit. It is also alleged on information and belief that Defendants did these acts knowing the harm that would result to Plaintiff and that Defendants did these acts notwithstanding that knowledge.
- 45. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violations of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to the following remedies as against Defendants: (a) a declaration that Defendants violated the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, and (b) an injunction preventing Defendants' unlawful actions.
- 46. Plaintiff suffered an "injury in fact" because Plaintiff's money was taken by Defendants as a result of Defendants' false "Made in the U.S.A." claims set forth on the COH apparel products.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Violation of Business & Prof. Code Section 17200 *Et Seq.* Against All Defendants)

47. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 46, inclusive, of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

- 48. Business & Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* provides that unfair competition means and includes "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading marketing."
- 49. By and through their conduct, including the conduct detailed above, Defendants engaged in activities which constitute unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices prohibited by Business & Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. Beginning at an exact date unknown as yet and continuing up through the present, Defendants committed acts of unfair competition, including those described above, by engaging in a pattern of "unlawful" business practices, within the meaning of Business & Professions Code Section 17200 et seq., by manufacturing, distributing, and marketing COH apparel products with a false country of origin designation and violating Section 17533.7 by falsely claiming that the products referenced herein are "Made in U.S.A." when they actually contain component parts manufactured outside of the United States.
- 50. Beginning at an exact date unknown as yet and continuing up through the present, Defendants committed acts of unfair competition that are prohibited by Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq*. Defendants engaged in a pattern of "unfair" business practices that violate the wording and intent of the statutes, by engaging in practices that threaten an incipient violation of law or violate the policy or spirit of laws because their effects are comparable to or the same as a violation of the law by manufacturing, distributing, and marketing their COH apparel products with a false country of origin designation, and by violating Section 17533.7 by falsely claiming that their COH apparel products referenced herein are "Made in the U.S.A." when they actually contain component parts manufactured outside of the United States.
- 51. Alternatively, Defendants engaged in a pattern of "unfair" business practices that violate the wording and intent of the statutes, by engaging in practices that are immoral, unethical, oppressive or unscrupulous, the utility (if

any) of which conduct is far outweighed by the harm done to consumers and public policy by manufacturing, distributing, marketing, and advertising COH apparel products with the false claim that the products referenced herein are "Made in the U.S.A."

- 52. Alternatively, Defendants engaged in a pattern of "unfair" business practices that violate the wording and intent of the statutes, by engaging in practices, including manufacturing, distributing, marketing, and advertising COH apparel products with the false claim that the products referenced herein are "Made in the U.S.A.," wherein: (1) the injury to the consumer was substantial; (2) the injury was not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to consumers or competition; and (3) the injury was of the kind that the consumers themselves could not reasonably have avoided.
- 53. Beginning at an exact date unknown as yet and continuing up through the present, Defendants committed acts of unfair competition, including those described above, prohibited by Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* by engaging in a pattern of "fraudulent" business practices within the meaning of Business & Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*, by manufacturing, distributing, and marketing COH apparel products with a false country of origin designation and violating Section 17533.7 by falsely claiming that the products referenced herein are "Made in U.S.A."
- 54. Defendant engaged in these unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices for the primary purpose of collecting unlawful and unauthorized monies from Plaintiff and all others similarly situated; thereby unjustly enriching Defendants.
- 55. As a result of the repeated violations described herein, Defendants received and continue to receive unearned commercial benefits at the expense of their competitors and the public.

- 56. Defendants' unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices presents a continuing threat to the public in that Defendants continues to engage in unlawful conduct.
- 57. Such acts and omissions are unlawful and/or unfair and/or fraudulent and constitute a violation of Business & Professions Code section 17200 *et seq*. Plaintiff reserves the right to identify additional violations by Defendants as may be established through discovery.
- 58. As a direct and legal result of their unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent conduct described herein, Defendants have been and will be unjustly enriched by the receipt of ill-gotten gains from customers, including Plaintiff, who unwittingly provided money to Defendants based on Defendants' fraudulent country of origin designation.
- 59. Plaintiff suffered an "injury in fact" because Plaintiff's money was taken by Defendants as a result of Defendants' false "Made in the U.S.A." claims set forth on the COH apparel products.
- 60. In prosecuting this action for the enforcement of important rights affecting the public interest, Plaintiff seeks the recovery of attorneys' fees, which is available to a prevailing plaintiff in class action cases such as this.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17533.7 Against All Defendants)

- 61. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 60, inclusive, of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
 - 62. Business & Professions Code Section 17533.7 provides:

It is unlawful for any person, firm, corporation or association to sell or offer for sale in this State any merchandise on which merchandise or on its container there appears the words "Made in U.S.A." "Made in America," "U.S.A.," or similar words when the

merchandise or any article, unit, or part thereof, has been entirely or substantially made, manufactured, or produced outside of the United States. (Emphasis added).

- 63. Defendants (both COH and Macy's) violated Business & Professions Code Section 17533.7 by selling and offering to sell merchandise in the State of California with the "Made in the U.S.A." country of origin designation as fully set forth herein. The merchandise at issue in this case actually contains <u>component</u> <u>parts</u> that are manufactured outside of the United States in violation of California and federal law.
- 64. It is alleged on information and belief that Defendants' violations of Business & Professions Code Section 17533.7 were done with awareness of the fact that the conduct alleged was wrongful and were motivated solely for increased profit. It is also alleged on information and belief that Defendants did these acts knowing the harm that would result to Plaintiff and that Defendants did these acts notwithstanding that knowledge.
- 65. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violations of Business & Professions Code Section 17533.7, Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to restitution of excess monies paid to Defendants by Plaintiff and Class members relating to the false "Made in the U.S.A." claims on Defendants' COH apparel products.
- 66. Plaintiff suffered an "injury in fact" because Plaintiff's money was taken by Defendants as a result of Defendants' false "Made in the U.S.A." claims set forth on the COH apparel products.
- 67. In prosecuting this action for the enforcement of important rights affecting the public interest, Plaintiff seeks the recovery of attorneys' fees, which is available to a prevailing plaintiff in class action cases such as this.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves, collectively on behalf of

the Class, and respectively on behalf of the Sub-Class, respectfully request the following relief:

- 1. That the Court determine that this action may be maintained as a class action by certifying this case as a California class action as to both the Class and Sub-Class;
- 2. That the Court certify Plaintiff to serve as a class representative in this case:
- 3. That Defendants' wrongful conduct alleged herein be adjudged and decreed to violate the consumer protection statutory claims asserted herein;
- 4. That Plaintiff and each of the other members of the Class and each of the Sub-Class recover the amounts by which Defendants have been unjustly enriched;
- 5. That Defendants be enjoined from continuing the wrongful conduct alleged herein and required to comply with all applicable law;
- 6. That Plaintiff and each of the other members of the Class and each of the Sub-Class recover their costs of suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses as provided by law; and
- 7. That Plaintiff and each of the other members of Class and each of the Sub-Class be granted such other and further relief as the nature of the case may require or as this Court deems just and proper.

21 1///

20

22 1///

23 1///

24 1///

25 1///

26 1///

27 1///

. . || . .

28 | | / / /

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Pursuant to Rule 38, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury with respect to all issues triable to a jury. Dated: June 9, 2014 Respectfully submitted, DEL MAR LAW GROUP, LLP By:/sJohn H. Donboli
John H. Donboli
E-mail: jdonboli@delmarlawgroup.com
JL Sean Slattery
E-mail: sslattery@delmarlawgroup.com
Attorneys for: LOUISE CLARK, an individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated

PaJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

'14CV1404 JLS WVG

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 THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

		<u>′</u>				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS				
Louise Clark		Citizens of Humanity, LLC; Macy's, Inc., and DOES 1 through				
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			
• •	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		County of Residence of	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	ONLY)	
			NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	. Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)			
• •	P, 12250 El Camino Real, Ste. 120,	, San				
Diego, CA 92130; (858)						
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	⊋ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	1		FF DEF 1	PTF DEF	
2 U.S. Government	图 4 Diversity	Citiza	en of Another State	2	Principal Place 🗇 5 🕱 5	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	ì		of Business In .		
	,	Citizo	en or Subject of a 💢 🗇	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	06 06	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	4. The A		had a service and a service and a service a	I manufacturation of the control of		
CONTRACT D 110 Insurance	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJ		ORFETTURE/PENALTY 0 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES ☐ 400 State Reapportionment	
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Inju	ury - 🔲 62	0 Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 410 Antitrust	
 ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negoriable Instrument 	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpta Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injur		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liab	ility 🗖 63	0 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	1 460 Deportation	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander Slander 368 Asbestos Pers 1330 Federal Employets' Injury Produc		ORR & Truck O Airline Regs.	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	
 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans 	Liability Liability 340 Marine PERSONAL PROP	☐ 66°	0 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark	☐ 480 Consumer Credit	
(Excl. Veterans)	345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud		Safety/Health 0 Other		☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability		LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Dam	nage	Act	362 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge	
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability		0 Labor/Mgmt, Relations 0 Labor/Mgmt, Reporting	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury		& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETIT 441 Voting 510 Motions to V		0 Railway Labor Act 0 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act ☐ 893 Environmental Matters	
 □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 	☐ 442 Employment Sentence ☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	I	1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party	894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information	
240 Torus to Land	Accommodations 🗊 530 General		Security Act	26 USC 7609	Act	
 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus &		IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application		☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access	
	Employment 🗇 550 Civil Rights	□ 46	3 Habeas Corpus -		to Justice	
	446 Amer, w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condit Other	l –	Alien Detainee 5 Other Immigration		☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights		Actions			
⊼ 1 Original □ 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from		sened -1 3 anothe	erred from	Magistrate	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which yo 28 USC Section 1332		(speci	(V)	Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cause: Violation of Consumer Statute			• .		
VII. REQUESTED IN			EMAND S		if demanded in complaint:	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			JURY DEMAND:	•	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE	SIGNATURE OF	ATTORNEY (OF RECORD			
06/0 9 /2014		the the				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		/ 				
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT APPLYING IF.	P	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE	